Certainly, capital outflows could be expected to resume on a massive scale if we, by our own actions, demonstrate to all the world an unwillingness to take those actions that are necessary to reduce and eliminate our deficit. In that event, no one could answer for the continued stability of the dollar.

I know of no substitute for the legislation before you that will adequately meet the need without turning in the direction of direct controls. Thus, it should be clearly understood that rejection of the substance of this legislation would force the United States to move, in this area of portfolio investment, to measures of direct control contrary to our traditions—measures that we must do everything in our power to avoid. For these reasons, I consider it of utmost importance that your committee take prompt and affirmative action in support of the general principles embodied in this proposal.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 22, 1963)

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

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

O Thou God above all, yet in all: Our way is veiled in night; with Thee alone is endless day. Out of the darkness and above the storms of earth, we lift our prayer.

In spite of our selfish schemes, which too often have been blind to the welfare of the common man at home and abroad, Thou hast entrusted to our hands and to those who march with us in freedom's cause the keys of the future. As the unworthy agents of Thy resistless will, our eyes are seeing Thy righteous sentence written against any tyranny which blasphemes Thy Holy Name, and the fulfillment of the ancient word: "Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall in it; and he that rolleth a stone, it will return upon him."

In this grand, yet awful, time, we are solemnly conscious in this historic Chamber that the light of each new day is calling for decisions of destiny which will mold the future, determining the shape of things to come for myriads of the sons of men and of generations unborn.

Open our eyes and strengthen our hearts, that we may trust tomorrow's gleams. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 22, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

H.R. 5244. An act to modify the project on the Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa, to permit the use of certain property for public park purposes;

H.R. 5945. An act to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; and

H.R. 8821. An act 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 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 1064. An act to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity;

S. 1576. An act to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction of community mental health centers, and for other purposes;

H.R. 844. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 845. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 2635. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations;

H.R. 3306. An act to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission;

H.R. 6225. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6481. An act to permit the government of Guam to authorize a public authority to undertake urban renewal and housing activities.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 5244. An act to modify the project on the Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa, to permit the use of certain property for public park purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5945. An act to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8821. An act 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 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury; to the Committee on Finance.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate met following a recess, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, and that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

Morning business is in order.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ADDITIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORY FACILITIES FOR MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on additional research laboratory facilities for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON UNAUTHORIZED USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS ADVANCED TO THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE, VIII OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the unauthorized use of Federal funds advanced to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Games, Squaw Valley, Calif., U.S.A. 1960, Inc., for construction of a sports arena, dated October 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON WEAKNESSES IN ADMINISTRATION OF HOSPITAL RESEARCH GRANT PROGRAM, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the weaknesses in administration of the hospital research grant program, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated October 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPLY TO B-118763, JUNE 28, 1963

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

to law, a report on the Department of Defense reply to B-118763, June 28, 1963, failure of the Department of the Navy to fully recover excessive administrative cost allowances included in fixed prices negotiated with Brown-Raymond-Walsh (a joint venture) under contract NOy-83333 for the Spanish base construction program, dated October 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON THE AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report on the Auburn-Folsom South unit, Central Valley project, California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MAJ. VICTOR R. ROBINSON, JR., U.S. AIR FORCE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Maj. Victor R. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Public Schools of Worcester, Mass., signed by James J. Hayward, clerk, relating to the enactment of legislation to permit the opening of schools with a prayer ceremony, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 215. Resolution providing additional funds for a study by the Committee on Government Operations of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency, authorized by Senate Resolution 27, 88th Congress (Rept. No. 591).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nomination of Maj. Gen. Fred M. Dean for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general in connection with his contemplated assignment as assistant to the Director, Weapons Evaluation and Control, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I ask that this nomination be printed on the Executive Calendar.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in addition I report favorably 245 officers for temporary and permanent appointment in the Navy and Marine Corps in grades not above lieutenant commander and captain and 509 officers for temporary appointment to the grade of major in the Marine Corps.

Since these names have already been printed 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 VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2253. A bill to make certain expenditures in connection with the Peoria, Ill., "medical center" project eligible as local grants-in-aid toward that project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2254. A bill to require the procurement of certain services by Government agencies from commercial suppliers whenever economy will result from such procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2255. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain property at Hot Springs National Park, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2256. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2257. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 2258. A bill to establish a voluntary special agricultural conservation wheat program for 1964 and 1965 crop years; to provide for the resumption of the use of wheat for feed in areas where it has been used historically for this purpose; to minimize the amount of export subsidies and diversion payments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. MCINTYRE (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 2259. A bill to further amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 371), to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

My Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of housing facilities for agricultural workers by permitting the amortization over a 60-month period of the cost, or a portion of the cost, of constructing such housing facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. BURDICK):

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—JOINT EXPLORATION AND USE OF SPACE

Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mrs. NEUBERGER) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65) favoring agreements with other nations for the joint exploration and use of space and to place a man on the moon, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

FEDERAL SERVICES PROCUREMENT ACT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would require the procurement of certain services by Government agencies from commercial suppliers whenever economy will result from such procurement. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 10 days so that those Senators who may wish to cosponsor may add their names to it.

This proposed Federal Service Procurement Act is, in my opinion, necessary to reverse a continuing trend toward interagency dealings for the provision of various services on a reimbursable basis, in competition with private, taxpaying firms. When one agency retains the services of another, the action is not usually based on any cost comparison; the proposed act would require that consideration be given to possible economies available through consideration of private enterprise firms providing like services.

Professional societies representing consulting engineers and photogrammetrists in private practice have recently called to my attention a number of instances of Federal interagency dealings competing with their members. Proposals from private firms were not invited, and so the Government has no means of ascertaining what savings, if any, might have been obtained.

I sincerely feel that the Government should be enabled to take advantage of the economies available through the employment of private firms or Federal agencies following a meaningful cost comparison.

RESTRICTION OF CERTAIN AREAS IN OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of the Air

Force, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes and for other purposes.

The legislation would restrict the use of certain submerged lands off the gulf coast of the State of Florida, and restrict the operation of mineral leasing laws therein.

The installation involved is a portion of the gulf test range consisting of over 24 million acres of submerged land which is used by the Air Force and Navy in the testing and development of weapons systems and in the training of personnel.

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

The bill (S. 2257) to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FOREST CREDIT AND NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the development of sustained yield forestry has brought many benefits to the national economy and the American people. It has permitted the more orderly development of forest products industries. Lands under such management afford wildlife habitat and recreational benefits for visitors. On occasion, however, a landowner finds it impossible to provide such management for want of credit. Better fire control, higher prices for forest products, the development of a market for hardwood pulp, and other developments have made certain kinds of forestry loans high grade credit risks for private lenders, thus freeing woodlot owners and forest products industries from any need to rely entirely on Government credit. I therefore introduce and send to the desk, for myself, and Senators SPARKMAN, MUSKIE, and PROUTY, a bill to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts.

Mr. President, this bill would increase the amount permitted for such loans from 40 percent of the value of stumpage up to 60 percent of the value of both standing and growing timber, land, and improvements thereon. It would extend the permitted term of such loans from 10 years up to 15 years. The bill is offered as an amendment to section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, enacted by Congress in 1953.

My own State of New Hampshire is 87 percent forested but much of these forests, especially on small woodlots, must be classed as poor second growth timber. Today's lumber markets require the best possible quality, so it is hard for our region to capitalize upon the undoubted economic and employment potential of these forests. As needed improvements cannot be taken without long periods of unrewarded investment, the nature of forest credit becomes very important to us.

Forest credit enables the woodland owner to increase his holdings to economically efficient size. It may enable an owner to hold rapidly appreciating stands until they are at an optimum stage for cutting by providing funds for taxpayments and improvement. Loans on such property sometimes enable the owner of unstocked or rundown forests to rehabilitate his stand. The owner might seek a loan in order to avoid cutting when a farm is sold, when he is in temporary financial difficulties, or to wait out a downturn in market conditions. In transmitting this bill for the consideration of the Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury expressed the belief that the credit needs of the timber industry require greater recognition. This bill will help to meet those needs and extend such recognition.

The bill is fully consistent with the dual-banking system. Most State-chartered banks already have such authority. In my own State of New Hampshire mutual savings banks may make loans on all real estate up to 70 percent of the value of the real property, either in New Hampshire or any adjacent State. State-chartered commercial banks may make loans on similar conditions in any New England State. In some States, the powers of State-chartered commercial banks are tied to the powers of nationally chartered banks, which in turn depend on section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act where forest credit is concerned. I believe this bill's passage would have one distinct benefit in contributing, throughout the entire dual-banking system, to a positive recognition of forestry as an appropriate field of lending activity.

There are many woodlots too small for commercially advantageous forestry operations. A second benefit from the passage of this bill might be to encourage the kind of effective operation that would serve as a base for credit. The excellent study of "Forest Credit in the United States," published by Resources for the Future, Inc., made this observation:

> A more aggressive effort on the part of the lending agencies to make credit available, if sound practices and organization are adopted, can be a powerful influence in bringing about the changes needed to make forestry a better basis for credit.

Such changes might include greater attention to cooperative marketing arrangements, reliance on technical advice from consulting foresters and State and Federal Government agencies, and regional treatment and warehousing facilities.

This bill will not meet all of our needs for improved forestry credit. The Farmers Home Administration operates a forest loan program whose liberal terms may be necessary for the more risky loans. I intend to explore the possibility of providing variable repayment schedules on private loans as well intermediate credit arrangements where forestry mortgages might be discounted. The support which this bill enjoys from forestry associations, State and National banks, and students of our resource needs makes it a very desirable first step. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the bill be held at the desk should additional Senators wish to cosponsor, through Thursday, October 31, and that the text of the bill appear at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The bill (S. 2259) to further amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 371), to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts, introduced by Mr. McINTYRE (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as added by the Act of August 15, 1953, c. 510, 67 Stat. 613 (12 U.S.C. 371), is amended to read:

"Any national banking association may make real estate loans secured by first liens upon forest tracts which are properly managed in all respects. Such loans shall be in the form of an obligation or obligations secured by mortgage, trust deed, or other instrument; and any national banking association may purchase any obligation so secured when the entire amount of such obligation is sold to the association. The amount of any such loan shall not exceed 60 per centum of the appraised fair market value of the growing timber, lands, and improvements thereon offered as security and the loan shall be made upon such terms and conditions as to assure that at no time shall the loan balance exceed 60 per centum of the original appraised total value of the property then remaining. No such loan shall be made for a longer term than three years; except that any such loan may be made for a term not longer than fifteen years if the loan is secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other such instrument under the terms of which the installment payments are sufficient to amortize the principal of the loan within a period of not more than fifteen years and at a rate of at least 6⅔ per centum per annum. All such loans secured by first lien upon forest tracts shall be included in the permissible aggregate of all real estate loans prescribed in the preceding paragraph, but no national banking association shall make forest-tract loans in an aggregate sum in excess of 50 per centum of its capital stock paid in and unimpaired plus 50 per centum of its unimpaired surplus fund."

CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSING FACILITIES FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a tax incentive, in the form of rapid amortization for the construction of farm labor housing. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until Tuesday, October 29, for additional sponsors.

Mr. President, the farmer who employs hired labor, and especially migratory labor, in many respects is in a position nearly unique among employers. Not the least of the farmer's special problems is

that he is generally under the necessity of providing housing for his employees. This housing is an extra item of labor cost, and where the housing is adequate, safe, and sanitary, the cost can become heavy indeed. This is especially true respecting migrant housing, because migratory workers are needed in large numbers, for short periods; and the housing provided for them is likely to stand vacant for large portions of the year. Current developments in mechanization further increase the burden of providing good housing, for in numerous crops and areas the need for the migrant's labor may be eliminated entirely within a few years.

Because the farmer carries this special burden, Mr. President, I believe it is appropriate to make some special assistance available to him. Despite the fact that many farm employers have performed exemplarily in providing good housing for their workers, there is still a great deal of housing for migrants that can fairly be described as deplorably wretched and totally inadequate for human habitation. Furthermore, the fact that the migratory worker may, at some future time, because obsolete is no reason to countenance the housing conditions he is sometimes faced with now.

The need for better farmworker housing was stressed—not for the first time—at a hearing just a week ago before the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. In testimony for the Department of Labor, Under Secretary John F. Henning gave a vivid description of the living conditions of many migrant farmworkers in this country. The following is an excerpt from Secretary Henning's testimony:

A field report by the State Services Division of the Bureau of Labor Standards on the living conditions of approximately 235 migrants in two camps in a Midwestern State is shocking. The first camp visited consisted of a group of six city buses and a trailer located in the middle of a field in the hot sun with no shade. According to the report, no water of any kind was available in the camp itself. Water was hauled in a large garbage-type can from a long distance; garbage and waste were collected in uncovered cans within 15 feet of the bus, which had no screens of any kind.

The second camp included 50 old buses parked in a grove of trees, where there were at least five pumps for water and a pit on the edge of the camp for disposing of refuse. Some of the buses had screens; more of them had burlap sacks on the outside of the windows. However, the three open doorways in each bus were not protected by screens of any kind and the windows for ventilation in the outside toilet were also unscreened.

A recent report from a regional consultant to the Bureau of Labor Standards on labor camps in a Western State describes sanitary conditions in a particular camp as atrocious, with no bathing facilities in the camp and no running water in the cabins. Wood stoves were used for cooking purposes, making the cabins extremely hot in the summer.

Typical of a widespread problem are conditions disclosed in an investigation conducted by the Bureau of Employment Security in a Southwestern States where the camp was found to have no hot water for bathing, improper drainage, and fire hazards. In other camps the investigator found stagnant water around outside water spigots, bath water seeping into a nearby well, screens in need of repair, and doors, floors, and seats from outside toilets missing.

Since this particular investigation was conducted under an international agreement imposing conditions on the use of foreign farm workers, the workers could be removed from these unsanitary surroundings. The Federal Government can offer no such protections to domestic farmworkers.

Mr. President, the principle of Federal assistance for farm housing is well established. The recent hearing from which Secretary Henning's testimony was quoted was directed to another migratory labor bill, S. 981, to expand the direct financial assistance for farm housing available under the Housing Act of 1949. But the gravity of the farm labor housing situation is such, in my opinion, that we should give the most serious consideration to every means at our disposal for correcting it. Accordingly, the legislation introduced today would create an incentive for the improvement of farm labor housing through an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code.

Under this bill, the construction costs of housing for domestic farm labor could be amortized for tax purposes over a period of 5 years, rather than, as at present, depreciated over 25, 30, or 40 years—whatever may be the entire useful life of the housing facility. In addition to new construction, the amortization deduction would be available respecting the costs of alteration or remodeling so as to improve or enlarge an existing housing facility for domestic agricultural workers.

The special deduction, in lieu of depreciation, could be taken by a farmer or other owner with respect to housing completed after December 31, 1962, or by the purchaser of such housing. To qualify, the owner would obtain a certificate from the Secretary of Agriculture covering these three points:

First. That the housing facility has been constructed to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for agricultural workers;

Second. If the housing is to be rented, rather than being furnished to farmworkers rent free, that the rentals will be reasonable in view of the occupants' probable incomes and earning capacities; and

Third. That during the 5-year amortization period, the housing will be made available primarily for occupancy by domestic agricultural workers and will be maintained in accordance with applicable minimum standards on safety and sanitation.

Mr. President, I realize that consideration of the tax measure is well underway. Yet, the equities of the bill introduced are so clear and, the tax implications so simple, that I believe it not unrealistic to anticipate that the Finance Committee can consider it at an early date and report it favorably during this Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 2260) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of housing facilities for agricultural workers by permitting the amortization over a 60-month period of the cost, or a portion of the cost, of constructing such housing facilities, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL FARMERS WEEK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], I introduce today a joint resolution providing that the 7-day period beginning on the first Sunday of April in each year be designated as National Farmers Week. Such a week would be observed with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and would serve to call attention to the American people the farmer's contribution to the strength and resources of our country.

The truly great story of our time, Mr. President, is a factual report on what farm families have done and are doing for our country.

The 188 million men, women, and children of the United States have more food of better quality in greater variety than any people in any country in all recorded history.

And not only do Americans have more than enough food available to them, they buy it for a smaller share of their incomes than do families in any other country. In the last 2 years the proportion of consumer income required to purchase food has dropped to the lowest ratio in history—19 percent of take-home pay.

Mr. President, while producing more and more better foods, farm families have been sending workers from the land into other areas of the Nation's economy—into manufacturing, transportation, business, and the professions and services. Our industrial development has been due in great measure to the fact that we were able to steadily increase food production, thereby substituting increased skills and technology for farmworkers.

In the last decade, production per man-hour in agriculture increased 77 percent. A century ago one worker on the farm supplied food and fiber for less than five persons. By 1940 the figure had risen to 10. Now, just 23 years later, each farmworker supplies food and fiber for 28 persons.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, those who feed us so well do not themselves eat very high on the hog. Farm income has improved the past 2 years, but it still averages only 60 percent of nonfarm income. But while farmers are fewer in number and do not share equitably in the national income, they make a significant contribution to the total economy.

There are fewer than 15 million people living on our farms—only about 8 percent of the country's population. The population of the State of California exceeds our national farm population.

Yet farmers create millions of jobs for fellow Americans. Ten million people have jobs storing, transporting,

processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture. Six million have jobs providing the supplies farmers use. Thousands in rural communities across the land make their livings providing services required by farmers.

The investment in agriculture exceeds $200 billion. That figure is comparable to about three-fourths of the value of current assets for all corporations in the country. It represents three-fifths of the value of all corporation stock on the New York Stock Exchange.

The investment in agriculture represents $21,300 for each farmworker, as compared with a manufacturing investment of $16,000 for each worker. In 1961, when our farmers had a gross income of nearly $40 billion, they spent $27 billion to operate their businesses.

Farmers spend over $2 billion a year for trucks, tractors, machines, and other equipment. Farming uses more petroleum than any other single industry—more than $2 billion is spent by farmers each year for fuel, lubricants, and equipment maintenance.

You could provide Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Portland, San Diego, and Chicago with electricity for a year and the kilowatt consumption would be about the same as the total needed to keep our farms going.

When people begin telling me, Mr. President, all the things the country is doing for agriculture, I ask them what would happen if this Nation lost three-fourths of the assets of all corporations, or three-fifths of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Exchange, or more than 16 million nonfarm jobs.

The answers to these questions are, in part, the answers to what farm families are doing for the country.

Mr. President, the resolution I have introduced today—a resolution providing for an annual National Farmers Week in the spring—would in a small way express a nation's gratitude to the men, women, and children who live and work on the Nation's family farms. I am hopeful the resolution will receive early consideration by the Judiciary Committee and that this body will see fit to pass it at an early date. I ask unanimous consent to have the joint resolution printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 128) providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. BURDICK), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the seven-day period beginning on the first Sunday of April in each year is hereby designated as National Farmers Week, and the President is requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 234)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 7885—the Foreign Assistance Act—and ask that it be printed and lie on the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This amendment will merely put contracts with and grants to educational institutions under the foreign aid program on the same footing as contracts with and grants to educational institutions in our domestic programs.

I have previously spoken about this amendment when I introduced it as an amendment to S. 1276. This amendment has since been perfected in consultation with the National Association of College and University Business Officers and the Commission on International Education of the American Council on Education. I shall speak on this amendment at greater length next week.

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

The amendment (No. 234) is as follows:

On page 50, delete lines 19 through 24 and on page 51 delete lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(k) Any cost-type contract or agreement (including grants) entered into with a university, college, or other educational institution for the purpose of carrying out programs authorized by part I may provide for the payment of the reimbursable indirect costs of said university, college, or other educational institutions on the basis of predetermined fixed-percentage rates (determined in accordance with a formula established by the Bureau of the Budget for determining costs), applied to the total, or an element thereof, of the reimbursable direct costs incurred, provided that none of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 20 per centum of the direct costs."

AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT TO TERMINATE MILITARY AID TO LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES (AMENDMENT NO. 235)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators ERVIN, NELSON, PROXMIRE, CANNON, MCGOVERN, MORSE, and SMATHERS, I submit an amendment to H.R. 7885—the foreign assistance bill. This amendment would provide for the termination of all military aid to all Latin American countries.

Recent events in Latin America emphasize the need for such an amendment. I intend to speak at length on this matter next week. I submit this amendment at this time so that my colleagues may have an opportunity to study it.

I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be printed and lie at the desk and also that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The amendment (No. 235) is as follows:

Insert between lines 8 and 9 on page 41 the following:

"(d) Section 505(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-195) is hereby amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the following proviso: '*Provided,* That, except (1) to the extent necessary to fulfill prior commitments and (2) to the extent that the President finds, with respect to any Latin American country, that the furnishing of military assistance under this Act is necessary to safeguard the security of the United States, and so informs the Congress, no further military assistance under any provision of this Act shall be furnished to any Latin American country.'"

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 236)

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ALASKA DAY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last Friday was Alaska Day.

October 18 marked the 97th anniversary of the transfer of Russian America from the ownership of the czar of all the Russias to the United States of America. On October 18, 1867, in a ceremony at Sitka, Alaska, Gen. L. H. Rousseau took formal possession of Alaska on behalf of President Andrew Jackson of the United States.

It was my great good fortune to be present at Sitka last Friday. Hundreds of people gathered in the former capital of Alaska from all sections of the 49th State. My colleague and friend, Representative RALPH J. RIVERS, had also gone to Sitka from Washington for this historic event. And, as has been the case for many years, the military participated actively. Present were Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, Commander in Chief, Alaska Command, as well as Maj. Gen. Ned D. Moore, Commanding General, U.S. Army, Alaska, Rear Adm. Fred E. Bakutis, commander of the 17th Naval District, and Rear Adm. George D. Synon, Commander of the 17th Coast Guard District, together with many other officers and military units. The people of Sitka are especially appreciative of all that the military has done to make this annual celebration a success, and speaking in their behalf now as well as my own, I want to thank General Reeves. On Castle Hill Friday afternoon there was reenactment of the lowering of the Russian flag and raising of the Stars and Stripes. Then Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska delivered the only address in a brief but very impressive ceremony.

The history of Alaska is a fascinating study. The histor yof Alaska is, in fact, nothing less than the history of our Nation's relations with Soviet Russia; for it is in Alaska that the eastern expan-

sion of Russia came face to face, or as we say now, eyeball to eyeball, with the western expansion of the United States. The experience which we gained in negotiating the sale with Russia in 1867 is as valid today as it was then.

Some will say the relatively new peril of communism has changed the face of the world, the ways of diplomacy. But I wonder. The more I read of the past, the more I am impressed with how little today is new, how much is the same.

An example of this, perhaps, is the hot line which President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev have agreed will provide instant communication between the White House and the Kremlin. I wonder how many Senators know that this proposal is not new; that it was first advanced by President Abraham Lincoln. Some of the reasons may be different, but the essential fact remains. In 1864, in the midst of the Civil War, the President in his annual message to the Congress, proposed the construction of an overland telegraph route from the east coast of America through Alaska and Siberia to the then capital, St. Petersburg, where it would connect with direct lines to the European capitals.

The construction of the project proposed by the Western Union Telegraph Co. was actually begun in 1865. Work crews began stringing lines from the Seward Peninsula in the region of Nome in that year. As a matter of fact, it was these Western Union employees who made the first gold strike on the Seward Peninsula. They were the forerunners of many, many thousands of sourdough miners who came to Nome at the turn of the century.

Gold was discovered in 1865 and then it was forgotten. It was not rediscovered until 1898.

A Western Union party ascended the Yukon River as far as Selkirk, Yukon Territory of Canada. In 1867 another party went up the Yukon as far as Fort Yukon. Meanwhile, similar parties were at work in Siberia.

It is sad to relate that all this work came for naught, for in 1866 the first transatlantic cable was laid successfully and as a result the overland system was no longer needed.

The sale of Alaska to the United States was negotiated and formally signed by treaty March 30, 1867. The Russians, however, we now know, had been interested in selling the territory for close to a decade.

In 1859 the subject was broached to the Russian minister to the United States by Senator Gwin, of California, acting on behalf of President Buchanan. No firm offer was made but mention was made that the United States might be willing to pay as high as $5 million.

The Russian Ambassador, Baron Edouard Stoeckel, in a confidential memo to his home government, said that this seemed to be a large sum, more than the colony was worth—more, in fact, he added, than the colony ever would be worth and certainly as much as the United States would ever be willing to give.

The baron was proved wrong on every point.

The baron, in his memo, pointed out the benefits which the czar would gain from the sale. The fur trade was declining in importance. The Russian-American company, which operated the colony and sold the furs, was in financial difficulties which seemed to be getting worse. Alaska could be seized by any strong naval power in time of war. No doubt, the baron meant Great Britain, a nation with whom the Russian Government had recently been at war. It was important to Russia that Britain not be allowed to obtain a dominant position in the Pacific. The baron recognized the truth that the nation which controls Alaska controls the Pacific Ocean, and he did not want it to fall into the hands of a great power. The United States was not then a great power but was strong enough to defend Alaska.

The strategic importance of Alaska is a fact which must never be forgotten, for if it is forgotten, it is only relearned at great cost. This was clearly and most expensively demonstrated at the beginning of the Second War when it was necessary to arm a defenseless Alaska at great speed.

There is another interesting document in the Russian archives from this period dealing with Alaska. It is thought to have been written by Admiral Popov February 7, 1860. The admiral stated that Russia might as well sell Alaska to America because America was bound and determined to have it in time by sale or otherwise.

By 1866 the Russians had decided to sell Alaska. They gave the minister a map with the frontiers outlined and told him not to take less than $5 million.

In March of 1867 Stoeckel called on Secretary of State Seward and the negotiations began.

Having been instructed not to take less than $5 million, Baron Stoeckel told Seward he could not possibly consider anything less than $7 million.

After weeks of hard fought negotiations, Secretary of State Seward finally obtained Baron Stoeckel's concession: Russia would sell Alaska for $7 million.

Because of various technicalities in negotiations, it become necessary for the United States to add an additional $200,000 to the selling price.

America bought Alaska the way most of us buy used cars.

The treaty was signed at 4 a.m. March 30, 1867. It was a strange time to sign a treaty but Seward was anxious to complete the deal, especially so because the 40th Congress was close to adjournment and he wished to obtain Senate approval of the treaty before the Congress went home. He was afraid the Russians would take affront if the treaty was not promptly ratified. Senators will feel a pang of envy at the thought of a Congress adjourning in March or April. Here it is October and here we are, still. Senators who were impressed with the speed and decision with which the Senate recently ratified the test ban treaty will also be interested to know that the sale-of-Alaska treaty was signed on the 30th of March, was considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, reported out and approved by a vote of 37 to 2 on April 9. It was charged at the time that delaying tactics were being used.

As I have said, on October 18 title was handed over from Russia to the United States. The Congress, however, did not get around to paying the bill until July 14, 1868.

It has been 97 years since the first Alaska Day. Since that time America's original investment has been repaid one hundred, nay, a thousandfold. Last year alone, Alaska oil and natural gas brought $31,599,000 into our Nation's economy, and this is but a beginning. The next 97 years will bring expansion and development of undreamed of proportions to Alaska. All America will benefit from Secretary Seward's great wisdom in buying Alaska, and we can overlook with a smile his, perhaps, unnecessary generosity.

FISHING IN TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it was with great gratification that I learned today that the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission has gone on record in favor of S. 1988, the bill which was introduced by me to "prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States." This bill is now before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, having been passed by the Senate recently. It is cosponsored by Mr. ERVIN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. DODD, and Mr. RIBICOFF. The fisheries industry generally considers it to be of significance and importance and as its author I want to thank the members of the Gulf State Marine Fisheries Commission for this endorsement. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be included as part of my remarks.

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

Resolved, That the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission go on record as approving in principle S. 1988 (88th Cong., 1st sess.), which legislation is designed to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That endorsement of the purposes of this proposed legislation is in no way intended to define territorial limits that are presently or may be claimed by any State of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the members of the Senate Committee on Commerce, the members of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the congressional delegations of the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

YES, VIRGINIA, THERE IS NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, for years I have been receiving philatelic releases from the Post Office Department announcing issuance of new postage stamps.

The other day I received philatelic release No. 80 on Post Office stationery with an announcement that the second special Christmas postage stamp will be commemorated at Santa Claus, Ind. However, I was very disturbed to see that the Post Office Department in its announcement used the names of two majority party Senators and one Representative to announce the ceremony.

I feel that if Senators and Representatives would like to put out a news release about Santa Claus, Ind., or Christmas postage stamps they should do so on their own time and using their own paper and ink. The Post Office Department should stick to its ZIP code.

Under the title of "Yes, Virginia, There Is News Management," I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the Post Office release so that my colleagues can see this latest attempt at administration publicity efforts.

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

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT PHILATELIC RELEASE No. 80

Senators VANCE HARTKE, BIRCH E. BAYH, and Congressman WINFIELD K. DENTON, of Evansville, Ind., announced today that nearby Santa Claus, Ind., will be the site of the first-day ceremony marking the issuance of the Post Office Department's second special Christmas postage stamp.

The Indiana Senators and Congressman said that Postmaster General John A. Gronouski had just informed them that the seasonally famous Indiana post office had been selected for the ceremony on November 1, during which the special stamp, featuring the national Christmas tree on the Ellipse near the White House in Washington, would first be sold to the public.

"Since nearly 2 million people a year and over 3 million Christmas cards pass through this unique Indiana community of only 35 residents, it is particularly suitable for the Post Office Department to issue the seasonal stamp here," Senator HARTKE said.

According to Congressman DENTON, the Santa Claus post office normally employs only two clerks but must add seven more employees during the Christmas season merely to satisfy the national demand for the popular Santa Claus, Ind., postmark.

The Post Office Department issued a Christmas stamp for the first time in history in 1962, and stocks were exhausted in many parts of the country despite a crash program to print a billion stamps.

"The Post Office Department has assured us that their printing plans, begun in the spring of this year, will provide enough stamps for all Christmas cards with an order of nearly 2 billion already in progress," Senator BAYH said.

Legend has it that the southern Indiana community got its unusual name on Christmas Eve of 1856 as town fathers in a local church struggled for a suitable name and were interrupted by the entrance of a gift-laden Santa Claus whose appearance prompted the children present to yell their recognition and thus name the town.

Robert Ripley, of "Believe It or Not" fame, put Santa Claus, Ind., on the map in the late twenties when he mailed giant-sized postcards from the small post office there with the now famous Santa Claus postmark.

The November 1 date for the Christmas stamp dedication at Santa Claus was selected by the overwhelming majority of postmasters as a result of their experience with Christmas mail handling and stamp sales a year ago.

Following the initial sale and ceremonies in Santa Claus on November 1, the Christmas stamps will go on sale the next day at all 41,000 postal installations around the Nation.

ANTHRACITE COAL SUPPLIES

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, Maine is presently faced with an inadequate supply of coal for the current heating season. Because of this threat, I have been making efforts to rectify this situation and have been contacting Federal agencies on the matter.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD a report received today from the Department of Commerce.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1963.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Mr. Dutton has sent us a copy of his letter to you of October 10 regarding the adequacy of anthracite coal supplies for the current heating season. Secretary Hodges has asked me to write to you indicating that we share your concern and that we are following very closely developments in the anthracite supply situation in respect to both the domestic and foreign markets. By reason of your expression of interest we are taking this occasion to give you what we have learned about the origin and nature of the present difficulties and what is being done to provide sufficient hard coal to U.S. consumers.

As you know the anthracite producing industry has suffered a continuing severe loss of domestic markets for more than 10 years. The closing of mines and curtailment of employment made the anthracite region of Pennsylvania one of the most grievously depressed in the Nation. With no reasonable prospect of checking, much less reversing the downward trend in domestic sales, producers and brokers looked abroad in the hope of recovering some of the market that had been lost there in recent years. The unusually hard winter of 1962–63 presented the opportunity to achieve a sizable increase in export shipments mainly to Western Europe.

We have been assured by the Department of the Interior that the increase in production in 1963 will more than cover the growth of exports, thus leaving sufficient anthracite for the domestic market to meet all reasonable demands. The Bureau of Mines estimates 1963 production through the first week in October at a figure of 2.2 million tons greater than for the corresponding period of 1962. Additional output for the calendar year 1963 is expected to exceed 1962 production by 3 million tons. Exports for the first 8 months were 900,000 tons ahead of last year and may top full year 1962 exports by 1.2 million to 1.5 million. The addition to our foreign exchange earnings of $25–$30 million represented by increased sales of this magnitude would be welcome indeed if achieved without deprivation of domestic consumers.

In summary, the picture we have given you of the anthracite situation is one of uneven distribution rather than general shortage. There are a number of reasons why certain dealers and areas may have inadequate supplies at this time, even though total supplies of anthracite may be sufficient for this heating season. Some dealers did not heed the urging of producers issued in the spring and delayed placing their orders. In past years prices turned soft in the spring and dealers were able to secure discounts in the summer months; this year prices remained firm and are slightly higher than a year ago. Further, some dealers, in an effort to beat an expected price rise, or to take advantage of competitor's short supplies, ordered larger quantities of coal than they have in the past at this time of the year. Still others, on the usual commercial criteria, are considered to be bad credit risks and their business is no longer wanted by the suppliers.

On the other hand some dealers, particularly those dependent on rail shipment, have legitimate complaints. There is strong evidence that truck trade has been getting in line ahead of rail trade at the mines and preparation plants. This situation reflects the fact that in a relatively tight market it is simpler and more convenient for the producers to serve those coal yards which get their supplies by truck. Therefore, it is not surprising that the bulk of complaints have come from New England and conversely that there have been no reports of supply difficulties from Pennsylvania dealers.

An attempt is now being made to deal with this problem of unequal distribution. In recent weeks some of the major producers have instituted an allocation program intended to redress the balance of shipments to rail versus truck customers. Under this arrangement shipments to New England should show an immediate improvement.

The Department of Commerce was represented at a meeting of producers and retail dealers last week at which an arrangement was agreed upon of allocating supplies to those areas and dealers which were in greatest need. Dealers will be urgently requested to place their complaints with their respective State associations to be forwarded to the Secretary of the Eastern States Retail Fuel Conference who will serve as clearing officer for the industry. Each dealer's complaint will be validated and, if found to be legitimate, will be referred to the president of the Anthracite Institute for corrective action by the producers.

In our view the industry's efforts to solve this problem by its own informal allocation should be given every encouragement and a fair chance of success. This way we avoid the permanent injury to our foreign markets for bituminous as well as anthracite coal which could result from unnecessary Government action. Nevertheless, we are mindful of our domestic needs and will continue to give close attention to anthracite distribution to see whether or not the industry arrangement will be effective.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL L. GOLDY,
Administrator.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND REFUGEES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, stemming from the United Nations, there is a little known function that I would like to bring out today, on this 18th birthday of the United Nations organization. Literally millions of helpless people, including women and children, the halt and the lame, and fighters for freedom, have been helped by this great humanitarian effort. I refer, Mr. President, to the vital work

of the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

This Government has played an important role by contributing funds and other resources to aid the efforts of the High Commissioner. I think it timely and useful that we be reminded of the accomplishments of this refugee program.

The office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—UNHCR—was established in 1951 by resolution of the United Nations General Assembly to provide international protection for refugees. Most of these refugees were Europeans.

The High Commissioner strived to find permanent solutions to longstanding refugee problems by assisting governments and private organizations to repatriate refugees voluntarily, or assimilate them within new national communities.

Later, the General Assembly authorized the High Commissioner to provide material assistance to refugees to help them reestablish themselves; and in a series of resolutions starting in 1957, the General Assembly authorized the High Commissioner to exercise his good offices in assisting governments to resolve refugee problems on their territories which are not the concern of the United Nations.

The High Commissioner has thus not only discharged his responsibilities for securing the legal and political protection of refugees and carrying out his own assistance programs: he has also influenced and coordinated the work of other international organizations—both governmental and private—private voluntary agencies and governments of countries offering asylum to refugees. That is, he has not only served effectively as a prime mover in promoting the solution of refugee problems, but also as a catalytic agent to stimulate maximum contributions and effort on the part of the international community. The leadership role of the UNHCR during World Refugee Year—1959–60—when the value of international contributions in behalf of refugees exceeded $92 million, is a notable example. The UNHCR carries out his functions in Europe, the Near East, Africa, the Far East, and the Western Hemisphere, and maintains offices in most of the countries within which refugees reside.

LEGAL AND POLITICAL PROTECTION

The basic job of the UNHCR is to provide legal and political protection for refugees. To this end, he insures the application of international conventions, particularly the Geneva Convention of 1951 relating to the status of refugees which secures certain minimum basic rights for refugees. Without this protection their assimilation into new national communities can never be fully successful. These guarantees include the right for them to work in their country of residence, including exercise of the liberal professions; social security benefits; eligibility for public housing; education and welfare; and other social benefits. His office also protects the refugees against involuntary repatriation, while facilitating the voluntary repatriation of those who choose it. A corollary activity is to insure the refugee's right to freedom of movement within and between countries, and their travel documentation.

The High Commissioner has placed great emphasis on his legal and political protection function. Partly through his efforts, 42 nations have adhered to the Geneva Convention. Hundreds of thousands of refugees have been naturalized within the countries offering them final resettlement, including tens of thousands who have been integrated within the countries which originally granted them asylum.

Especially important is the task of assuring generous asylum policies for political refugees in the various countries into which refugees flee. Almost without exception refugees fleeing from political persecution are granted asylum.

As of January 1, 1963, there were still an estimated 1,300,000 refugees throughout the world who were eligible for the High Commissioner's legal and political protection services.

UNHCR MATERIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Since 1955 the UNHCR has carried out material assistance programs designed to reestablish refugees within his mandate. During the last 3 years, he has also carried out, coordinated or contributed to programs, chiefly in Africa and Asia, for refugees who are not within his mandate.

The UNHCR's regular assistance program has primarily covered European refugees from communism in Europe, but has also included a program in the Far East for European refugees escaping from Communist China. It has concentrated on promoting integration within the asylum countries of the refugees who could not be emigrated to other countries. Using voluntary agencies as his primary contractors and operational agents, the UNHCR program provides counseling services, housing, grants to enable refugees to become reestablished in business or their liberal professions or trades, and similar measures.

It gives special attention to rehabilitating severely handicapped refugees through pensions, medical therapy, old-age homes and other forms of institutional placement. Interim care and maintenance assistance is given to the most needy cases.

When the UNHCR commenced its regular assistance program on a large scale in 1955 there were 270,000 unassimilated mandate refugees in Europe and elsewhere. There are today no more than 30,000 unassimilated refugees, despite the fact that over 300,000 new refugees have entered Europe during the intervening years, including 180,000 Hungarian refugees who escaped in 1956–57 after the abortive Hungarian revolt. This reduction has been brought about by the combined efforts of a number of agencies and governments. The UNHCR programs have provided assistance during this period to 137,000 refugees, and have been directly responsible for reestablishment—largely through local integration—of 82,000 refugees.

In his regular program the High Commissioner first attacked the problem of refugees who had been living in camps for many years. By the end of 1962 he had successfully reestablished 32,000 of these refugees, leaving only 4,000 still in camps in Germany, Austria, Italy and Greece, all of whom will be reestablished by the end of 1963. During the past 2 years the UNHCR has shifted emphasis to solving the problem of out-of-camp refugees through country clearance programs. It is now engaged in a final 3-year effort to resolve this program completely by the end of 1965.

A particularly compassionate problem facing the UNHCR is that of the refugees who are severely handicapped by mental, physical, or social disabilities. These refugees, numbering several thousand, have been passed over many times by immigration missions from resettlement countries. The UNHCR instituted special programs, on an individual case basis, for solving the problems of each of these refugees and working out their successful rehabilitation. It employed a trained psychiatrist, for example, to direct a special mental health program in behalf of 1,800 hardship cases in this category. Half of these cases have now been successfully solved, and the other half are under treatment. Similarly, half of the 850 refugees suffering from particularly severe physical or social handicaps have now been resettled abroad on a self-sufficient basis, and the remainder of these cases are being processed for similar settlement. Another significant achievement was the successful local reestablishment, largely within Austria, of some 7,000 Hungarian freedom fighters who did not qualify for immigration to other countries. The High Commissioner expended $11 million for this effort.

In the Far East the UNHCR has carried out a joint program with the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—ICEM—for the care and maintenance and oversea resettlement of European refugees—mostly White Russians—arriving in Hong Kong from Communist China. These refugees are the remnants of a group, with their families, who escaped into China from Russia just after the Bolshevik revolution over 40 years ago. They have been victimized within Communist China, and the Soviet Union has pressed for their forcible repatriation. This program, which has attracted worldwide attention, has successfully resettled over 13,000 of the refugees over the past few years, leaving only some 2,000 of the refugees still on mainland China to be assisted in the future.

The UNHCR's regular program has been funded through contributions from many governments, including the United States, voluntary agencies, and other private sources, and by the provision of matching funds by asylum countries for projects carried out within these countries. All told, contributions to this program to date have exceeded $120 million, of which nearly half has come from the international community and slightly over half from the supporting contributions of the asylum governments.

THE UNHCR PROGRAM FOR ALGERIAN REFGUEES

From 1959 through 1962, the High Commissioner operating under a special

mandate from the U.N. General Assembly—carried out a program in behalf of over 200,000 Algerian refugees who fled from the war in Algeria into Morocco and Tunisia. Operating jointly with the League of Red Cross Societies, and with assistance received from many governments, including major contributions from the United States, the High Commissioner's office provided food, shelter, and clothing for these refugees while they were in Tunisia and Morocco. More than $22 million was expended by the UNHCR and the Red Cross in this relief operation.

When the Evian Agreements made it possible for the refugees to return to Algeria in the summer of 1962, the High Commissioner participated in the supervision of the repatriation operation. This massive movement was carried out successfully in 2½ months.

The High Commissioner has also continued to provide assistance to these refugees to facilitate their reintegration into the war-torn economy of Algeria. This repatriation program brought an end to a compelling humanitarian problem, since 85 percent of the refugees were children, mothers, and elderly persons.

THE UNHCR GOOD OFFICES PROGRAM

The office of the UNHCR was established primarily to deal with the postwar problem of European refugees in Europe. The subsequent development of new and compelling refugee problems in other areas, notably Asia and Africa, influenced the United Nations General Assembly to pass several resolutions from 1957 onward authorizing the UNHCR to use its good offices in assisting refugees who are not the concern of the United Nations. Under this authority, the High Commissioner acted in a twofold capacity: he has raised funds for asylum governments to help them meet the heavy financial burdens of caring for the refugees; and at the request of the asylum governments, he has arranged and supervised programs designed to reestablish the refugees.

The problem of over 1,200,000 refugees in Hong Kong has been dealt with primarily by the Kong Kong Government. However, the General Assembly passed resolutions in 1957 and 1962 calling upon the High Commissioner to solicit contributions from the international community to help meet this problem. The UNHCR has raised nearly $1 million for Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and Macau which has been made available to help fund projects carried out by the Hong Kong and Macau Governments and by interested voluntary agencies. The UNHCR also contributed funds to the Government of Cambodia, at the latter's request, to help meet the refugee problem in that country.

The High Commissioner has been particularly active under his good offices function in helping to resolve refugee problems in Africa during the past 3 years. These problems involved some 6,000 refugees from Ghana who fled into Togo; over 150,000 Angolan refugees who entered the Congo; and 150,000 refugees from Rwanda who fled during 1961 into the neighboring asylum countries of Uganda, Tanganyika, Burundi and the Kivu Province of the Congo. The pattern of UNHCR assistance has been similar in all of these cases. In each case the asylum government requested the UNHCR to coordinate the development of international assistance and to act jointly with it in supervising the assistance program; the UNHCR called upon the League of International Red Cross Societies and the voluntary agencies to provide resources and staff, acting as its operational agents; and the UNHCR arranged and supervised programs for resettling the refugees on land within the asylum countries. In addition to interim direct relief, the refugees have been given housing materials and construction tools, and seeds and agricultural implements, to help them become self-sufficient. Through these efforts the UNHCR was able to solve completely the problem in Togo by the end of 1962, and has made signficant progress in resolving the problems of the Angolan and Rwanda refugees.

While the High Commissioner has devoted only about $3 million of his own funds to these good offices programs, as in the case of the refugee problem in Europe, he has successfully mobilized the attention and resources of the international community toward helping to put an end to problems which are a threat to the peace and which arise from the disturbing political developments of the 20th century. Consistent with his mandate from the General Assembly, the High Commissioner has attacked all the problems within the purview of his office on a purely humanitarian and nonpolitical basis.

Mr. President, this sums up in hard, cold, numerical facts, the accomplishments of the refugee program carried out by the United Nations High Commissioner. What I have been unable to do is to reflect the pathos, multiplied millions of times, signified by the refugees helped. Words could not accomplish this. Each of us would have to see for himself the privation, hunger, ill health and objection in the faces of these displaced persons of the world. This, of course, is impossible in this Chamber, but I ask each of you to reflect for a moment on this matter and join me in reaffirming our support and faith in this great humanitarian program.

In a sense, by aiding this vital program, we have lived up to the words of the Statue of Liberty, "Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed to me."

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, 18 years have passed since the U.S. Senate advised and consented, by a vote of 89 to 2 to the ratification of the United Nations Charter. I voted to consent to the U.N. Charter with the conviction that the United Nations would be an instrument to help maintain peace in the world, not by deciding the terms of settlements between nations, but by assisting them to obtain a peaceful settlement of differences through the prestige and the influence of public opinion developed on the basis of debates in the Assembly.

In signing the charter the United States pledged with 49 other nations to strive "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." The 50 charter members, seeking to prevent future devastation such as the world had suffered from World War II, reaffirmed their "faith in fundamental human rights," and declared their intent to "promote social progress." Since 1945, 61 additional nations have subscribed to the principles of the U.N. Charter and the organization has labored valiantly in the attempt to establish the proper world conditions in which the important and humanitarian charter objectives might be realized.

Since its inception the United Nations has played an important role in the settling of many international crises and in the mediation of numerous smaller controversies among nations. From Kashmir to the Congo, from Korea to Cuba, in the Suez and other areas, the U.N. has been significantly committed to the defense of freedom and the preservation of peace. The struggle thus far has been tedious and costly. Yet, as new areas of conflict appear in many parts of the world, such as in Yemen and Malaysia, we realize that the struggle is far from over.

In dealing with issues of vast international implication, the United Nations has demonstrated great versatility. It provided the forces for freedom in Korea. It maintains a peacekeeping mission in the Middle East. At the same time it provides the world with a continuous forum for debate, a channel for the presentation of national positions, and a center for important negotiations. Although some of these functions have been subjects of vehement criticism, each has been and continues to be significant.

Other aspects of the world body's operations, although they have received less publicity, are equally important in attempting to carry out the charter's objectives. Such agencies as WHO, UNESCO, UNICEF, FAO, and the ILO are constantly striving to provide the world's population with a more meaningful and satisfactory life and a higher and more secure standard of living. The assistance in public administration as well as the application of science and technology in less developed areas are integral parts of the war on want and poverty. The stimulation of economic development, the promotion of international trade, the increase of food production, and the uplifting of health standards and literacy rates, are all of major importance in closing the gap between the have and have-not nations. In advancing social welfare and human rights, these agencies are contributing to the conditions which formulate the basis for peace in the world.

It is imperative that we maintain the proper perspective in considering the appropriate role of the United Nations. While we praise its possibilities, we must also be aware of its limitations. However, although the organization has not been completely successful in all that it has undertaken, it is still a valuable force for good in the world and I believe merits our continued support.

To be effective and useful, it is obvious that the United Nations must have adequate financial resources. If all member nations would meet their financial obligations this would be possible. Unfortunately some countries have proved unwilling to fulfill their commitments, thereby placing heavy burdens on other nations, particularly the United States. The future success of the U.N. depends on the active support of all member nations, not just a few of the larger ones. If that body is to become financially dependent on the United States, it will lose its character as an independent body standing on its own two feet and its value as a constructive force for peace in the world will be reduced.

Today we honor the United Nations and its achievements. At the same time we honor the many dedicated men and women who have contributed to its development. We must remember, however, that this body can only be as effective in its effort to promote peace among the nations of the world and social welfare for the many poverty-stricken peoples of the world as its members will it to be. Thus, on this 24th of October, we offer our hope that the United Nations will continue to be strengthened as a vital instrument in man's quest for peace, progress, and justice.

PLIGHT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UKRAINE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the President of the North Dakota Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, recently wrote to me about the plight of the people of the Ukraine. In his letter he enclosed an editorial from the Bismarck Tribune, Bismarck, N. Dak., entitled, "Hunger Again 30 Years After," along with a leaflet "Famine in Ukraine—a Warning for the West." I want to call these two items to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, Oct. 12, 1963]

HUNGER AGAIN 30 YEARS AFTER

Food shortages in Russia come on the bitterly appropriate anniversary of an historic famine. It was 30 years ago that the great hunger of 1929–33 brought death to millions in the Ukraine.

Famine then was a weapon of Soviet terrorism. The Ukraine's 60 million acres of land produced wheat for some 20 million tons of bread. It provided, between 1909 and 1913, 20 percent of Europe's grain supply.

But Ukrainians resisted the collectivizing of their country, and Moscow Communists resorted to drastic measures. They confiscated 500,000 farms, drove 2.5 million people from their homes, deported a million peasants to slave labor camps and set out to reduce the Ukraine by starvation.

An edict of August 2, 1932, forbade peasants, under penalty of death, to take any of the food they produced. They were forbidden to leave villages in search of food outside the Ukraine. All food products of the Ukraine were designed for export. While Communist militia stood guard over grain elevators full to overflowing, families died of starvation in streets and cannibalism reportedly became widespread. Ukrainians say between 6 and 7 million of their people died.

The anniversary is called to mind by Dr. Anthony Zukowsky of Steele, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, State branch.

Thirty years ago, famine in a food-rich land was calculated and artificial and a weapon of subjugation. Moscow is not exactly free with information as to what has produced this year's food shortages, but that they exist is known to be a fact. For some millions of persons who lived through the famine of the early thirties, this will be a painful anniversary.

FAMINE IN UKRAINE—A WARNING FOR THE WEST

The Kremlin today dominates one-third of the world and threatens the entire free world with subjugation and tyranny. The picture of conditions in the subjugated territories and enslaved nations shows only terror, slavery, mass genocide, persecution, and misery.

This leaflet is being issued upon the 30th anniversary of one of the most horrible crimes committed by the Kremlin upon its victims—an artificial famine calculated and carried out to break the will of the Ukrainians in their resistance and opposition to the regime.

Ukraine, with a population of 45 million has the richest farming land in Europe. Sixty million acres of land produce wheat for 20 million tons of bread. From 1909 to 1913 Ukraine provided 20 percent of Europe's grain supply. It was known as the granary or breadbasket of Europe.

In 1920 the Russian Communists overran Ukraine and made it their colony. They utilized the resources of Ukraine to develop their power and plans for sowing the seeds of chaos and revolution in the world. They introduced a system of slave labor in order to obtain products and goods cheaply and in this way to undermine the world economy.

In 1929, taking advantage of the economic crisis in the world, they began a 5-year drive against the peasants, forcing them into the collective farms. The Kremlin used the most diabolical methods on its resisting victims. In Ukraine, where the inhabitants by nature and tradition are most radically opposed to collectivization and state regimentation the effects were unbelievably horrible. From 1929 to 1932 the Moscow Communists confiscated 500,000 farms; drove 2,500,000 people with their children and aged out of their homes; deported 1 million peasants with their children, wives, aged and ailing to slave labor camps into the tundras and Siberia to die of exhaustion and hunger.

With resistance still strong, Moscow resorted to extreme measures and calculated a plan of starvation. All food products in Ukraine were designated for export. By official edict of August 2, 1932, the peasants were forbidden under penalty of death to take any of the food they produced. They were forbidden to leave their villages in search of food beyond the borders of Ukraine, while throughout the other territories of the Soviet Union food was plentiful. Entire families died in the streets of the villages in the terrible tortures of starvation. Cannibalism was widespread. The grain elevators were overflowing, but they were vigilantly guarded by the armed Communist militia to prevent the people from reaching the life-giving grain—all of which was removed from Ukraine. The International Red Cross offered aid and relief to the victims of Moscow but the Soviet Government vehemently denied the very existence of famine and the need for aid. As a result of this famine between 6 and 7 million Ukrainians died.

Such methods are used by the Kremlin to Russify and subjugate the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. Even these methods, however, are not completely successful. The love of freedom is so strong and so firmly entrenched in the hearts and minds of the Ukrainians that they continue to this day to resist actively and passively, the tyranny in their land. They will continue to resist until their final goal of a free and independent nation is achieved. And these gallant people deserve the support and encouragement of every American who believes in the principles of democracy and human rights.

The suffering and misery of the Ukrainians throughout their long enslavement in the Soviet Union should serve the free world as a warning. We should not permit ourselves to be blinded to the real aims of the Kremlin by the current Russian peace offers. For the Kremlin offers the world not peace, but misery and enslavement.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.

CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE SUPPORTS CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent statement of the Catholic Association for International Peace in support of the civil rights bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. It singles out for special mention the need for FEPC legislation, for greater powers for the Attorney General, and for action to eliminate segregation in public accommodations. This is another expression of the growing moral definition this issue is being given throughout the land. In recent months I have noted statements of this kind appearing in the RECORD from the following church groups: General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, the Fourth General Synod of the United Church of Christ, the Catholic Bishops of the United States, the Washington Hebrew Congregation, the Church Council of the American Lutheran Church, the Methodist Conference on Human Relations, and the President of the Lutheran World Federation. This is a growing voice and represents something very fundamental in the thinking of our countrymen. I urge the Members of the Senate to take the time to read these statements.

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

STATEMENT OF THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE IN SUPPORT OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

The Catholic Association for International Peace, which seeks peace with dignity for all men throughout the world, strongly endorses the civil rights bill now being considered by Congress. The measures which this bill advocates are justified in terms of traditional Catholic principles regarding racial justice, principles which are being articulated with ever-increasing refinement and urgency.

In 1958, the Catholic bishops of the United States issued a statement on "Discrimination and the Christian Conscience." The bishops pointed out that, although great strides had been made since they had addressed themselves to the evils of racism 15 years earlier, in recent years "the march toward justice and equality has been slowed if not halted in some areas. The transcendent moral issues involved have become obscured, and possibly forgotten."

Five years later, in spite of recent advances, these words are still applicable in large parts of our country, North and South. And it remains true that, as the bishops said, "the

heart of the race question is moral and religious." Enforced segregation carries with it "the judgment that an entire race, by the sole fact of race and regardless of individual qualities, is not fit to associate on equal terms with members of another race. We cannot reconcile such a judgment with the Christian view of man's nature and rights."

In this country, enforced segregation has long deprived the Negro of rights and privileges which, in justice, are his. In the basic areas of education, employment, housing, and voting, oppression conditions have prevented him from exercising his full human rights. The various evils which have followed upon this oppression, which are a direct consequence of segregation, are now being ascribed to the Negro and offered as reasons for continuing the very conditions that engendered them. This circle must be broken and the measures contained in the civil rights bill, as it was recently reported out of a House Judiciary Subcommittee, are designed to do just that. The provisions directed against segregation in public accommodations, the injunctive relief to be invested in the Office of the Attorney General in the cases where constitutional rights are violated, the FEPC legislation—all insure that the Negro will more nearly attain that status in our society which is properly his.

The Catholic Association for International Peace supports the civil rights bill, not because it will, if enacted, reduce the threat of widespread violence—although it may do that; not because it will enhance the prestige of our country in other lands—although it may do that; not because it will increase the strength of our economy—although it may do that. The CAIP supports this bill and urges that it be enacted without crippling compromise because it is designed to remove from the Negro unjust burdens under which he has so long labored, because it is designed to insure for the Negro the exercise of rights which he has been so long denied.

These rights, and their concomitant duties derive from the very nature of man. The Catholic bishops of the United States said in their joint pastoral letter of August 23, 1963:

"Respect for personal rights is not only a matter of individual moral duty; it is also a matter for civic action. Pope John stated: 'The chief concern of civil authorities must * * * be to insure that these rights are acknowledged, respected, coordinated with other rights, defended and promoted, so that in this way each one may more easily carry out his duties.'

"We know that public authority is obliged to help correct the evils of unjust discrimination practiced against any group or class. We also recognize that every minority group in America seeking its lawful rights has the obligation of respecting the lawful rights of others.

"It is clear that the racial question confronts the conscience of every man, no matter what his degree of direct or indirect involvement. Indeed, the conscience of the Nation is on trial."

NEW YORK TIMES ARTICLE STATES NEED FOR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. John C. Esty, Jr., writing in the New York Times magazine of October 20, has presented us with an excellent discussion of the inequities of our present Selective Service System in an article entitled: "The Draft: Many Threatened, Few Chosen."

Although I urge the Senators to read this excellent article in its entirety, I would like to quote a brief section in which Mr. Esty characterizes the position in which the young man of draft age finds himself.

Even though many of his peers actually have served in the Armed Forces (by earlier enlistment), the average draft-eligible 23-year-old sees only a majority of his friends getting deferred because of a personal situation which differs only slightly from his own. One friend happens to have found a girl who will marry him. Another has enough money to go to graduate school. Another happens to incline to medicine or the ministry. The inevitable result is that he wonders why he should be the one to get hooked. I am afraid that a young man today, instead of feeling guilty about not serving, feels somewhat inept if he can't work out a way to avoid the draft.

Mr. Esty does make one error in stating that the cold war GI bill never seems to be reported out of committee. In order to set the record straight, I would like to note that the cold war GI bill has been favorably reported out of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in 1959, 1961, and 1963. In 1959 the cold war GI bill was passed by the Senate; and during this session of Congress, S. 5 has been on the Senate Calendar since July 2.

Mr. Esty, however, is absolutely correct in stating that the passage of the cold war GI bill would be an excellent method to at least reduce the inequities suffered by those who actually serve in the Armed Forces while their contemporaries continue their civilian educations and occupations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Mr. John C. Esty, Jr., entitled "The Draft: Many Threatened, Few Chosen" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE DRAFT: MANY THREATENED, FEW CHOSEN—OUR SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM IS SO SELECTIVE, SAYS A CRITIC, THAT ONLY A MINORITY ACTUALLY SERVES, AND IT IS TIME WE DID SOMETHING ABOUT ITS MANY INEQUITIES

(By John C. Esty, Jr.)

(NOTE.—John C. Esty, Jr., headmaster of Taft School, was for 10 years associate dean at Amherst, where he developed a special interest in the draft while counseling students about it. He served in the Air Force, 1951–53.)

When President Kennedy exempted married men from the draft a few weeks ago, it was evident from the news stories that many reporters and readers did not fully comprehend what was going on. Yet the reaction to the President's announcement was typical of the shallow understanding which has characterized most reports about the draft for the past 12 years. It is unfortunate that a national policy that affects so many lives does not yield more readily to simple exposition.

In this instance, it was announced that the manpower pool now contained 1.7 million eligible men available for military service. Since draft quotas for the coming year are expected to average about 7,000 per month, there was obviously a vast oversupply for a limited demand. The solution seemed reasonable enough: defer the category with the greatest claim to an uninterrupted life. Thus, married men, who comprised 3 out of every 10 draftees, and 340,000 of the 1.7 million men on the waiting list, are free.

These were the facts, and the only real news interest seemed to be the possibility of a rash of precipitant marriages. A few polls were taken, a few interviews were sought, and everyone seemed to agree that 2 years in the Army was better than a lifetime of K.P. with a wife you didn't love.

This kind of oversimplification obscures the fact that the Executive order is just the latest in a series of jerry-built measures designed to remove some of the inequities, some of the inadequacies, some of the strains and some of the ridiculous internal inconsistencies in our present manpower procurement system. There are alternatives to the Selective Service System, but we seem too attached to this faithful old machine—held together with baling wire—to consider seriously some other way to man our cold-war garrison.

In order to understand the present weakness of the draft mechanism and consider new solutions intelligently, it is necessary first to understand how the system works and what its impact is on individual young men.

By act of Congress, every American male is required to register with his local draft board on his 18th birthday or within 5 days afterward. If he is away from home, he may register with any convenient board, which will then forward his papers to the home board. Usually within a year, he receives a classification questionnaire, from which his board learns of his occupational status and his immediate plans. At this point most young men are classified 1A—meaning available for service—unless they are clearly deferable by virtue of the fact that they are engaged in essential industry or farming, are ministers (or studying to become same), are in medical school or, in some cases, in other schools or colleges. One's classification doesn't matter, anyway, until he approaches his 23d birthday, at which time his status is examined again to see if he is deferable. If he is not, he is ordered for preinduction physical and mental tests. If he passes these, he is inducted into the Army in about a month.

There is a priority of draftable categories established by Executive order. Local draft boards have been required to exhaust all men in each of the following categories before moving to the next:

1. Recalcitrants and draft dodgers.
2. Volunteers—in the order in which they volunteered.
3. Nonfathers between 19 and 26—oldest first.
4. Fathers between 19 and 26—oldest first.
5. Men over 26, whose liability has been extended because of previous deferment.
6. Finally, those between 18½ and 19.

Currently, half the draft quotas are filled by volunteers (the period of service is the same) and the remainder has come from nonfathers from age 26 down to age 23. When draft quotas were sharply increased during the Berlin crisis of 1961, the additional men came from category 3 down to age 22½. The new Executive order splits up category 3 and promotes bachelors ahead of married men. Since there will now be fewer men (just bachelors) in the third category, the age of vulnerability, 23, will certainly drop—perhaps to 22½.

The priority chart shows some of the ways to avoid being drafted: marry or turn 26 or don't turn 19. It doesn't show the possibilities of deferment for other reasons, and it doesn't indicate how many men are involved in each group. To get this information we must take a different approach and examine what will happen this year to the men who will turn 23. The following figures are only approximate, but they do indicate the order of magnitude. The projection is based on the situation existing before the new order deferring married men: 1,300,000 men will reach age 23; 650,000 of these will not qualify on physical and mental grounds; 400,000 will have served or be serving in the Armed Forces by virtue of a previous enlist-

ment; 130,000 will be deferred as students, teachers, or for other reasons; 80,000 will be drafted; 40,000 will be in uncertain status.

About 3 in 10 draftees recently have been married, so the new order will defer about 24,000 of the 80,000 men who would have been drafted. There will probably not be enough qualified bachelors among the 40,000 23-year-olds in the "uncertain" category to make up the difference; hence the need to move to a younger age level. A projection similar to the one above, for the age group from 22½ to 23 suggests that this age group will produce at least 60,000 qualified bachelors. With less than half that number actually needed, we can predict that the new age of vulnerability will probably be around 22 years and 10 months. The only clarity that really emerges from these figures is that every physically and mentally qualified bachelor who reaches his 23d birthday will be drafted, unless he has reason to be deferred.

The reader who has had the patience to study these figures (and part of the problem is that very few do) will begin to see why many are threatened but few are called. Of the 1,300,000 men who will turn 23 this year, only half will qualify for the draft and a quarter of these will not have to serve. By the time this age group reaches 26, only about 40 percent will have served in the Armed Forces. But the major implication of the figures is that only 80,000 men out of a potential of 1,300,000 (less than 10 percent) will actually be drafted.

The new Executive order will not alter this incredibly low ratio; it will serve mainly to remove uncertainty from the lives of the married men. To make matters worse, the number of men who turn 23 each year is dramatically increasing, so that if draft quotas remain about the same, the ratio may drop well below 1 in 10. The inequity is obvious.

Even though many of his peers actually have served in the Armed Forces (by earlier enlistment), the average draft-eligible 23-year-old sees only a majority of his friends getting deferred because of a personal situation which differs only slightly from his own. One friend happens to have found a girl who will marry him. Another has enough money to go to graduate school. Another happens to incline to medicine or the ministry. The inevitable result is that he wonders why he should be the one to get "hooked." I am afraid that a young man today, instead of feeling guilty about not serving, feels somewhat inept if he can't work out a way to avoid the draft.

This observation is corroborated in the report of a 10-year study by the Conservation of Human Resources project at Columbia University. According to the director, Eli Ginzberg, "Most young Americans grow up without the understanding of military obligation, with the consequence that if and when they are called to duty they view it as an imposition, an annoyance, or a stroke of bad luck that they should get caught while so many others escaped." Professor Ginzberg concludes that the present attitudes of American youth toward military service are an "invitation to national disaster."

Moral erosion and confusion in one's sense of duty are not the only negative effects of our highly Selective Service System. As more and more deferment categories are set up to drain off the manpower pool, more and more youthful decisions are influenced by the chance to escape the draft. After 10 years of counseling college students on military service, I have seen this effect firsthand.

A student chooses his major field because it leads to a job in an essential industry. A senior plans to keep his student deferment by continuing on to graduate school, even though it makes no sense educationally. A career field is chosen arbitrarily just because it will mean an automatic deferment. Some students are paralyzed for effective planning of their lives because they can't figure out where the draft fits in.

And now, I suppose, the order deferring married men can't help but affect the thinking and planning of a great many young couples. It strikes me as ironic that with all the current concern over Federal control of education and interstate eating places, Selective Service may well exert a far more invidious and subtle form of control than we have ever suspected.

It has been necessary to renew the current Selective Service legislation every 4 years since 1951, but congressional debate has typically been desultory. The act has passed each time by overwhelming majorities mostly because of powerful bipartisan support from the House and Senate Armed Forces Committees.

With the responsibility of raising an army for the cold war, these men have not been willing to take the risk of trying new approaches to manpower procurement, and they cannot admit that the situation may now be too complex for old answers. The principle of present needs has always overwhelmed the principles of constitutionality, universality, and equity. Unfortunately, the principles back of our military conscription have not been fully explored since the 1951 hearings.

Confusion over principle is obvious from the fact that the Selective Service System is used to implement the Universal Military Service and Training Act of 1951. Present practice makes a mockery of the original intent that every able-bodied young man serve his country. Our current difficulties arise from the strain of maintaining a semblance of universality while armed service needs dictate greater and greater selectivity. The time has probably come when we can no longer reconcile these opposites and must choose between them. At this point new possibilities and proposals emerge rapidly.

If we determine—as a matter of principle—that every young man is needed in the service of his country, then we need only to expand our concept of national service to achieve universality and fairness. Clearly only a few will serve by carrying a gun. Some sort of Civilian Conservation Corps could be created with a therapeutic division for erstwhile 4-F's. The Army's famous literacy courses could be invoked for the illiterates. The Peace Corps—both domestic and international—could count for national service, as could work in hospitals or social agencies. Perhaps, too, public school teaching for 3 years might be equivalent to Army service for 2.

Surprisingly enough, this scheme is only the logical extension of what is going on now with all the kinds of deferments granted by local draft boards. It would require only a slightly broader vision of how a young man might serve his country.

On the other hand, it might be more feasible to develop a completely voluntary military establishment and forget about compulsory service altogether. Here again we are not so far from this extreme as one might think.

The annual replacement need for our present establishment of 2.7 million men is about 600,000. The Army could well get along without its 80,000 draftees, who aren't around long enough to train for any significant jobs and whose reenlistment rate is less than 15 percent, compared with an overall rate of 54 percent. The draft mainly exists to pressure those other half-million men into enlisting, but no one is exactly sure how many would fail to enlist if there were no draft.

We have a new military service pay bill, and jobs are scarce in many sections of the country. Constant efforts to make service life attractive and professionally rewarding have steadily pushed up the reenlistment rate. Just a few more moves in this direction might well enable the Armed Forces to compete with the civilian economy for their manpower.

If we must continue with our present system, there are still a number of devices which would help to reduce the uncertainties and redress the inequities.

Mental and physical tests could be given at the time of initial registration so that the half of each age group who are destined to be disqualified would not have to wait 5 years to find out. The GI bill (which is constantly before some committee, but never seems to be reported out) could be reinstated as partial compensation to the few who get called. Since the Armed Forces would much rather conscript men under 22, the age of freedom might be lowered from 26 to 22. This would mean that many more men would escape the draft, but they are now, anyway—except that now they don't know it until they are 26.

None of these proposals makes any sense if one views the draft as operating satisfactorily, or as the best answer we have to the manpower problem. But no one who has listened to the young men whose lives are involved can accept those premises. Even if the present inequities and inadequacies are accepted as sacrifices to expediency, it must be understood that they can only worsen in the future. As the Selective Service System strains and creaks under its impossible task, it must be understood that each stopgap measure to keep it working has sociological and psychological implications far beyond the immediate problem.

In 1959, an amendment to the draft act was offered, which would have extended the law for only 2 years. A Presidential commission was to conduct a full-scale study of all aspects of manpower procurement and report back within that time. The amendment was defeated because there wasn't time to ask such fundamental questions.

Now we have 3½ years before the present act expires. A Presidential commission could be appointed now to reestablish the principles on which we base our military manpower procurement. It could explore the wider effects of our present system, and develop new concepts and alternatives more suitable to our changing needs. Then Congress would be in a better position to produce legislation sufficiently free from ambiguity and inequity to rekindle a concern for national service. Perhaps then it would not be considered slightly odd for a young man to ask what he can do for his country.

SALUTE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, today marks the birthday of the United Nations. Many changes have occurred since this international body came into existence on October 24, 1945. The fact that we have come these 18 years through international tribulations that in previous eras have inevitably led to large-scale conflicts with the world still reasonably intact is due in large measure to the work of the United Nations.

As in all human endeavor the United Nations is not perfect, but in those fields where it can logically work it has done a solid job and achieved substantial results. In the everyday working of our diplomacy it provides an extremely useful forum for the interchange of ideas and understanding so necessary to successful negotiation.

Mr. President, I would like to salute the United Nations for a job well done and wish it continued success in the future. It has demonstrated that cooperation between nations is feasible and that the resort to arms is not inevitable.

The New York Times of today carried an editorial which outlines the hope for the future of the United Nations and the need for our continued support of that organization. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE U.N. AT 18

As the United Nations marks its 18th birthday, the agenda before the General Assembly is long on problems; difficulties of administration and representation appear frozen, and there is no want of crises either in the headquarters building or in many parts of the world that have become the U.N.'s province.

Why, then, can the chief U.S. spokesman at the U.N., Ambassador Stevenson, say that this birthday is the brightest in the history of the organization? Principally for the very reason that the U.N. is so heavily burdened. It has become the place for nations to turn to: for new nations to be heard and old ones to use more frequently as a forum for diplomacy. "Faith in the world alliance for peace" is rising, Mr. Stevenson said. The detractors who contend that the United Nations jeopardizes the sovereignty of the United States no longer find an important audience in Congress or across the country.

When the U.N. came into existence on October 24, 1945, the roster of its members was less than half of that today. Effective representation is vital if the world organization is to function skillfully as a peacekeeping agency. Certainly the permanent membership of the Security Council, born out of the Second World War, can be broadened; the nonpermanent membership could also be expanded more nearly to recognize emerging continents and new alinements.

The very peacekeping operations that give the U.N. its teeth are at the same time the main reason for its financial crisis. Payments for one of both of the U.N. special forces standing guard in the Middle East and the Congo have been refused by the Soviet Union, France and other states. Unless they meet their obligations the U.N. will have to limit its peacekeeping activities to nonfighting operations, and its effectiveness as a force for peace will be severely limited if not destroyed.

CORDOVA, ALASKA, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ENDORSES ABSTENTION PRINCIPLE IN FISHERIES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, inasmuch as the fishery problems of the North Pacific remain unsolved and are to be considered at a later date, it is pertinent to comment on the September 10, 1963, resolution passed by the Cordova, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce.

The resolution deals specifically with the abstention principle which gives to a nation exclusive right to a fishery if that nation "has subjected one of its own coastal fisheries to investigation and regulation for the purpose of conserving the fisheries and is making as full use of it as should be made." Such exclusive rights would extend as far the resource itself.

Thus, reads the resolution of the Cordova Chamber of Commerce:

Be it resolved by the Cordova Chamber of Commerce of Cordova, Alaska, That it urges representatives of the United States, Canada, and Japan to renew the abstention principle at their meeting in Tokyo on September 16, 1963.

Copies of this resolution were made available to Ambassador Benjamin Smith II, head of the U.S. delegation, as well as to members of the Alaska congressional delegation. My able colleague, Senator E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT, a man most knowledgeable in fishery matters, was a member of the U.S. delegation.

Now that the Senate has given its approval to S. 1988 which would make possible the enforcement of our 3-mile fishing limit, it is imperative that we take the second important step in this area which would be to extend the fisheries limit to 12 miles if and when a Governor of a State makes such a request.

My bill, S. 1816, would make this possible. The chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, my able colleague and friend, WARREN MAGNUSON, has advised me that his committee is "very conscious of the importance of the 12-mile fishing zone." I believe it is high time Congress took action.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Cordova abstention resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE CORDOVA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, CORDOVA, ALASKA

Whereas the welfare of the Alaska salmon industry is of prime importance to the economy of Cordova; and

Whereas the welfare of this industry is seriously endangered if the abstention policy formulated by the United States, Canada, and Japan 10 years ago is rescinded; and

Whereas the abstention principle is based on the Truman proclamation establishing that any nation that has subjected one of its own coastal fisheries to investigation and regulation for the purpose of conserving the fishery and is making as full use of it as should be made, has an exclusive right to that fishery as far off shore as it extends; and

Whereas American salmon fishermen, the industry and government have abided by the terms of both the Truman proclamation and the subsequent abstention principle; and

Whereas both United States and Canadian fishermen are prohibited from net fishing for salmon beyond the 3 mile limit on the high seas in the interest of conservation and proper management of the salmon fisheries: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Cordova Chamber of Commerce of Cordova, Alaska, That it urges representatives of the United States, Canada, and Japan to renew the abstention principle at their meeting in Tokyo on September 16, 1963.

Adopted this 10th day of September 1963.

FRANK BURNS,
President.

BART HALL,
Secretary.

CHILEAN CULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to commend the Republic of Chile and the Honorable Ambassador of Chile, Sergio Gutierrez-Olivos, for their excellent cultural program which has been presented during the month of October, entitled "Image of Chile." President Kennedy stated in a speech on the Alliance for Progress on March 13, 1963:

We invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need teachers of your literature and history and tradition, opportunities for our young people to study in your universities, access to your music, your art, and the thoughts of your great philosophers. For we know we have much to learn.

The Chileans have responded magnificently to this invitation.

The inaugural program of the "Image of Chile" on September 22 in the West Auditorium of the State Department gave us an example of what we have been missing. The Ancient Music Group of the Catholic University of Chile, played, besides familiar works of the 16th and 17th centuries, indigenous music of the same period. To quote Irving Lowens in the Evening Star, September 25, 1963:

The Chileans made their strongest impression—in the alternately simple and exotic music of their own country.

Of the director, Sylvia Soublette:

Miss Soublette was trying to show that Chileans know the wonderful and too long neglected heritage of mediaeval and renaissance music. Chile not only shares this heritage but has an ancient music of its own worth hearing.

Since the inaugural concert, we have been treated to "An Evening With Claudio Arrau," in which the distinguished pianist presented an all-Beethoven program at the State Department under the sponsorship of Mrs. John F. Kennedy and the members of the President's Cabinet.

The "Image of Chile" program has included a photographic exhibit; a panel discussion of Latin American poetry, literature, folklore, and theater; a piano recital by the talented and beautiful pianist Ena Bronstein; and a folklore program of traditional Chilean music and dancing. It includes an exhibit of Chilean art which will be shown in Washington in November and then appear in other cities in the United States later this year. I am both pleased and honored that the art exhibit will come to the Walker Art Institute in Minneapolis in December of this year.

"The Image of Chile" program offers us an opportunity to learn about and appreciate the rich cultural tradition of Chile. It brings to our attention a phase of Latin American life about which we seldom hear—the rich artistic, literary, and musical traditions of a cultured and sophisticated people.

"The Image of Chile" program has been brought to the American public through the efforts of the Chilean Ambassador and his staff, with the financial support of Chilean citizens and business firms, and U.S. businesses located in Chile. It is a superb example of the type of cultural exchange program that can be accomplished through both public and private support.

I hope it is the first of many to be presented by our Latin American neighbors and I also hope that the United States will be prepared to send to Latin America programs similar to the superb "Image of Chile" festival which we have engaged this month.

I ask unanimous consent that selected portions of the brochure "Image of Chile" be inserted into the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the selected portions of the brochure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMAGE OF CHILE

Chile, fértil provincia y señalada
En la región Antártica famosa,
De remotas naciones respetada
Por fuerte, principal, y poderosa;
La gente que produce es tan granada,
Tan soberbia, gallarda y belicosa
Que no ha sido por rey jamás regida,
Ni a extranjero dominio sometida.

—Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga, LA ARAUCANA, 1569.

Chile, fertile province, famous
In the vast Antarctic region,
Known to far-flung mighty nations
For her queenly grace and courage,
Has produced a race so noble,
Dauntless, bellicose and haughty,
That by king it ne'er was humbled
Nor to foreign sway submitted.

—From the translation of C. M. Lancaster and P. T. Manchester.

We invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need teachers of your literature and history and tradition, opportunities for our young people to study in your universities, access to your music, your art, and the thought of your great philosophers. For we know we have much to learn.

In this way you can help to bring a fuller spiritual and intellectual life to the people of the United States, and contribute to understanding and mutual respect among the nations of the hemisphere.—President John F. Kennedy, on the Alliance for Progress, March 13, 1961.

We willingly take up President Kennedy's friendly invitation and challenge, for it affords us a unique opportunity to fulfill several desirable objectives. It permits us to portray, even in fragmentary form, the cultural heritage of a distant land still too little known and understood in this great sister Republic. It encourages us to pioneer an effort which we are sure will be emulated by other nations of Latin America, each with an eloquent and important expression of our common spiritual legacy.

Finally, it permits us to reciprocate in some small measure the wealth of knowledge and ideas that flows from the United States to the rest of the world, and give form to the esteem and affection in which we hold this Nation and its people.

I know I will be pardoned if I here voice my appreciation of the devotion, effort, and ideas which my small group of colleagues at the Embassy of Chile has brought to the organization of this program.

We at the Embassy of Chile have not been alone in this venture, and elsewhere in this brochure I have attempted to acknowledge our great indebtedness to the various organizations, enterprises, and individuals who gave so generously of their support and collaboration.—Sergio Gutiérrez-Olivos, Ambassador of Chile.

IMAGE OF CHILE INAUGURAL

Sunday, September 22, 8:30 p.m., Department of State, West Auditorium (black tie). Invitations to be distributed.

The underlying philosophy of "Image of Chile" will be the theme of the inaugural program of the series, sponsored by the members of the President's Cabinet. Secretary of State Dean Rusk will open the program with a brief introduction, and will be followed by Leonard Bernstein, distinguished conductor, pianist, and composer, and Ambassador Sergio Gutiérrez-Olivos, of Chile.

The Ancient Music Group of the Catholic University of Chile will present a concert of old European and 18th century Chilean and Mexican music on early instruments. The program will close with a recital of Chilean poetry by Felicia Montealegre, equally celebrated as a Chilean artist and as Mr. Bernstein's wife.

PHOTOGRAPHIC EXHIBIT

September 22–October 24, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily, Department of State, West Foyer. Public invited.

The exhibit will include works of representative Chilean photographers which present an image of the land, the people, and the life of Chile.

RECITALS OF ANCIENT MUSIC

Tuesday, September 24, 8:30 p.m., Washington Cathedral, Wisconsin and Massachusetts Avenues NW. Public invited.

The Ancient Music Group of the Catholic University of Chile will present a concert of old European and 18th century Chilean music on early instruments. The concert is sponsored by the Washington Choral Society.

Saturday, September 28, 2:30 p.m., National Gallery of Art, East Garden Court. Invitations to be distributed.

This concert will be sponsored by the members of the President's Cabinet and preceded by a brief introduction by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

IMAGE OF THE POETRY

Friday, September 27, 8:30 p.m., Georgetown University, Copley Lounge, 36th and O Streets NW. Public invited.

A selected group of panelists will discuss Latin American poetry, with special emphasis on Chilean poetry. The program is sponsored by the Latin American Forum of Georgetown University.

The Embassy of Chile has invited Richard Eberhart, Frank B. Gibney, Langston Hughes, Randall Jarrell, James Laughlin, Muna Lee, Robert Lowell, Archibald McLeish, and Howard Moss to participate in the discussion. Fernando Alegría, noted Chilean writer now teaching at the University of California, will act as moderator.

AN EVENING WITH CLAUDIO ARRAU

Monday, September 30, 8:30 p.m., Department of State, West Auditorium. By invitation of Mrs. John F. Kennedy and the members of the President's Cabinet.

Under the sponsorship of Mrs. John F. Kennedy and the members of the President's Cabinet, Claudio Arrau will give an all-Beethoven recital. Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON will open the program with brief introductory remarks.

Mr. Arrau, a native of Chile, is held to be one of the world's great pianists and has been acclaimed as the foremost living interpreter of Beethoven.

His program will consist of five sonatas: Opus 27, No. 1; Opus 27, No. 2 (Moonlight Sonata); Opus 111; Opus 81a (Les Adieux), and Opus 57 (Appassionata).

RECITALS FROM MARIO MIRANDA

Tuesday, October 8, 8:30 p.m., Pan American Union. Public invited.

Mario Miranda, a disciple of Claudio Arrau, has met with warm acclaim from critics in Europe and America. He was awarded first prize at the Munich International Piano Competition in 1953, and played the world premiere of Gustavo Becerra's Piano Concerto at the Second Inter-American Music Festival.

Mr. Miranda will be supported by the Claremont String Quartet at this concert, which is sponsored by the Pan American Union. His program will include works of Chilean composers Gustavo Becerra, Eduardo Maturana, and Juan Orrego Salas.

Wednesday, October 23, 8:30 p.m., Carnegie Hall, New York. Box-office admission.

Mr. Miranda will play works of Padre Antonio Soler, Beethoven, Chopin, Schönberg, and Debussy at this concert.

IMAGE OF THE NOVEL

Thursday, October 10, 8:30 p.m., Catholic University. Public invited.

This program presents a panel discussion of Latin American fiction, with particular emphasis on Chilean writers and the interaction of United States and Latin American fiction. The program is sponsored by the Catholic University of America.

The Embassy of Chile has invited Francisco Aguilera, Francisco Ayala, James Baldwin, Maria Luisa Bombal, Vance Bourjaily, Truman Capote, Alfred Knopf, Norman Mailer, Norman Podhoretz, Richard Rovere, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., John Steinbeck, William Styron, and Thornton Wilder to participate in this discussion.

Prof. Arturo Torres-Rioseco, Chilean writer who for many years has headed the Spanish and Portuguese Department of the University of California, will moderate the discussion.

IMAGE OF THE FOLKLORE

Sunday, October 13, 8:30 p.m., George Washington University, Lisner Auditorium, 21st and H Streets NW. Public invited.

A program of the traditional songs, dances, and music of Chile will be presented by a Chilean folklore group under the direction of Eugenio Dittborn, director of the Experimental Theater of the Catholic University of Chile. The program is sponsored by the George Washington University and the Institute of Contemporary Arts.

Thursday, October 17, 8:30 p.m., Pan American Union (black tie). Invitations to be distributed.

This program, sponsored by the Pan American Union, will draw from the varied repertory of Eugenio Dittborn's Chilean folklore group.

RECITAL BY ALFONSO MONTECINO

Monday, October 14, 8:30 p.m., Howard University, Crampton Auditorium. Public invited.

Under the sponsorship of Howard University, Alfonso Montecino will give a piano recital of works of Chilean composers and Beethoven's Diabelli Variations.

Montecino, a disciple of Claudio Arrau, is one of Chile's most gifted young pianists. His recital in Washington last year was described as "superb" by Paul Hume, music critics of the Washington Post.

RECITAL BY ENA BRONSTEIN

Friday, October 18, 8:30 p.m., Pan American Union. Public invited.

Miss Bronstein will give a piano recital of works of Chilean composers and of Brahms, Debussy and Liszt, under the sponsorship of the Pan American Union.

She has been studying with Claudio Arrau and Rafael de Silva for the past 4 years in New York under a grant from the Organization of American States. At 21, she is considered one of Chile's most promising pianists.

IMAGE OF THE THEATER

Monday, October 21, 8:30 p.m., Washington Theater Club, 1632 O Street NW. Public invited.

This program will consist of a roundtable discussion of the Latin American theater, with special emphasis on the Chilean theater and the mutual influence of the United States and Latin American theatrical movements. The program is sponsored by the Washington Theater Club.

The Embassy of Chile has invited Edward Albee, Harold Clurman, José Ferrer, Tyrone Guthrie, John P. Harrison, Elia Kazan, David Merrick, Allan Pryce-Jones, José Quintero, Howard Taubman, Gore Vidal, Anthony West, and Tennessee Williams to take part in this discussion. Luis A. Heiremans,

well-known Chilean dramatist, will act as moderator.

RECITAL BY EDGAR FISCHER

Monday, October 21, 8:30 p.m., Pan American Union. Public invited.

Edgar Fischer has studied under Leonard Rose, first cellist of the New York Philharmonic, for the past 2 years and this season is joining the National Symphony Orchestra. He is one of the best exponents of Chile's new generation of talented young musicians.

IMAGE OF THE MUSIC

Thursday, October 24, 8:30 p.m., American University, Glover Auditorium. Public invited.

This roundtable discussion of contemporary Latin American music in general, and Chilean music in particular, is sponsored by the Music Department of American University. It will also deal with the influence exerted on one another by the music of the United States and of Latin America.

The Embassy of Chile has extended invitations to participate in this discussion to Jeanne Behrend, pianist and composer; Vannette Lawler, executive secretary, National Conference of Music Educators; Robert Whitney, music director of the Louisville Philharmonic Orchestra; David van Vactor, composer and conductor of the Knoxville Symphony Orchestra; Lloyd Ultan, chairman of the Music Department of American University, and Guillermo Espinosa, Colombian conductor and director of the Music Division of the Pan American Union.

Juan Orrego Salas, noted Chilean composer, critic and teacher, presently professor of Latin American music at Indiana University, will act as moderator.

ART EXHIBIT

November 2–23 inclusive, Howard University Gallery. Public invited.

Some 50 representative examples of contemporary Chilean painting, selected from collections of the New York Museum of Modern Art and the Museum of Contemporary Art of Santiago, will be exhibited under the joint sponsorship of Howard University and the Inter-American Committee.

The exhibit was prepared by Nemesio Antúnez, director of the Museum of Contemporary Art and a well-known painter in his own right. It will be formally opened by Dr. Rafael Squirru, director of the Department of Cultural Affairs of the Organization of American States.

FACING UP TO THE U.N.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today is United Nations Day—the day 18 years ago when 29 nations, by their ratification, brought the U.N. Charter into effect. Since then, we have had 18 years to observe the U.N. in action, years in which we should have been able to learn something about the organization and our participation in it. It is high time that we recognize the U.N. for what it actually is, not what we think it should be, or what extremists of both hues tell us it is.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the U.N. is an essential instrument for the conduct of our foreign policy. In the modern world, with ever increasing interdependence, our foreign policy demands a three-dimensional approach. We have long accepted the necessity of bilateral diplomacy, of nation-to-nation contacts. Somewhat later, we became convinced of the value of regional organizations for the common welfare and defense. Still more recently, we endorsed the desirability of a multinational arrangement. Each approach has its own special kind of utility. Today I would like to recount some of our recent accomplishments in the multilateral sphere through the U.N.

Ringing still in our ears is the clamor generated by the Cuban crisis. As you know, at one time or another, we brought bilateral, regional and multilateral pressures to bear to resolve this problem. No one denies that, in the longrun, our willingness to use force was the most compelling argument in obtaining the removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba. However, it is equally true that the regional solidarity in the Organization of American States and the international attention focused on Soviet activities in Cuba through the United Nations, contributed to this objective.

In the United Nations, we were able to present our evidence directly to the representatives of 109 nations, a job which otherwise we should have had to do in 109 separate capitals. We thus focused immediate world attention on the crisis and where the responsibility for it lay. Moreover, we were able, through the U.N. Secretary General, to work out some arrangement for cooling off the crisis and avoiding an armed clash. The Soviet Union found itself isolated and alone in the face of universal condemnation.

Lester Pearson put it well:

> When you have a good case with strength to back it, stand firm: without provocation or panic. When action in defense of that case has to be taken quickly and by yourself, bring that action before the United Nations at once—as the United States did on this occasion.
>
> The United Nations once again became the indispensable agency through which the parties could find a way out of a crisis without war. I know the United Nations couldn't force a solution on a great power which doesn't want it, but you can't exaggerate its importance as a means for finding and supervising a solution.

That, I think, just about sums it up.

A second example can be seen in the Congo. The Communists were seeking a foothold in central Africa, and this foothold has been denied to them, largely through United Nations intervention. The alternative would have been a direct confrontation between United States and Soviet power—the use of American troops. In this case, there was no regional organization that we could call upon, no regional resources equal to the task.

Now for 3 years, the United Nations has protected the Congo from internal chaos, reconquest, the Communist subversion. Both cold war and hot war were averted. The country is well on its way to viable, non-Communist independence. The civilian economy is being helped on its feet so that the anarchic conditions which led to and abetted the original Congo crisis are ended.

Mr. President, I have been talking about peacekeeping, the U.N. activity which comes most frequently to public attention. But frequently obscured by the publicity on military operations is the fact that 17 out of 20 United Nations employees are working on peaceful pursuits—the long, tedious tasks of bettering life on this planet. Wars and threats to the peace are caused less by frictions than by frustrations—frustrations from hunger, pestilence, poverty, ignorance, and denials of human rights. More than three-fourths of every U.N. dollar goes to support the international programs arrayed against the age-old scourges of mankind. Thus, the United Nations is working constantly to alleviate the frustrations which make for unrest and, eventually, for dangerous breaches of the peace.

Last month I pointed out five areas in which attention can be focused on East-West problems through the U.N.

First. The area of financial support for the United Nations and its peacekeeping functions.

Second. The field of outer space.

Third. The field of lunar exploration.

Fourth. The field of educational, cultural, scientific, and economic exchange.

Fifth. The field of East-West trade.

Mr. President, the U.N. has proven to be an effective instrument for achieving U.S. foreign policy objectives, as well as for promoting international harmony. But since the United Nations is a political body, we should not be surprised that delegates there sometimes say things that we do not and cannot accept, that they often speak with one eye on the international scene and the other on their constituents at home. And we should not be surprised if things do not go well for us 100 percent of the time.

The fact is that our batting average at the United Nations is close to .900, laudable in any league. And the fact is that no major Soviet proposal opposed by us has ever been approved by the United Nations. This is a record of which we can be proud and one which stands as telling testimony of the value of the United Nations as a means of furthering our foreign policy objectives.

Mr. President, the United Nations is here to stay. It has a record of proven performance that merits our wholehearted support.

Our distinguished ambassador to the U.N., Mr. Adali Stevenson, has reviewed the record of the U.N. with his customary eloquence:

> Now our hopes are firmer and more confident. When we look back it is to 18 years of tumult and danger in the world, sobered and moderated in the United Nations. We know now from experience that we are building an effective organization which can deal with crisis—because it has done so time and again.
>
> No one claims we have yet developed a perfect instrument, but few urge us to stop trying. We all profoundly regret that every disturbance to the peace has not been controlled without loss of life, yet we must give thanks that many more lives have been saved because the United Nations has kept the disturbances within limits in this time of trouble, tension, and revolution all over the world.
>
> President Kennedy asks, "Is not peace, in the last analysis, a matter of human rights?" The United Nations answers yes, but its huge economic and social effort to safeguard the dignity and improve the welfare of individuals. Let us pray for the day when the use of force will be so unthinkable that the protection of liberty and the eradication of hunger and disease will absorb all the efforts of the United Nations.

PROGRESS AT FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the September 1963 issue of Eyapi Oaye, the monthly newsletter of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, sums up the progress being made on that Montana reservation through various federally financed programs such as area redevelopment, accelerated public works, public housing and Department of Interior resource development. The following summary appears in the "Superintendent's Comments":

There is a great deal of activity going on at the Fort Peck Agency now and in a few months there will be even more.

Roads: The Poplar west road has been graded into a fine road. A new road has been made to the Wiota pump and canal which leads from the Missouri River.

Irrigation: New pump plant and canals at the west end of the reservation are under construction. The work will continue for quite a while.

Employees' quarters: Four new houses are being constructed. Two of these are already occupied.

Accelerated public works: Very soon an APW program will be in operation. Picnic and camping improvements and fire lane construction will be completed in Poplar, Frazer, and Wolf Point communities.

Jail and court chambers: The new jail will be constructed, beginning this winter, just east of the community hospital.

Tribal administration building and community center: The new administration building will be located just southeast of the present tribal building.

Public housing: All of you have watched this project grow. Completion is expected next spring.

Each of these developments make our community a better place in which to live. The total cost will be close to $1.5 million. The tribes are contributing about $90,000 of this amount. Most importantly, over 175 people who had no job a year ago will be working.

I know there are many local people who deserve credit for the development underway in this northeastern Montana community. They include Superintendent Stanley D. Lyman and his staff, the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, led by President William Youpee and the Roosevelt County Planning and Improvement Council.

As I pointed out previously on the floor of the Senate, these local leaders view the Federal Government as a partner, whose programs should be used selectively and fitted to local needs, rather than as a villain to be denounced.

Montana has its share of those who denounce the accelerated public works program, public housing and resource development which are providing a better life and 175 new jobs for the people of the Fort Peck Reservation area. But, I am proud to say, we also have these local leaders who make the programs work and make them meaningful. I salute them.

UNITED NATIONS DAY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today is the 18th anniversary of the United Nations. There were some who, discouraged by the failure of the League of Nations, thought the United Nations would never last so long. There were others who, caught up in the postwar enthusiasm for the creation of international institutions, conceived of the United Nations as the panacea for all of man's ills. They expected the international organization to become a world government overnight; they perhaps believed it would be able to resolve all disputes, including conflicts between the great powers.

The United Nations has neither been a failure nor has it been a cure-all. In important instances of aggression it has failed to act: Hungary and Goa need only be mentioned. But in other circumstances it has met the challenge and undertaken important mediating and peacekeeping operations: Palestine, Suez, the Congo. It has survived internal crises: Soviet use of the veto and demand for a troika Secretary General; the problem of financing expensive peacekeeping operations; the upsurge in its membership from 51 to 111.

Furthermore, the United Nations has been extensively utilized by its members during the first 18 years of its existence. The requests for technical assistance from the organization have been constantly increasing. By the end of March 1963 the special fund alone, which did not even begin operations until 1959, had received 629 requests for aid. The United Nations has been engaged in a number of colonial issues, and recently the African countries in particular have asked the United Nations with increasing frequency to act on colonial questions. The U.N. has dispatched a total of nine peacekeeping operations, with the consent of the governments concerned, to act as a neutral force in areas where the peace was threatened. The Secretary General has often been asked to mediate in disputes or establish a commission to do so.

The accomplishments of the United Nations in the last year alone are worthy of record. In early 1963 the gradual withdrawal of U.N. troops from the Congo began: The U.N. mission of securing the reintegration of the country had been accomplished. In May Indonesia took over control of west Irian from the United Nations; the United Nations itself, as a result of agreement between the Netherlands and Indonesia reached through U.N. mediation, had undertaken the administration of west Irian for a 6-month period. In June a special session of the General Assembly agreed on the basic principles for financing the United Nations and on a scale of assessments for financing the peacekeeping operations through the last 6 months of 1963, thus ending the acute financial crisis of the organization. Members agreed by an overwhelming majority that it was the collective responsibility of the U.N. membership to finance all activities undertaken by the world organization. More recently, a plebiscite was held under U.N. supervision to determine whether the people of Sarawak and North Borneo wished to join the Malaysia Federation.

At the current assembly session already a resolution has been adopted by acclamation banning nuclear weapons in outer space, another expression of consensus by the nations of the world that outer space should be used for peaceful purposes alone. The Congo operation has been authorized to continue, on a reduced basis, for another 6 months until the Congolese security forces are sufficiently built up.

And so the assembly session will continue.

The United Nations may not be a cure-all, but it has survived and is still thriving after 18 years of trials. The fact that members have placed over 80 items before its 18th session indicates that interest in its continuation as a dynamic force on the world scene is not waning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

DIXIE PROJECT, UTAH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 26) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS—RECESS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, at 2 o'clock a ceremony is scheduled. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair shortly before 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m., took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m. the Senate reassembled when called to order by Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 24, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SPARKMAN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the legislative business of the Senate will be suspended, pursuant to Senate Resolution 216, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 216) reading 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 Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, late a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, with the passing of the late Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, the people lost a champion and a true friend.

Perhaps it would appear to some trite to say that ESTES KEFAUVER was a man of the people. But he was, and he never forgot it.

Moreover, with the passing of ESTES KEFAUVER, his family lost a loving husband, father, brother, and relative; and his friends lost one who possessed a gentleness of spirit and personality found all too seldom.

ESTES KEFAUVER was tolerant, understanding, generous, always willing to consider the other man's point of view, and inclined many times to yield his own point of view to that of others, if it had strong merit.

Working relations between Senator KEFAUVER and me were of the best. The personal equation between us was a pleasant one, and particularly grew warm and pleasant during the last years we served together when we had so many common problems which required solution. So when I say he was gentle, tolerant, and considerate, I speak from an abundance of experience.

In his public life, he was a true champion of the public interest. This came first with him. ESTES KEFAUVER was a U.S. Senator in the fullest meaning of that term. His colleagues would have great difficulty recalling any instance when he took a narrow, sectional point of view. True, he loyally represented the State of Tennessee and its people; but he represented, too, his Nation and his fellow Americans.

Mr. President, I think that along with Jackson, Hull, Polk, and Johnson, Estes Kefauver will be remembered generously in history as one of Tennessee's great.

Possessed of indomitable spirit, unflagging courage, and energy that upon many occasions seemed to me beyond human capacity, he was an implacable foe of the crooks, the cheats, and the frauds, and an inveterate enemy of the specially privileged and of those who sought to further their own will and interest to the detriment of the public good.

The family of the late Senator KEFAUVER are in the gallery. To each of them, I extend now the warmest of sympathy, the deepest of understanding, and a sharing of their great loss. But to each of them, also, I extend congratulations for ESTES KEFAUVER.

Mr. President, I desire to read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
October 21, 1963.

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ALBERT: In accordance with our conversation regarding this Thursday, October 24, the day set aside by the Senate for Senator KEFAUVER's eulogy, I am enclosing my remarks which you have so graciously consented to read into the RECORD for me.

I am also enclosing a copy of my letter to Senator MANSFIELD, explaining my absence at this solemn time, and asking that he read it into the RECORD.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,

HERBERT S. WALTERS.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
October 21, 1963.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: On Thursday, October 24, the Senate will voice its sorrow over the death of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and will pay fitting tribute to his memory.

It is distressing for me to have to report to you that I will be unable to be present on this occasion. Unfortunately, several months prior to the notice I received only last Friday, setting the date of Senator KEFAUVER's eulogy, I had made some important engagements in Tennessee and it was impossible for me to make any changes at this late date.

I have asked my colleague, Senator ALBERT GORE, to read into the RECORD what I would have said personally if I could have been with you. It would be most gracious of you, as majority leader, to also read this letter into the RECORD, clarifying my absence at this solemn time.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,

HERBERT S. WALTERS.

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR WALTERS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, at this time I should like to read the remarks of my distinguished junior colleague [Mr. WALTERS], who at this time is unavoidably absent:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WALTERS AT THE U.S. SENATE EULOGY SERVICES FOR SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

Tennessee, the Nation, and the world mourn the passing of a great man.

The Volunteer State has always contributed its share of leaders for the effective representation of our State and our country. Andrew Jackson, Andrew Johnson, and James K. Polk, three of Tennessee's sons, rose to the highest office in the land and history will echo their names along with those of Cordell Hull, John Sevier, and Sam Houston.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a leader of that stature. It is from the unique position as his successor in this great deliberate body that I can speak with authority as to the magnitude of his work. His rugged individualism and singleness of purpose may have aroused the ire of many, but there is no one who can question the dedication to service of mankind that motivated ESTES KEFAUVER's life.

I, as some of you, had my differences with him, but never once did his conduct ever command anything but my highest respect. He was honest and sincere in his unshakable belief that the things he fought for were for the ultimate good of all and for this he must be admired.

Those of us who epitomize his work today can draw much from another characteristic of ESTES KEFAUVER; his word was his bond. During the years I served as a member of the Democratic National Committee I had contact with people from every part of the country and it was agreed by all that knew him or had any dealings with him that he was a person who would never go back on his word.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a man to whom honestry and trust were the watchwords of his career.

It is indeed fitting for us to pay homage and tribute to one who carried out the oath of office to which he so nobly subscribed, and it can be said that beyond a doubt ESTES KEFAUVER kept his word to all to the end.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the man in the coonskin cap is gone. Just 36 hours after his last speech on this floor, mortality turned to immortality and his fascinating career came to an end. It is a stark reminder of the unpredictability of life and how uncertain this mortal journey can be.

For more than 16 years, I served with ESTES KEFAUVER in the House and Senate. The coonskin cap was not a political ornament in his life. Rather it was a fitting symbol of the frontiersman, exploring new ground, venturing into uncharted hills and valleys of a complicated economic domain.

What shall I say of a man, a friend, a colleague, a Senator with whom I disagreed so often, whose purposes I sought to frustrate, if possible, with whom I fought fiercely over differences in viewpoint both in committee and on the Senate floor year in and year out? What does one say about such an adversary?

He was a gentleman. That says much. Differ as we did, it was in a friendly spirit. Never have I seen him angry. Our exchanges could be sharp and to the point. In lesser men, they might have excited a deep and continuing anger. But never in him. He exemplified as did no other person in my acquaintance, that old biblical admonition, to let not the sun set on one's anger.

His fixity of purpose marked him as one with a definite and precise mission in life. He was indeed a crusader. Sharp criticsm, sarcasm, efforts to impeach his position on public matters never diverted him from his convictions and his firm purposes. His patience always remained intact. Rail at him as one might, dismember his arguments if one could, discredit his purposes if that were possible, and scold him if it seemed to accomplish a purpose, his patience was always intact, his persistence was unyielding, and his conviction unshaken.

His sense of mission was a many-splendored thing. Outstanding was his zeal for little people, for little business, for a true competitive system under which young and old, rich and poor, might have an equal chance. His investigations in the antitrust and monopoly field were a testimony to an iron determination that our competitive system must be made to work justly and equitably. Whether these investigations took place in the field of milk or bread, motor cars or steel, insurance or electrical equipment, the objective was always the same; namely, to lift the hand of monopoly from little people that they too might survive and prosper. Our differences and disagreements were more often over method than objective, but having charted a course, he stood by it to the very end.

His courage was limitless. He knew even as I knew that there were many who disagreed with his philosophy of government and with his methods. In his long and varied political career there must have been many pressures upon him. As an elected official there must have been times when he had to equate these pressures in terms of a continuing career in the Senate. Regardless of what they were, he never qualified, he never faltered, he never compromised where principle and conviction were involved.

Mr. President, mankind does not produce many Kefauvers, men who are willing to face up to abuse and sharp criticism for a cause, men who are willing, if need be, to endure the rupture of friendships for a cause, men who even though in physical pain or moral anguish will not relent in the pursuit of truth and right as they understand it, men who can brush aside frustration and start over again where a compelling goal beckons them on, men who move slowly with poise and purpose but never walk backward, men who in the bright fanfare of a political career never forget their humble beginnings, and men who are resolute to the end.

But such a man was ESTES KEFAUVER, and as I watched all that was mortal committed to earth on that farm on the outskirts of the little town of Madisonville, Tenn., where he was born, I thought of the stately sturdy oaks amid which the service was held. He was truly one of mankind's sturdy oaks until a divine hand snatched him away. I shall always salute his memory as a foeman to be respected; admired and loved as a friend.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it was my good fortune to come to know ESTES KEFAUVER two decades ago, when we served together in the House of Representatives. I have followed his career of dedicated public service with admiration and respect ever since. He was an honest, straightforward man whose gentle nature belied the sharp mind and keen insight God gave him. His respect for the institutions of our democracy was overshadowed only by his devotion to its people. As a campaigner he had no peer. He loved the people and they loved him. His campaigns for national office, which took him across the country many times, left a deep and lasting impression on the millions who saw him and felt his famous handshake. His passing took from the Senate a champion of the people who have no lobby but the ballot box.

The zeal which marked his guardianship of the public interest won him national fame as a foe of crime, monopoly, and greed. While his reputation as a legislator sprang from investigations which often captured the headlines, many quiet acts of courage marked his service in this body. In the hysteria of the McCarthy era his was a calm voice which rose above the tempest. When, in that same emotional climate, an effort was made to restrict the treaty-making powers of the President, Senator KEFAUVER was a leader in opposition to it. We were companions in many of these struggles in those dark days and I drew strength from him.

His service as chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation is a testimonial to his concern for the public welfare. Enactment of the drug safety bill last year was due in large measure to the fact that Senator KEFAUVER and his staff, as the New Republic put it, "knew more about the drug industry than the industry knew about itself." This measure is typical of the progressive legislation ESTES KEFAUVER sponsored. Gentleness and good humor marked his demeanor but, as many a witness before him discovered, his placid exterior concealed an astute and probing intellect.

Although he was not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, he had a keen interest in foreign affairs. As Senators know, he was always especially concerned about the position of the United States in the Atlantic community. Shortly after his election to the Senate some 15 years ago, he stressed the need for increased cooperation among the countries of the North Atlantic. In 1949, when the NATO treaty was before the Senate for ratification, he described it as an, "interim measure, a measure that will gain the time needed to explore in peace a far more promising prospect—the possibility of eventually uniting the democracies of the North Atlantic by our own basic Federal principles into a great Atlantic Union of the free." While many difficult obstacles must be surmounted before his dream is realized, events of recent years prove the wisdom of his objective. He repeatedly sponsored the Atlantic Union resolution to establish a convention of representative citizens from NATO countries to explore avenues through which greater political and economic unity might be achieved. Its adoption in 1960 was the culmination of his untiring efforts. Senator KEFAUVER, on six occasions, was a delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, and in 1961 he served as Chairman of the U.S. delegation. As a member of the political committees of these conferences he made invaluable contributions and it was largely due to his efforts that the Conference of NATO Nations was held in Paris last year. No man worked as hard in promoting the concept of Atlantic unity. A long time associate and friend, Edward J. Meeman, of the Memphis Press-Scimitar paid this tribute to him:

> I will wage that he will have a great place in history as the statesman, who, more than any other, pioneered in behalf of the federation of the free.

The storms that threaten the Atlantic Alliance today reflect the enormity of the task which ESTES KEFAUVER charted. It is to be hoped that the wisdom of his counsel will finally prevail.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a great American in the best tradition of public spirited Tennesseans—Jackson, Polk and Johnson, Crockett, and Hull. His name will rank with theirs in the history of his State. His populist spirit and philosophy were drawn from the springs of independence and courage that have watered American history. A Democrat in every sense of the word, his career marked by a steadfast faith in the people of America—a faith which through their reciprocation brought him close to the highest office in the land.

I miss him. The Senate misses him. And, the people of America miss him. The extent of the Nation's loss was, perhaps, best expressed by the editorial writer of the Arkansas Gazette who began his tribute simply, "ESTES KEFAUVER was one of the really good ones."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join all other Senators in paying tribute to our departed friend.

I knew and was closely associated with ESTES KEFAUVER for almost a quarter of a century. I was first elected to Congress in 1936, and about 2 years later ESTES was elected. Our districts adjoined. Our towns were about 100 miles apart. We were neighbors in more ways than one. I remember that back in the days when we were getting ready for World War II, when we were interested in having war plants located in our districts, ESTES and I often worked together to try to locate a plant in either his district or my district or on the line somewhere, that would be helpful.

I worked with him closely in the House of Representatives. I came to the Senate in November of 1946, and 2 years later so did ESTES; and again we were closely associated. For several years we sat side by side in the Chamber.

I had the opportunity to go on trips with ESTES in connection with national defense and other programs in which our Government was interested, and I witnessed his tireless, diligent, able work in that connection.

Furthermore, we were neighbors in the true sense of the word, in the District of Columbia. We lived only one or two blocks apart; at one time we lived only three houses apart. We attended the same church. It was always a pleasure and delight to see the Kefauvers come to church and to Sunday school. It was not

a matter of sending the children to Sunday school. It was not a matter of one member of the family coming to church, but they attended as a family.

Many times have I seen him playing with his children. He was a family man. He loved his family and gave them a great deal of attention.

I campaigned with ESTES. I echo the words expressed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that, "as a campaigner he had no peer."

I recall that early one morning during the 1956 campaign, when he was a candidate for Vice President, a long-distance telephone call from Kentucky woke me up to say that ESTES was to campaign throughout that day but that he was ill with a bad throat. I was asked if I could come down there and pinch-hit for ESTES. I said that I could not get there. I was then told that a schedule had already been arranged, so I went down to Kentucky and spent the day, and far into the night, trying to pinch-hit for ESTES. However, I felt my total inadequacy in matching this great man who had become a tradition, "the man with the coonskin cap," who, on the campaign trail, could not be equaled.

I knew him in his work in the Senate. I was closely associated with him. He was a member of the Small Business Committee when he was in the House of Representatives, and I was also a member of the same committee, and he and I often discussed small-business matters. I was associated with him in connection with various resolutions which he presented to the House of Representatives, and also to the Senate—one of which was the proposed amendment to the Constitution with reference to the electoral college. The Senate at one time passed that joint resolution. I am not sure whether it was after he entered the Senate. Perhaps it was before—it was originally known as the Lodge-Gossett joint resolution, but when those two Members left and when Senator KEFAUVER was in the Senate and Senator Lodge was gone, Senator KEFAUVER became the principal sponsor, and the Senate passed it by an overwhelming vote.

I was glad to hear the Senator from Arkansas mention his interest in building a strong western alliance, an Atlantic community, which has been accomplished as a result, in part, of some of the work he did. It is still in an evolutionary process. The NATO Parliamentarians Conference, which is to meet a week from now in Paris, has on its agenda further consideration of solidifying the underpinnings of NATO and the Western European nations.

I could name many matters in which he was interested. He was a dedicated public servant. He was able and courageous; but he had another characteristic which I felt attached to him more strongly than to any other Member of the Senate—he was tenacious. When he got hold of something he believed in, he could not be shaken loose.

In short, ESTES KEFAUVER was an able legislator, a courageous legislator, a good citizen, a good man. We shall long miss him in this body.

A while ago the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] touched on a point I should like to emphasize, when he said that in a way congratulations were in order. I often think that the grief we mortals suffer when someone close to us passes away should be moderated by gratitude for what their loved one did while he was living here with us. Today the country can be thankful that ESTES KEFAUVER lived and that he served so well throughout the years.

I join in extending sympathy to Nancy, his lovely widow, to the children, to his sisters, and to other members of his family. America has lost a great and fine citizen.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield now to the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE].

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I find it most difficult to express my feelings on this day dedicated to the memory of ESTES KEFAUVER. Since I am a comparative newcomer in this distinguished body, I shall speak not only of my association with ESTES, Senator to Senator, but also of our friendship. For I believe that in the simplicity, honesty, and gentleness of this man we find the roots of his greatness as a Senator.

I would like to quote one of his favorite prayers, by which he tried to live and which I feel reveals his true and deeper nature.

> Teach me, my Lord, to be sweet and gentle in all the events of life, in disappointments, in the thoughtlessness of others, in the insincerity of those I trusted, in the unfaithfulness of those on whom I relied.
>
> Let me put myself aside, to think of the happiness of others, to hide my little pains and heartaches, so that I may be the only one to suffer from them. Teach me to profit by the suffering that comes across my path.
>
> Let me so use it that it may mellow me, not harden nor embitter me, that it may make me patient, not irritable, that it may make me broad in my forgiveness, not narrow, haughty and over-bearing.
>
> May no one be less good for having come within my influence. No one less pure, less true, less kind, less noble for having been a fellow traveler in our journey toward Eternal Life.
>
> As I go my rounds from one distraction to another, let me whisper from time to time a word of love to Thee. May my life be lived in the supernatural, full of power for good, and strong in its purpose of sanctity.

It can truly be said that in the death of ESTES KEFAUVER the Nation lost a friend. However, when the news of his passing first reached me, my immediate feeling was one of a deep and irrevocable personal loss. For the instant I could think only—and perhaps selfishly—that my friend and political mentor was gone. This great and good man who had counseled me through most of my political life—no longer could I turn to him for help and advice.

I first shook the hand that was to shake countless thousands of other hands on a crisp New Hampshire morning in January of 1952. The famous crime-fighter was in New Hampshire on a quest—for the Presidency of the United States. And he was asking for my help. Somehow, it should have seemed incongruous—this tall Tennessean standing in the snow in New Hampshire, asking a country lawyer to help him become President of the United States. As I think back on it now, it was the most natural thing in the world, for this man exuded a warmth and sincerity that forged an immediate bond of friendship between us.

Mrs. McIntyre and I worked hard for ESTES in the campaigns of 1952 and 1956, and never shall we expect to find again a person who was so appreciative of assistance, so understanding of mistakes, or so manfully able to accept defeat.

By what name shall we remember ESTES KEFAUVER? Crusader? Politician? Statesman? Lawmaker? Well, he was all of these things. Also it was given to him, as it is given to few, the ability to lead and at the same time remain one with the people.

There were those who disagreed with ESTES KEFAUVER, but they were not among the people. There were those who feared ESTES KEFAUVER, but they were not among the people. There were those who felt the wrath of ESTES KEFAUVER, but they were not among the people. And there were those who crushed the hopes of ESTES KEFAUVER, but they were not among the people.

In all of the thousands of words printed in newspapers across America in tribute to Senator KEFAUVER, one line in an editorial in the Kansas City Star sticks in my mind. It said simply: "The voters trusted him."

For during his entire political life he fought to protect the people against the corrupters, the empire builders, and the gangsters. He stood alone more than once, in this very Chamber, to espouse unpopular causes and issues in which he believed. For if ESTES KEFAUVER had a fault, it was that he stubbornly persisted in what he felt was right, whatever the odds. To these causes he gave all of his energies and his time, caring not what physical toll they took on him.

And, so, Mr. President, if the countless thousands of people across this Nation who loved ESTES KEFAUVER as I did and miss him as I do were here with us today, I think they might agree that these lines from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar best sum up our feelings:

> His life was gentle, and the elements
> So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
> And say to all the world "Here was a man!"

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in 1954, upon the death of the late Senator from North Carolina, Hon. Clyde Hoey, I had the honor to have ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, become my seatmate. We were seatmates for several years after that date.

Senator KEFAUVER had every right to feel unkindly toward me if he had wished to do so, because he knew I had, in supporting another, opposed him rather vigorously for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency in 1952. I found at once not a trace of vindictiveness in him, never a word or mention of that earlier disagreement, never a word of anything but constructive assistance in the years during which we worked together on a considerable number of issues which came before the Senate.

I enjoyed and appreciated the opportunity to have those years of close asso-

ciation with a man whom I came to admire more and more with each passing month and every passing year.

There are many things I could say, but I shall refer to only one issue, an issue with respect to which we happened to find common ground, and as to which I am more indebted to him than to any other person. The Senate also is indebted to him. It was his passionate belief that all citizens of the United States should have the right to vote, and that that right was a fundamental matter in a government such as ours—the right of active participation in governing this great Nation.

For a long time he had believed that a Federal statute would be adequate to wipe out the poll tax. We talked about it. I told him, whether that were true or not, I did not believe that course was practical, I did not think it could or should be done that way. Furthermore, I thought such a solution could be always subjected to delay, even if it were followed; whereas it seemed to me that the constitutional amendment approach was the desirable, and certainly the practical one, to follow.

After a while he came to the conclusion either that the other approach was impractical or that the constitutional amendment approach was the better. I do not know what was his reason. But he threw himself into the effort for the repeal of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in Federal elections by means of a constitutional amendment with a degree of devotion and self-abnegation that I have rarely seen.

I know that it was not wholly easy for him to take that position, both in the great committee in which he was serving at the time and as a Senator from a State where there was no unanimity on that subject.

On three different occasions, serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, of the Committee on the Judiciary, he subjected the proposed amendment to careful, exhaustive hearings. When it proved impossible to bring the matter to the Senate otherwise, he was generous enough to help me to attempt to add it to an amendment in which he was deeply interested, and which was then pending on the floor of the Senate. As the RECORD will show, it was placed on that amendment as a second or additional amendment. At that time it was not acceptable to the other body.

In a later year he joined actively and effectively in another effort to bring the matter before the Senate. Without laboring the matter, the Senate approved the proposal by a very large vote, as did the House, and it went to the States for ratification.

The way in which ESTES KEFAUVER devoted himself to the effort to have his State act favorably upon the amendment was but a continuation of the effort that he had shown in the Senate.

A few moments ago another Senator spoke of Senator KEFAUVER's persistence, of his tenacity of purpose. He certainly showed it in this poll tax effort. I shall never forget the great pleasure of seeing the way he looked one morning when he announced from the floor of the Senate that his State had been the first State of all the Southern States to ratify the proposed constitutional amendment.

That success, I believe, and will always believe, was largely due to his persistence, his tenacity, and his continued effort, in which he was joined by his distinguished colleague, now the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and also by his distinguished Governor.

I mention this because I believe it to be important for the RECORD to clearly show that while he had plenty of time for other interests, in connection with the Atlantic community, in connection with antimonopoly matters, and in connection with various other issues—because he was a Senator of broad interests and of many activities—one of the activities to which he was most devoted and to which he gave much time and effort and energy was the matter of assuring to his fellow citizens the right to cast their ballots in elections for President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives without the requirement of paying any tax.

I found ESTES KEFAUVER a most gentle man, a most generous man, and yet a most firm and fearless man.

Sometimes we do not think of gentleness, graciousness, charm, and generosity, such as his, as residing in the same individual, who is also a man of unyielding firmness and complete fearlessness. However, these qualities were all present in ESTES KEFAUVER. Just as the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], journeyed down to Knoxville and then to Madisonville at the time of the interment of ESTES KEFAUVER, I was one of those who made that sad journey. I will never forget the gracious and lovely manner of Nancy Kefauver and their children on that occasion—in spite of their deep sorrow. They went down and back on the same plane with the Senate group which had been assigned to attend.

Likewise, I could never forget the faces of those thousands of his fellow citizens who were there at Madisonville, and later at the old family plantation, at the family cemetery, to see laid away the man in whom they had implicit trust, the man whom they felt represented them truly and stood for the things in life that they respected most and desired so greatly.

It was a most impressive occasion. It could not have failed to send every Senator and every other person who had the opportunity to be present back to his duties with inspiration, and the belief that devotion to duty such as ESTES KEFAUVER showed, and such as he lived, makes an impression upon one's fellow citizens, and leaves a place in their hearts which is terribly hard to fill. That kind of expression was present in the faces of the many people who were there—thousands of low estate and of high estate—showing their personal grief because of the passing of one whom they loved and trusted.

Mrs. Holland and I join in expressing our grief and sympathy to Mrs. Kefauver and the children. We shall long miss ESTES KEFAUVER in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it was not my privilege to serve with our late colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER, on any of the committees on which he served in the Senate. Yet I felt very close to him almost from the time I came to the House of Representatives and found him there until the time of his death while he served in the Senate.

Throughout that time my regard for his great ability, and for his sincere pursuit of the public interest as he saw it, was profound. He came to New Jersey, as he came to many other States, in pursuit of the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. The impression he made upon our New Jersey people was as deep and lasting as it was all over the country; that is to say, very lasting and very deep.

The very characteristics that endeared him to us and that awoke our admiration and respect, and that gave us confidence not only in him but also in the great country that he loved so profoundly, somehow communicated themselves to all the people with whom he came into contact in New Jersey and elsewhere.

That his pursuit was not successful in no way diminished the zeal for his service to our country, or his attention to his duties in the Senate.

Among other things, he was a "loner." If there is such a thing as an "establishment" in the Senate, I suppose he was perhaps the most unlikely one to be included in such a group.

Perhaps the Senate is unique in that it includes a number of "loners."

Perhaps one of its chief functions—but not its only function—is to make a place for persons of that kind in our life as a country and in modern society. ESTES KEFAUVER fulfilled both functions—that of a Senator in the true sense, in the fulfillment of all the responsibilities that the office entails, and, in addition, the representative of something unique in American life, a very great symbol of the importance of the individual. In all these ways we shall remember him as long as our memory lasts, and shall mourn his passing.

Mrs. Case joins with me in extending our most tender sympathy to Mrs. Kefauver and the children.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when ESTES KEFAUVER departed the company of living men, our hearts were sad, for we knew that we had lost a friend and a valiant fighter. His large outstretched hand reached across America and grasped the hand of the storekeeper, the housewife, the small businessman, and the farmer. Millions of Americans in all parts of this country and in all walks of life remember the tall Tennesseean who, in the spring of 1952, warmly shook their hands and drawled, "I'm ESTES KEFAUVER and I'm running for President. You'll help me, won't you?"

His kind, folksy manner endeared him to them, and his determined fight against the forces that would take advantage of those who may not have so much in worldly goods and in opportunity earned for him their lasting gratitude.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a rugged Tennessee mountaineer of hearty pioneer stock. He was born in the land of Andrew Jackson, endowed with his spirit and fight, with his courage and determination. ESTES KEFAUVER's every act would have indicated that he was ever mindful of this rich and fearless heritage. It was only fitting that the coonskin cap should become his symbol. As a star football player for the University of Tennessee, his physical prowess and his endurance won for him the nickname, "Old Ironsides." His physical strength was matched by the strength of his character and convictions. ESTES KEFAUVER forthrightly stated his position and would not retreat from a fight in defense of the principles in which he believed. "The glory of man," said Solomon, "is strength." And ESTES KEFAUVER was strong. The eloquent words of Senator John W. Daniel, in tribute to Thomas Jefferson, so fittingly describe the strength of ESTES KEFAUVER:

He was strong and all powerful in courage; yes, in civic courage, the rarest of all kinds of bravery. All nations are brave in their own way. Massive battalions, thousands strong, will march to death midst flashing bayonets and screaming shells—not a man dropped out of his place. But the courage that faces the sneer of fashion, the scorn of power, the scowl of altered friendship "the proud man's contumely and the insolence of office"—this is the courage that belongs alone to souls "touched to fine issues" * * * the superb, quiet, patient, daring courage that looks public opinion in the eye and dares confront it and affront it, and not flinch from the encounter.

"KEFAUVER" became a household word as he relentlessly sought out the ganglords of organized crime and vice and alerted all America to the scope of their operations. He was one of the first public figures to use the medium of television to give the American people an insight into the functioning of the committees of Congress and to inform them about a grave national problem. His independence and straightforwardness at times cost him political support and yet he did not compromise a principle for personal gain. He was truly the practicing idealist. ESTES KEFAUVER first won his seat in this body by fighting an uphill battle against what seemed to be insurmountable odds, and as a Member of this body, he never stopped fighting regardless of the obstacles. He was ever alert to safeguard the spirit of our free enterprise system and quick to do battle against those who would abuse it and through monopolistic practices impose unfair burdens upon the American people.

ESTES KEFAUVER fought for his people and he nobly strived for peace and justice for the whole world. He will have a great place in history as the statesman who pioneered in behalf of the federation of the free. He was chief sponsor of the Atlantic Union resolution, and he remained a prime and steadfast advocate of Atlantic unification. In our fights against the forces of reaction who would destroy the Tennessee Valley Authority, those of us who realize how much it has meant to our section of the country and to the Nation had no stancher ally or more resolute fighter than ESTES KEFAUVER.

When ESTES KEFAUVER departed the company of living men, the people of America—the average American, the common man—lost a devoted friend, a valiant fighter for their cause. The people of the world lost a statesman and a dedicated champion for world peace and understanding. In his spirit and example, the fight for the ideals that were his life will go on with renewed dedication.

He will be forever an influence,
A memory, a goal, a high example,
A thought of honor in some noble heart,
Part of his country's treasure and renown,
Oft giving courage unto souls that strive.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I had the honor and privilege to serve for many years with ESTES KEFAUVER on the Committee on the Judiciary. It so happened that we were seated beside each other in the committee. During the many years I served with him, I always found him to be fighting for what he considered the rights of the common man in the United States. Also, in many instances, he was fighting against somebody, even in committee. But that did not stop ESTES KEFAUVER from trying to persuade the committee with respect to what he thought was for the best interests for the people of not only his State of Tennessee, but of the United States, as well.

So, with sorrow in my heart, I join my colleagues today in eulogizing ESTES KEFAUVER, the late senior Senator from Tennessee, who left our midst on August 10. I had the good fortune to serve with him. I was among those who attended his funeral in Tennessee; and one would have to go to that funeral in order to know how the people of Tennessee appreciated him. They had tears in their eyes, because they knew they had lost one of their dearest and best friends when they lost ESTES KEFAUVER.

He was one of the most energetic Members of this body, and could be found working with deep interest on any number of legislative projects, regardless of whether they dealt with matters coming before the committee on which he served, or with bills before the Senate. He was the Senate's plodder who insisted on completing a job, regardless of whether it was one which brought headlines and fame or whether it was one of the menial tasks which sometimes bring on criticism and even bitter opposition.

It made no difference to ESTES KEFAUVER, so long as he thought he was fighting for what he believed was right and just.

Even with all the Senate work to which he attended, Senator KEFAUVER found time to write books and to make personal studies and inquiries, and he was one of the best informed Members of the Senate on the issues before it.

The people of the United States unquestionably will remember him for his conscientious and persistent work on the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly legislation and his never-ending fight against crime and corruption.

One would have to be behind the closed doors of the Senate Judiciary Committee in order really and truly to appreciate the fight ESTES made to try to keep the monopolies from taking over the United States.

He was a friend of the underprivileged and the downtrodden, and did much to set our Nation on a course to overcome one of our major problems—that of juvenile delinquency. More than once he came within reach of the highest office in this land, the Presidency of the United States; but, having failed to attain this office, he never once let disappointment steer him away from what he thought was his duty and what he loved to do—to serve the people of Tennessee and our Nation. His dedication to duty and his good sportsmanship throughout his political life should be an example to others who follow in his footsteps.

My heart and my sympathy go out to his wife, his children, and the other members of his immediate family. They have lost a good husband and a good father; and we have lost a friend and colleague who constantly fought for the rights of all the people of the United States.

I have been asked to read to the Senate a resolution, adopted by the Capitol Hill chapter of the Federal Bar Association, memorializing ESTES KEFAUVER. It is as follows:

RESOLUTION OF CAPITOL HILL CHAPTER, FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMORIALIZING SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

Whereas the late Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, the senior Senator from Tennessee, was a founding member of the Capitol Hill chapter of the Federal Bar Association and was dedicated to the chapter aims of holding high the standards of the legal profession in the activities of all members of the bar serving in the legislative branch of our Government; and

Whereas Senator KEFAUVER, by his wise counseling, by his attendance at meetings of the chapter, and participation on panels and at conventions of the association, and by his very exemplary life itself was an inspiration to all members of the bar to more noble achievements toward thoroughness in and justice under the law; and

Whereas Senator KEFAUVER, through his many able writings, addresses, floor debates, and untiring committee activities in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, contributed immeasurably to a greater public respect for the law and to an improvement in the functioning of Congress; and

Whereas Senator KEFAUVER, who was a truly great American and a credit to his State and Nation, departed this life on August 10, 1963: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Capitol Hill chapter of the Federal Bar Association hereby in heartfelt and meaningful terms in the spirit and brotherhood of our great profession, pays tribute to the memory of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, able lawyer, statesman, patriot, and friend, and directs the officers of the chapter to make this resolution known to

the members of our profession and to the best extent possible to the public at large, and that a copy of it be presented to the family of our late and distinguished member.

Approved by the chapter council, October 17, 1963.

Unanimously adopted at a general meeting October 24, 1963.

ERWIN G. KRASNOW,
President.

JAMES E. PALMER, Jr.,
Chairman, Memorial Committee.

Attest:

WALDO MOORE,
Secretary.

Mr. President, all of us have lost a very dear and capable friend.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is a privilege to have this opportunity to pay a simple tribute to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER.

His untimely death has deprived the Senate of one of its most able, fearless, and courageous Members; and I, personally, have lost a friend with whom I was in close personal association for more than 23 years. This association on many occasions brought me to the great Tennessee Valley, to his great city of Madisonville, to Chattanooga, and to the marvelous works of the TVA, that he had championed for so long.

I knew him in his home, with his wonderful wife, Nancy, and their fine children. I also had the privilege of knowing his father and mother and his faithful and loyal sisters. From time to time, over the years, Nancy and ESTES made me a part of their household. He was as close a friend as I have ever had. It was a totally loyal friendship; and he never faltered in that loyalty.

As an authentic liberal, ESTES KEFAUVER stood firm with those of all nations who champion the dignity of the individual and respect for human rights. This often meant that he championed causes which were not popular in his native State. Time after time the political "dopesters" predicted his defeat at the polls; but at each election he came back stronger than before, which was a testimonial of the respect the people of his great State had for him.

The accomplishments of ESTES KEFAUVER for his country and mankind were legion. There is no need now to set them out. For ESTES KEFAUVER life always kept its zest and savor. In his living there was no unutilized energy. He gave himself wholeheartedly to the engrossing aims and obligations of political life; and no matter how he chanced to feel, in his view the major matters must be got on with.

To Nancy, the children, and sisters, my deepest sympathy.

Mr. President, my senior colleague [Mr. MAGNUSON] is out of the country on official business. Prior to his leaving he prepared a tribute to ESTES KEFAUVER. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Today the U.S. Senate pauses appropriately to pay tribute to a late and beloved colleague who, stricken in the midst of his arduous labors, has gone to a realm where there is no crime, no cruelty or greed, no wrongs or injustices such as he fought against throughout his earthly career.

I am referring, of course, to the late Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, he of the warm handshake and warmer heart, soft spoken and gentle in manner, but who also could be and was an implacable foe of every form of human exploitation.

ESTES KEFAUVER has been described as a man of many interests while his one great interest was people, all people whatever their walks or conditions of life.

It was ESTES KEFAUVER's interest in people that, I believe, impelled him to seek legislation to protect them from racketeering and monopoly, to assist the consumer, to defend the weak and humble, to combat juvenile delinquency and the black market in unwanted babies, to strengthen international ties and to advance innovations which he felt would make for better government.

When he twice sought the nomination for President of the United States, it is my opinion that he did so not from personal ambition or self-esteem, but in the conviction that as Chief Executive he could achieve more swiftly those objectives which in his heart and mind he deemed would benefit the people of the Nation.

When Senator KEFAUVER was elected to the Senate in November 1948, he was assigned in January to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, now the Committee on Commerce. As we worked together on that committee during the 1st session of the 81st Congress, I came to admire his thoroughness, patience and dedicated application to the problems before us. The friendship we established in those days has been enduring.

Legislation relating to communications, then as now under the committee's jurisdiction, had a special appeal to Senator KEFAUVER, and he served as chairman of two special communications subcommittees.

It was also while he was a member of the committee that he indicated great concern over the problem of organized crime. At the conclusion of the 1st session of the 81st Congress, the Senator transferred to the Judiciary Committee, and was named there with Senator Wiley, of Wisconsin, to serve on a Special Committee To Investigate Crime in America, to which Senators O'Conor of Maryland; Hunt, of Wyoming; and Tobey, of New Hampshire, of the Commerce Committee, were also appointed. As we know, Senator KEFAUVER was designated chairman of this committee, and the broad inquiry into rackets and racketeers in our major cities drew national attention.

As a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1952, Senator KEFAUVER entered 18 primaries, winning 15 of them, but Governor Stevenson, of Illinois, received the nomination at Chicago.

In 1956 Senator KEFAUVER again aspired to the Democratic nomination for President, again campaigning in his genial, methodical, people-to-people way, and with limited funds. Again he was not successful in being chosen the standard bearer for his party, but he did gain the personal satisfaction of winning thousands upon thousands of new friends, and to him this was indeed a rich measure of success.

Seeking a third term in the U.S. Senate in 1960, the voters of Tennessee chose him over his opponent by more than a 2-to-1 plurality.

Now he has left us, his work unfinished.

Three bills to which he attached special importance are pending in committees. A bit of ESTES KEFAUVER's spirit lives on in these bills. Whether they are enacted or not, they are fitting symbols of the things he lived and fought for, of his great warmth and humanity, and of his hatred of injustice.

One bill would establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime with the object of combating the problem that had deeply troubled him ever since he had noted, as a member of the Committee on Commerce 15 years ago, the disregard that racketeers and crime czars hold for State boundaries.

Another bill, which Senator KEFAUVER would have styled the Antiracketeering and Monopoly Boxing Act, would establish the Office of National Boxing Commissioner for the stated purpose of curbing "monopolistic control of professional boxing."

The third bill would establish an Office of Consumers to represent the economic interests of the consuming public before agencies of the Government and to conduct certain surveys and investigations in their behalf.

Senator KEFAUVER was a very busy Senator, but never did he flinch from duty on the numerous committees on which he served and never did he indicate a weariness of the flesh or spirit to his colleagues.

He was a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in itself a tortuous, grinding job with tremendous responsibility.

He was a member not only of the Senate Judiciary Committee, but of four subcommittees: Constitutional Amendments; Patent, Trademarks and Copyrights; Juvenile Delinquency; and Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation, on the last of which he served as chairman.

I grieve for his passing. All of us here will miss him. All of us will treasure the associations we have had with him through the years. And all of us, I am sure, who have not already done so, will wish to express their sorrow and condolences to his gracious wife and their four children.

He was a husband and father, a statesman and a legislator, a politician, if you please—and most of all a man they will be ever proud of.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the shock of ESTES KEFAUVER's death has abated somewhat, but the grief at losing a friend remains.

ESTES KEFAUVER was my friend; he was a friend of thousands. On many occasions he was my adversary, but he was always my friend. In all my experience as a lawyer and legislator, I never had a more formidable opponent, yet when the battle was done, it was characteristic of Senator KEFAUVER to extend the sincere hand of friendship.

There were many facets to Senator KEFAUVER. One was the man, the Lincolnesque figure trudging up and down the Main Streets of Tennessee towns—and towns almost anywhere in the country—his oversized hand probably often aching with pain from too many grasps with his fellow citizens' hands.

Another facet was that of his being a nominee of his party for the Vice Presidency, pursuing the arduous task of cross-country campaigning.

I well remember the time when he made his appearance in the latter part of October 1956, on the occasion of the

national corn picking contest in Columbus, Nebr. He had an arduous schedule. He was tired. His voice was raspy. He had contracted a low grade infection of some kind and was running a fever. But notwithstanding all those handicaps and his condition, he insisted on going out to the field, where a stiff wind was blowing up the dust, and making his appearance, not out of considerations of vanity or considerations of an egotistical nature, but because he did not wish to disappoint the thousands who had gathered there to hear the man from Tennessee.

Another facet of Senator KEFAUVER was the series of televised crime hearings, his softly uttered probings producing a real-life underworld story that fascinated an audience of millions, and made them aware of a condition needing attention.

But I am convinced that the Senator was at his best as chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, on which I served with him for 4 years. He was spectacularly single-minded in his pursuit of evidence of wrongdoing. He challenged the giants of half a dozen major industries.

Within the select committee, Senator KEFAUVER and I often represented widely conflicting viewpoints and philosophies. We differed drastically on point after point, in hearing after hearing, not on the declared purposes or goals sought so much as on the means or methods by which they should be attained.

But throughout, he was always quiet, respectful, and self-controlled. He may at some time have lost his temper. I do not know. But I can truthfully say I never saw him lose his temper.

His soft drawl, his courtly demeanor, his composed features masked a bulldog tenacity which never ceased to surprise his colleagues and his many friends.

As with all men who hold strong views, Senator KEFAUVER suffered defeat and frustration on occasion. Lesser men would have compromised, shifted their positions, and found a way to save face. But that was not the way for ESTES KEFAUVER.

It was not the way for Nancy Kefauver, whose tenacity and other admirable Scotch characteristics matched and supported the convictions of her husband so loyally, so suitably.

Mr. President, while the Senate is a poorer place without ESTES KEFAUVER being here, nevertheless we are the better for his long years of service which enhanced the Congress and its workings mightily.

Mrs. Hruska and I join the many, many friends in extending the tenderest sympathy to his loving and beloved wife, Nancy and the rest of their fine family.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the death of ESTES KEFAUVER the Senate has lost one of its most useful Members and the country one of its most devoted servants.

ESTES KEFAUVER came to the Senate in 1949 after a distinguished career in the House of Representatives, and he was a Member of this body for nearly 15 years. During that time both we and the millions whom he served learned to know the full measure of the man. He was soft spoken, gentle, and friendly in manner and he had indeed an external simplicity of bearing which excited the derision of many supersophisticates. This simplicity was not put on but was the natural expression of an innate friendliness and a genuine liking for people combined with an utter absence of pretense or posturing. People responded to ESTES' handshake and to his friendly greetings because they knew that he was truly one of them and that he was their champion. So far as the people were concerned, he was probably the most popular Senator of us all.

Underneath this amiability was rock-like integrity, fighting courage, dogged persistence, a sharp and shrewd mind, and warm devotion to the interests of the people. Without large private means and amidst all the temptations of public life, he kept himself clean and unspotted. Nor was his honesty merely a matter of dollars. He was intellectually upright. He would not twist evidence in his own behalf or argue demagogically.

He had the courage of a lion. He early took on the powerful boss of Tennessee, Ed Crump, of Memphis, and won by going directly to the people. He braved the anger and reprisals of the criminal underworld in his famous countrywide crime investigations. He dared to investigate and expose monopolistic control and practices in a wide variety of industries from steel to drugs and in so doing brought down on his head storms of criticism. He worked for the reform of congressional procedures although this did not make him popular with the power structures of the Senate and House. A lover of his native southland, he yet dared to take a national stand on sensitive issues which at least immediately went against the grain of perhaps the majority of citizens in his State.

He had dogged persistence. For years he tried to reform the drug laws of the country in order to protect the public both in matters of price and quality. Fought by the big commercial interests, sniped at and impeded by Government bureaucracy, he nevertheless triumphed as the thalidomide story unfolded and with the help of two heroic women, Drs. Barbara Moulton and Frances Kelsey, he forced a reluctant Congress and bureaucracy to protect the public. He fought to keep the channels of trade and communication open for both business and the consumers. He had a deep faith in ethical competition and waged a lifelong struggle to save that system both from monopoly and from unethical practices. He was a pioneer in stressing the need for the democratic nations to join together in some form of closer union.

And underneath his rustic manner was one of the sharpest minds in the Senate. Under his quiet but penetrating cross-examination he revealed the criminal underworld while he cut equally through the specious defenses of highly paid Wall Street lawyers and adroit lobbyists. He saw the forces which were degrading the promise of American life and had the wit to lay them bare. He was in fact an authentic intellectual, although he took pains to obey Kipling's mandate of not looking too good or talking too wise.

But most of all ESTES KEFAUVER had a great heart for the welfare of people. He was their tribune and their champion without affectation or pretense. His great heart literally broke fighting their battles over who was to control Telstar communications and his death occurred in the midst of his last battle on this issue.

Finally, may I close on a personal note. He was my friend for nearly 20 years, ever since he and my wife served together in the House of Representatives.

I am proud that I supported him in 1952 in his campaign for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, and that I walked with him the last bitter mile as many of the powerful sought to heap humiliation upon him. His bearing under defeat turned reverses into spiritual victory.

We worked together in the Senate for most of the same causes and his loss is a heavy one. He stood up tall and straight in this body and he will long be remembered. A true tribune of the people has entered the Valhalla of the valiant. May his successful example inspire others to be more like him.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the one word—irreparable—has been on the lips not only of many of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S colleagues but of countless Americans in characterizing his loss. Perhaps, as is often said, there are no indispensable men. However, the passing of ESTES KEFAUVER causes me—and I doubt not many others—to challenge that facile assumption. I believe that his loss is irreparable—irreparable to the Senate, to the whole Congress, to his State of Tennessee, which he loved so well, but more important to the entire Nation—and, perhaps, beyond our natural boundaries when one considers the image of democracy at its finest that he projected to the entire world. Is not his the image, the American image, that we as Americans would like to have projected to all mankind? I so feel.

The American people, in any event, were truly bereaved when that great soul that was ESTES KEFAUVER departed this life.

His was a battle casualty. He was fatally wounded in action. It was on the floor of the Senate late one afternoon, toward the close of a grueling day, while engaged in one of his monumental battles—and leading that battle—that he was stricken. He was fighting, along with a small group of his colleagues, against a monopoly, an unregulated monopoly, "organized for private profit," as the bill creating it clearly spelled out; a monopoly in a vast new and unexplored cosmic field—in a field infinite, with unknown and untapped possibilities—space. He had carried on that battle

with 15 of his colleagues a year previously in the 87th Congress. He lost that battle, but it was renewed when the effort to authorize the appropriation of $45 million to subsidize that corporation "organized for private profit" again raised the issue forcibly whether it was really a private corporation, and if so, whether it should be. The issue on that fatal day was the justification, or lack of justification, for an appropriation for a corporation—presented to the Congress as pure private enterprise—which at the first possible opportunity appeared to be reaching, and reaching deeply, into the Federal Treasury. It was in the midst of this struggle that ESTES KEFAUVER felt ill. Later in the evening, he went to the hospital, where 30 hours later, his great heart gave way.

As always, that fight, like ESTES KEFAUVER's many others, was a fight for the public interest. Indeed, the public interest never had a stancher, more determined, more indefatigable champion in public life than ESTES KEFAUVER. His eminent public career in the House of Representatives for 8 years and in the Senate for 15 years, was illuminated by his unfailing espousal of causes and of legislation that sought to make life better, fuller, and more meaningful for the great mass of the American people. He was instinctively a champion of the underdog, of the underprivileged, of the so-called little people, whose welfare, whose frustrations, and whose hopes were ever his concern. And the people whose causes he espoused recognized him as their defender. No Member of the Congress was more widely known and more widely beloved. He was the people's Senator, and he was a national figure.

As a defender of the consumer, ESTES KEFAUVER inevitably found himself arrayed against the powerful vested interests which by and large dominate many aspects of American life. He found himself arrayed against entrenched political bossism when he took on and ultimately vanquished the powerful Crump machine in his home State of Tennessee. He found himself in conflict with big industry, with big steel, and other great corporations, with their administered prices. He was concerned with the effect of those prices whether it be steel or electrical equipment or bread or any of the essentials of modern life on the cost of living of the American family. And so he fought them.

He waged a heroic battle against abuses in the drug industry. His concern was not merely for the health of the American people, so deeply implicated in the medicines they need, but for their pocketbooks. He knew of the high cost of medication and worked hard to do something about it. He won battles—notably in the 87th Congress, when the unexpected revelations about thalidomide and its macabre effects on the unborn caused one of those miraculous breaks in the entrenched opposition to his efforts and gave him the signal victory for the legislation he had sought. He realized that although he had won that battle, the war still remained to be won. Now it has lost its mightiest warrior and its leader.

He waged a war against crime and racketeering. He showed up its connection with some of the big city political machines and their resulting corruption and earned for himself the antagonism of some of those high in political life. It did not faze him in the least. He was unswervable from what he deemed the path of rectitude.

A southerner, he refused to sign the southern manifesto calling for massive resistance to desegregation, thus performing one of his numerous acts of courage and further evidencing the depth of his democratic feeling. He was wholly free from prejudice on the basis of race, color, or creed.

We Alaskans will always be grateful to him for his early and vigorus support of Alaska's statehood as he likewise gave his voice and vote to Hawaii's. His deep faith in the basic American principle of government by consent of the governed made that support natural and consistent with ESTES' political philosophy.

Perhaps the outstanding example of ESTES KEFAUVER's courage took place during the height of the era of McCarthyism. Then, the denunciation of anyone as soft on communism was presumed to be a politically lethal blow. Demonstrating their freedom from such an imputation, and undoubtedly also because they deemed the Communist conspiracy a real menace to our freedom and our democratic institutions, Representatives and Senators sponsored legislation to outlaw the Communist Party. There was a bandwagon rush to support it. In the debate preceding the vote ESTES KEFAUVER, who had taken an extensive part in the discussion, said:

> Many of us are concerned about the precedent of outlawing a particular group. Perhaps next year Congress will not like some other group. Perhaps 10 years from now Congress may not like another group. In the history of this Nation, is this not a new approach to the problem? Have we ever outlawed any group before in the history of the United States? In the history of our Nation, has any group ever been outlawed or condemned as illegal by legislative enactment?

Apparently, he did not get what, to him, were satisfactory answers to his questions. He continued his questioning to determine whether, under the provisions of the pending legislation, there was a right of appeal or judicial determination if and when enactment had taken place in the Senate.

Although ESTES KEFAUVER was no less aware than his colleagues of the existence of the Communist conspiracy and its sinister purposes, it was evident that he had, nevertheless, serious doubts about the wisdom of this legislation as a means of combating the Communist menace at home. Fearing that he would vote against the legislation, his staff and others pleaded with him to go along with what was bound to be an overwhelming majority. They warned him that to do otherwise would be political suicide. But ESTES KEFAUVER refused to be stampeded by the current hysteria, nor did he think that our American institutions were so fragile that they could be impaired by the few Communists in our midst.

When the roll was called, the bill was passed by a vote of 81 to 1—the 1 was ESTES KEFAUVER.

But, however determined, persistent, and tenacious his battling, ESTES KEFAUVER was never bitter, even after some disappointing setbacks, never vindictive, and as far as I can remember, never angry, or at least if he was, he did not show it by any display of temper. The even tone and low key of his unemotional delivery—for he was not a fiery orator—reflected the calmness and serenity of his temperament. He could be indignant at what he considered injustice and evil, but his indignation was not directed at his fellow men as individuals.

For, above everything else, he was a kind person, a gentle person, a modest person, and, however deeply he felt involved in the causes for which he fought, he fought them without rancor, without malice, without self-glorification, and with full appreciation of the other fellow's point of view.

His greatness lay in his steadfast devotion to the principles and to the causes for which he fought, and in the courage which made him oblivious to the odds against him and to any political consequences that might follow. That, despite some hard-fought electoral contests, these contests turned out to be without adverse political consequences, is a tribute to the people of his State of Tennessee who, even if they did not always agree with him, recognized the integrity, sincerity, and honesty which ESTES KEFAUVER so conspicuously incarnated.

His place will not be filled, and his departure leaves a tragic void in our public life. The tragedy lies in the fact that at age 60 he could have been expected to give for another score of years the kind of dedicated public service that often almost singlehanded he had been rendering.

We shall all miss him sorely, and our sympathy goes out not only to the American people who are so much poorer for his passing, but first and foremost to his lovely wife and beautiful children, to whom he was so devoted.

It is pertinent that ESTES KEFAUVER died poor, but to his family he left a priceless legacy and to America a shining example.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, when ESTES KEFAUVER passed away, the average man in America lost a true, trusted, and genuine friend. Millions of his fellow Americans had the highest admiration and respect for ESTES KEFAUVER; and those of us who served with him in the House of Representatives, and later in the Senate, know that this feeling of comradeship was fully and justly deserved.

ESTES KEFAUVER talked a language that everyone understood. Time and again he demonstrated a remarkable ability to translate the great and complicated problems and challenges of his time into the simplest phrases. In a quiet and

uncomplicated way he invariably came to grips with complex issues, and striking at the very heart of the problems in question, without losing sight of genuine human value.

Throughout his career of public service, ESTES KEFAUVER demonstrated the courageous independence that is the hallmark of leadership. His genius enabled him to look beyond the marbled halls and lobbies of Capitol Hill to ascertain the effect of any given legislative proposal upon his fellow Americans, who seldom come here or get in touch directly with us to express their fears and more important, their hopes.

His unwavering devotion to individual rights often confounded the pressure groups. ESTES KEFAUVER held fast to the philosophy of freedom and rugged individualism that, in an earlier time, guided the statesmanship of another Tennesseean, Andrew Jackson. When the coonskin cap became his political symbol, millions of his fellow Americans grasped the idea. They loved this tall and scholarly Tennesseean. They liked the way he looked you straight in the eye, and the way he spoke not only from the head but from the heart.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a genuine liberal and a progressive, in that he sought new solutions and was willing to consider the validity of new answers to old questions. He was a tireless crusader. Perhaps no man in all history shook hands with as many people throughout the Nation as did ESTES KEFAUVER in two presidential campaigns.

He loved people, and they responded to him. I had seen him arrive at 2 o'clock, after a day that had begun some 16 or 18 hours earlier, and spend time with people, not because he was campaigning, but because the people had waited for him until 2 o'clock in the morning and he felt they should not go away disappointed.

I had seen him fulfill a grueling and grinding campaign schedule that ended at 2 in the morning and was resumed at 6 o'clock in the morning, through dust storms in my home State; and I had seen him travel through the parched earth area of Oklahoma that year because he loved the people and felt that the people were entitled to have the benefit of his ideas about government.

He was unselfish. Although he had lost the fight he had made for the nomination for the Presidency, he worked unselfishly and tirelessly for the successful candidate at the Democratic Convention, and worked as hard for him, or even harder than he worked for himself.

As chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee in the Senate, as an active member of the Select Committee on Small Business, as chairman of the Anticrime Committee, his uncompromising courage and diligence in fighting wrong-doing and vice, yielded great benefits to all.

The issues which he sponsored, not passively, but aggressively, were myriad.

ESTES KEFAUVER never asked, "Is the issue popular?" Instead, he asked, "Is it right?" and acted on that basis. He never asked the question, "Can it pass?" but, "Should it pass?" and gave his full attention to the effort to have it passed.

He stood for world peace and for the establishment of the United Nations before it was actually proposed. He was a stalwart supporter of NATO, the Marshall plan, food for peace, and foreign aid, and was active in that field of affairs when often such stands were unpopular, but were necessary to bring the United States into a position of leadership as the only Nation to which others could look. He favored the TVA, REA, social security, medical care, antitrust legislation, civil rights, inflation control, and other important measures on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives at an early date. In the matter of a philosophical approach to governmental issues, he was a scholar. He was constantly thinking about and studying proposals for congressional reforms. In the reorganization of Congress, he was one of the strongest supporters, and he advocated many new and vital suggestions to help modernize our system.

ESTES KEFAUVER knew how to fight a good fight. His sense of fairness, and his gentlemanly approach to debate and parliamentary procedures, endeared him to all who worked alongside him in Congress.

His vision, his integrity, his talent, and his devotion often caused him to place service ahead of self; and thus it was that this desire to work, to do, to achieve, and to fight for others, and the schedule that he set for himself brought to him the untimely toll of death.

To his gracious wife and their fine children, Mrs. Monroney and I extend our deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, the departure from our ranks of our colleague, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, was a shock to us all.

My first thought on hearing of his death was that the people of this country had lost one of the greatest champions they could have in public life.

By the people, I mean those ordinary folk who have no expensive lobbies and no vested interest in anything but good government.

It was a dedication to the rights of his fellowman and their protection against exploitation that characterized ESTES KEFAUVER's public career.

Few men have enjoyed the recognition and respect that greeted him from one end of our country to the other.

He was welcomed so often in Michigan, for example, that we felt he almost was one of our native sons.

In the Senate, ESTES KEFAUVER made an outstanding record in many legislative battles, but always he was on the side of his friends, the people.

Speaking as one who feels honored to have known and worked with Senator KEFAUVER for nearly 10 years, I can say only that he will be sorely missed.

I join with my many colleagues in expressing deep sympathy to Nancy, his lovely wife, the children, and all of his relations in their sorrow.

Mr. GORE. I now yield to the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, each of us in this body feels genuine loss in the passing of our colleague, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER.

As the falling of a mighty tree leaves a a void against the sky, so the passing of this tall Tennessean creates a vacuum which can be neither quickly filled nor easily forgotten. We shall miss his forthright counsel and his independent strength as we seek to carry forward the legislative burdens of the Nation.

It was my privilege to know ESTES KEFAUVER as a friend and coworker since the 76th Congress, when he came to the House of Representatives. We served together in the Senate in a spirit of cooperation which was engendered by mutual interests. He was, as I sensed it, a public servant of energy, devotion and conscience.

Throughout his career as a lawyer and Member of Congress and vice presidential candidate, ESTES KEFAUVER never lost touch with the individual citizen—the man in the street—whose trust and respect he won in countless battles. In the courts of law, in congressional hearing rooms, and in debate, he was ever the steadfast friend and champion of the people, as he knew them.

He was a tall man physically. But he was one who was quick to stoop to aid those who needed assistance.

ESTES KEFAUVER will be missed by his colleagues in the Senate, and by the constituency he served in Tennessee, and throughout the Nation.

Mrs. Randolph joins me in extending most sincere sympathy to Nancy and the children. We shall remember him. We shall remember them.

Mr. GORE. I now yield to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

ESTES KEFAUVER; CHAMPION OF THE COMMON MAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, he came from Madisonville in Monroe County in his beloved Tennessee; his life was worthy of the best deeds of the two exemplars for whom his town and his county were named.

And when they carried ESTES KEFAUVER back for burial on the family farm in Monroe County in the rugged hills of east Tennessee last August 13, from a life untimely ended in the full prime of his effectiveness, a grateful people gathered from all parts of the Union to pay him homage. Their car license plates read from Maine to California; many doubtless lacked the means for plane tickets, but they came in the uncounted thousands, driving their own cars across a continent, to pay their last respects to the body of the leader who had come to be in America, the candidate and champion of the common man. He was that and more; he was the unfailing champion, advocate, and defender of the common man in the Halls of the Congress of the United States. I was there in Tennessee last August 13. Mr. Presi-

dent; I saw the people. I was here in the Senate with ESTES KEFAUVER, Mr. President; my office was just around the corner from his on the fourth floor of the Old Senate Office Building. I give a testimony today, based on my personal knowledge of their man. Providence has privileged me to have been a living witness to a part of the life of one of our Senate greats, a man whose life casts a beneficial glow on the whole work of the Senate. He came from the mountains, he reflected their strength in his own life.

ESTES KEFAUVER first came to widespread public notice in my home State by fighting for the Tennessee Valley Authority, as a Congressman. Next, he gave the hearts of our people a lift by beating the Crump machine in the Tennessee Senate race of 1948, and coming to the U.S. Senate. His crime committee investigation of big crime in America brought him national fame, enhanced by the judicious, dignified, and fair manner in which he conducted the hearings. My first opportunity to see and hear ESTES KEFAUVER came in September 1951 at the national convention of the American Bar Association in New York City. He spoke for a public defender in the courts for those defendants unable to employ an attorney. An investigator of crime and criminals, he demanded the protection of the law for those accused of lawlessness.

In his drive for the Presidency in 1952, he was an extremely popular figure in my home State of Texas, and in the campaign of 1956, when he was his party's nominee for the Vice Presidency, I had the privilege of traveling with him in a caravan from Dallas to Waco, of seeing throngs of people cheered by his friendly, modest, unostentatious greetings. Instinctively, the people trusted him.

He was a generous man, in all facets of his life. His aids were permitted to help other Senators with research. I was the beneficiary of such aid by his staff. ESTES KEFAUVER was extravagant with his time in pursuit of justice for the people. He was generous with his time, for anyone seeking counsel or assistance.

When I came to the Senate in 1957, he and his charming wife, Nancy, were the first people in Washington to invite my wife, Opal, and me into their home. He was hospitable, in the best traditions of his native Tennessee.

He was a friendly man, friendly to everybody, but he was more than that to me. He was my personal friend. I counted him my closest friend in the Senate. Our hearts are full of sympathy for his beautiful and fine family. I felt a debt to his ideals, as those other great Tennesseans, Andrew Jackson, and Andrew Johnson; and Sam Houston had inspired other Texans in other generations. ESTES KEFAUVER is in the mold of a Sam Houston or an Andrew Johnson or an Andrew Jackson or a James K. Polk; he is worthy to be ranked with them.

ESTES KEFAUVER was cast in the mold of a Jackson or a Houston. Independent, fearless, fighting against great odds, taking on the political kingmakers of the Nation singlehanded, plunging into a just cause without pausing to count the cost, never slowing down for his own personal aches or pains, standing on his feet to protect the people, even with the fingers of death closing upon him; he was a champion to cheer for, a friend and leader to mourn. There is an emptiness in the Senate Chamber now that may not be filled in our lifetime.

Personally, I counted ESTES KEFAUVER among the five most vital and valuable persons serving the Government of the United States, counting all branches of government.

I have given this subject considerable thought since ESTES KEFAUVER left this body in August. It is my considered judgment that there are not three persons working in the Government of the United States today who are more valuable to the people of the United States than was ESTES KEFAUVER.

In the investigation of the conspiracy of the manufacturers of electrical equipment, ESTES KEFAUVER uncovered enough evidence of conspiracy to cause the manufacturers to plead guilty. My home city of Austin, Tex., owns its own electrical plant. On one piece of equipment costing millions of dollars the electrical manufacturers had all entered identical bids. After the Kefauver exposure, the manufacturer, this year, reduced the bid on one piece of equipment alone by $600,000, saving that amount for the taxpaying and electricity-using citizens of Austin, Tex., my home city, on only one piece of equipment.

Consider how much he meant to the whole country.

His work covered many fields of our economic life. By his courageous stand against powerful forces in both parties in the drug investigation he prevented the sale of thalidomide as a pain relieving drug to pregnant mothers, and thus saved families the tears and agonies of limbless babies.

He led the fight last year against the monopolistic giveaway of our uses of outer space for communications purposes. He virtually died on his feet fighting against a furtherance of that giveaway.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a gallant champion. His life has added one of the brightest chapters in the whole history of the Senate, in all of its generations. May his family take solace and comfort from the great useful inspiring life he lived.

Mr. President, many tributes were written about ESTES KEFAUVER after he died. I want to place two of them in the RECORD—two that were written by the working people he loved. They were written about a man they loved and trusted. He was worthy of their trust; he was worthy of America's pride and trust.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "ESTES KEFAUVER—A Gallant Champion," published in the Retail Clerks International Advocate for September 1963, and an article entitled "Champion of Rail Workers: KEFAUVER's Death a Great Loss to Labor and Nation," published in Labor, an international weekly newspaper, of August 17, 1963.

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

[From the Retail Clerks International Advocate, September 1963]

ESTES KEFAUVER—"A GALLANT CHAMPION"

Members of the RCIA join the Nation in mourning the death of ESTES KEFAUVER, U.S. Senator, twice an aspirant for the office of President, and a steadfast friend of the union member, the consumer—the ordinary citizen.

His courage and conviction forged a close bond between Senator KEFAUVER and the officers and members of the Retail Clerks International Association that endured for many years until his death at 60.

As a featured speaker at the Diamond Jubilee Year Convention held in Chicago in June, as well as at the 22d International Convention in New York City in 1951, he was attentively listened to and warmly received.

His remarks illustrated his character and outlook as well as expressed the warm friendship shared between him and the RCIA.

His philosophy of fair treatment of working men and women was summed up at the New York City convention of the RCIA:

"We feel that labor is not entitled to any special consideration, any special advantage, but that you are entitled to an equal status, an equal opportunity, and that you are entitled to have laws that are going to treat you fairly.

"Seeing that that is done is a determination which many of us are not going to forget, and it will be done whenever we have the votes and the strength which we are rapidly gaining in the Congress of the United States to bring that about."

Senator KEFAUVER's public record was a measure of the man. He fought against the Taft-Hartley Act and fought hard for the extension of the minimum wage law to retailing and an increase in the minimum. He fought for the Tennessee Valley Authority and was the scourge of organized crime.

His greatest achievement perhaps was the Kefauver drug law passed last year, giving comprehensive protection and assurance to the purchasers of prescription drugs.

At the time of his death he was working to extend the protections guaranteed to consumers by the Federal Government. At the 24th International Convention in Chicago he urged support for a Federal Council of Consumers:

"From the other side of the counter, the consumer's side, there is also a need for action at the Federal Government level. Businessmen have their Department of Commerce; workers have their Department of Labor; and farmers, though their number is dwindling, still have their Department of Agriculture.

"Yet nowhere in the Federal Government is there any official, independent voice for the consumer—and that term applies to just about everybody these days.

"I am sponsoring a bill, along with 27 other Senators, to establish a Consumer Council. The idea would be that consideration would be given at the top level of government to the points of view of the consumer."

The tall Tennessean was frequently compared to Andrew Jackson, who also came from that State. Through their homespun outlook and their championing of the cause of the common man—as well as their

unreserved acceptance by the voters—they met on common ground.

After death Senator KEFAUVER returned to his birthplace, Madisonville, Tenn. His simple burial there was fitting for a statesman who had never lost touch with the people.

He was born there on July 26, 1903, the son of a dairy farmer and hardware dealer who was the town's mayor.

He entered politics on a State level in 1938 and was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1939. Reelected four times, he entered the Senate in 1949, serving continuously until his death.

KEFAUVER made an unsuccessful bid to become the Democratic presidential nominee in 1952 and 1956 and was chosen as vice presidential candidate in 1956 to team with Adlai Stevenson who headed the Democratic slate that year.

At the conclusion of KEFAUVER's address to the RCIA convention in June 1951, International President Suffridge thanked the Senator in words that are appropriate as an epitaph:

"I think all of us know and realize the background of the Senator who just spoke to us. We know him as a man who has the warmth of a Lincoln, a man who has the foresight and vision of an F.D.R., and a man who has the integrity of a Jefferson."

[From Labor, International Weekly Newspaper, Aug. 17, 1963]

CHAMPION OF RAILWORKERS: KEFAUVER'S DEATH A GREAT LOSS TO LABOR AND NATION

Railroad workers and all other Americans suffered a heavy loss last week when Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, died in a Washington hospital. A heart attack which at first seemed mild proved fatal.

KEFAUVER, 60, literally worked himself to death for the public good. In his last 2 days, he led a group of liberal Senators in a strenuous but losing fight against another giveaway—this time of $44 million of the taxpayers' money, to the Communications Satellite Corp., dominated by giant American Telephone Co.

After long and hot debate, the Senate passed a $5.5 billion Space Agency authorization bill with the $44 million in it.

KEFAUVER was serving his third term in the Senate and had previously been in the House for 10 years. In his election campaigns, the whole-hearted support of railroad labor and the union movement as a whole helped him overcome powerful opposition by selfish and sometimes sinister interests, who hated him for his courage and independence.

BATTLING FOR RAILMEN

In this session of the Senate, KEFAUVER was pushing his bill to declare a "moratorium" on railroad mergers until December 31, 1964, so as to give Congress time to study the shattering effects of the huge mergers on rail employment and the public interest.

Also, he cosponsored legislation for an investigation of railroad finances and ownership. And he cosponsored a resolution for continued negotiations in the big rail work rules dispute under the eye of a watchdog committee of Congress.

These latest actions by KEFAUVER are typical of the helpful hand he has given to railworkers and labor as a whole many times in the past.

Son of a pioneer Tennessee family, KEFAUVER won fame as an athlete at the State's university, and was elected president of the student body. He worked his way through Yale Law School, taught and practiced law in Chattanooga, helped win the fight for TVA, and was active in local and State civic affairs until he was elected to the U.S. House, where he served with great distinction.

EXPOSED UNDERWORLD

After moving up to the Senate, KEFAUVER gained national renown by his investigation of organized crime and its corrupting effects on public morals and politics. Lords of the underworld, and some political leaders, never forgave him for that, and contributed lavishly to the campaign funds of some of his opponents in later elections. Nevertheless, KEFAUVER always won.

By 1952, KEFAUVER had gained such national stature that he won 14 of the 17 State presidential primaries, but he lost out to Adlai Stevenson in the party nominating convention. The same thing happened in the 1956 presidential campaign, but he was chosen then as vice presidential nominee.

FOUGHT MONOPOLISTS

Always a leading fighter for consumers and against monopolists and price fixers, KEFAUVER conducted famed probes of price rigging in the steel, electrical equipment, drug and other industries. He succeeded in putting new "teeth" in the antitrust laws and stronger controls over marketing of drugs after the shocking "thalidomide" scandal broke.

The latest result of his battles in the drug field came on the day he died. The Federal Trade Commission ruled that six big drug manufacturers "conspired to raise and fix prices on tetracyline, the leading antibiotic drug, with sales over $100 million a year."

Success of this illegal conspiracy, the FTC said, was made possible by a patent which Chas. Pfizer & Co., a giant of the drug industry, obtained by deceiving the U.S. Patent Office. KEFAUVER, in his reports on his drug probe, always emphasized that misuse of patents is a main foundation for the monopolistic system which makes old and ill people pay exorbitant prices for prescription drugs.

MANY TRIBUTES

Messages of tribute to KEFAUVER poured in from all over the Nation. Foremost among these was one by President Kennedy. He declared that KEFAUVER's "devotion to the public interest and the welfare of the people made him a powerful influence." Kennedy added that his death "deprived the Nation of one of its most distinguished leaders."

Some words spoken by one of Shakespeare's characters might well be applied to ESTES KEFAUVER: "He was a man, take him for all in all, we shall not look upon his like again."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, like most successful men in public life, ESTES KEFAUVER had a public image. But unlike many nationally prominent individuals, his image was the man himself. He was no different in or out of the spotlight. It is one of the prime reasons why people throughout the breadth of our great land loved him so well. They could sense that he spoke and acted always from the heart; that he was not schooled on Madison Avenue. Nor was he glazed with a veneer of cordiality that concealed cynicism and contempt from those from whom he sought support. He was real; he was genuine. It is possible for some of us to speak with firsthand knowledge on that particular phase of this great man.

In my own State of Wyoming, his influence was considerable. The reservoir of followers that filled to overflowing throughout the years during the many trips he made to my State stands as a living monument to the kind of direct inspiration he instilled in people.

One incident among many that we still talk about in Wyoming occurred in the campaign of 1956, when he was visiting a small community in southwest Wyoming—a big community in our terms, but small when considered from here—Rock Springs, in Sweetwater County. Senator KEFAUVER was to make a brief appearance, to include a speech and a public reception.

When his plane landed at the local airport, there were no portable stairs. Most of the airports in that area are not equipped to handle some of the larger planes that fly across that part of the country. For a while, it looked as though the people would have to content themselves with a speech made from the door of the aircraft at the airport. But ESTES, as the people were all calling him, even then, ordered the crew to uncrate the portable ladder which most of these craft carry. It was a chute; and in a grand swoop, he slid down out of the plane through the chute and into the crowd.

This was no idle gesture on his part, and was never interpreted in that way. It illustrated very well the innate dignity of ESTES KEFAUVER which lay in his sincerity and in the conviction that the average man was his concern. The people out my way have never forgotten that little incident.

Only 2 or 3 weeks before his passing, ESTES honored me by appearing in Cheyenne, the capital city of my State, at a testimonial dinner. His appearance at that dinner drew from the city of Rock Springs a delegation of 35 persons, who drove a distance of 275 miles, not to testimonialize McGEE, but to pay tribute to the presence there of ESTES KEFAUVER, who, although he was a Senator from Tennessee, was indeed a man of all Americans. They felt that a part of ESTES belonged to them. They were thrilled, once again, because he paid special attention to them; he had taken time from the busy round of events in Cheyenne to visit with them and to reminisce over some of the incidents of the past.

But even as I suggest that the people of Wyoming, individually, venerated ESTES KEFAUVER, still another incident bears recounting. One of the pleasantest visits, a visit that I shall never forget, was a short trip he and I took, along with some of our colleagues—I see in the Chamber the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who was in the party—to Yellowstone Park, last July. Yellowstone Park is more than Wyoming; it is "Crossroads, U.S.A."

What would have impressed any casual visitor at that moment, as we were standing in the vast lobby of the Lake Hotel, in the center of the park, was how all of America seemed to recognize at once the presence of ESTES. They said: "Hi, ESTES. Hello, ESTES. I last saw you, ESTES, in Minnesota"—or "Alabama"—or "New Hampshire." People all across the land crossed his trail in Yellowstone Park. ESTES KEFAUVER loved the people, and that affection was reciprocated.

There was more to this great and beloved public servant than even his true humility, his candor, his love of people, and their love, in turn, of him. In continually pressing for the achievement of the causes in which he believed, he in-

spired not only the plain people of America, but also the leaders at all levels and in connection with all causes, to follow his example.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a true liberal. He was convinced that the individual's lot in life could be improved and ought to be improved, and he dedicated his every effort to achieving that improvement.

His effective work in this body in the fight against organized crime, against unfair monopoly, and against those who would compromise the standards of service to the public is an indication of his real concern for the welfare of his fellow men.

ESTES KEFAUVER was not only a man of strong principles, he also worked to put those principles into action. And work, to ESTES KEFAUVER, was just that—work, hard work, and plenty of it. Just as his style of political campaigning meant meeting more people and shaking more hands, so his style of legislative work meant keeping longer hours and holding more hearings than most of his contemporaries. He was never known to shrink from a task or to give up before the job was complete. And neither would he shrink from a position he believed correct, just because it might be unpopular or might expose him to the mudslinging attacks of those who would pander to the mean and petty side of human nature, for political ends.

It is easy to talk about ESTES KEFAUVER, he was a big man and his memory and the memory of many associations with him brings a warm glow to the spirit. But it is certainly far more difficult to realize that he is no longer with us. His loss has already been keenly felt in this body and in our country. But even though he has passed on, his principles, his example, and his courage live on and still are very much with us. They become the guidelines and the inspiration to many of the rest of us. Those inspirations do not die.

We miss ESTES. The people of his State miss him. The Nation misses him. All of them need the kind of leadership and courage he exemplified.

Mrs. McGee would join me in expressing our sympathy to his lovely wife, Nancy, and their family. As Americans, we shall ever be proud of this great man, this great American.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, ESTES KEFAUVER and I served together in the House of Representatives. We became good friends then, and over the years I held him in the highest esteem. His sudden death last August shocked the entire Nation. We are still saddened by his loss, and, indeed, will be for many years to come.

Mr. President, when I say the entire Nation was shocked by his passing, I recall distinctly two occasions—one, in the Virgin Islands; another, on the campaign trail—when literally scores and scores of men, women, boys, and girls crowded around ESTES KEFAUVER, seeking his autograph, which he patiently gave; and from time to time he would say to someone, "This is Senator YOUNG, and he will give you his autograph." However, Mr. President, they were not seeking any autograph except that of this truly great man, ESTES KEFAUVER.

He was in every way a man of courage, of conviction, of tenacity, of great ability, and of dedication, known to and beloved by Americans—by the ordinary, average "little fellows," as we say—by the rank and file of the citizens of our country, in whose behalf he ceaselessly toiled.

He was always a dedicated public servant; he was always a champion of the "have-not's." A fine, big man, himself, he was always strenuously fighting for the rights of men and women whom he considered were being pushed around by those who were more powerful. He was a tireless foe of organized crime, of monopoly, and of special interests.

He was, in a very real respect, always a champion of the underdog, a guardian of the public interest. As such, he endeared himself to countless numbers of Americans in all walks of life. While he usually appeared unhurried and relaxed, he was at all times a man of great industry.

I am proud and honored to have served for many years with this "man in the coonskin cap." For more than 25 years, he served his native State of Tennessee and his Nation. He served with distinction as an official of his State, as a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, and as a Member of the Senate of the United States. During those years, ESTES KEFAUVER knew defeat, as well as victory; setbacks, as well as accomplishments. Yet, he never wavered in his determination that all Americans receive "a fair shake."

I recall very well that in 1952 he made a tremendous impression in Ohio when, almost alone, he campaigned for support as a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination. I was then in private life—having been retired by the will of the voters of my State in 1950. As a private citizen, I gladly gave him my enthusiastic support and help. At that time I knew of other powerful supporters and very close friends that he made in Ohio. One I have distinctly in mind was Edward "Ted" Lamb, of Toledo, who admired ESTES KEFAUVER so very much because, like ESTES, Ted Lamb has always been a champion of the underprivileged. Over the years Ted Lamb would speak almost reverently of his affection and admiration for ESTES KEFAUVER.

Let me say that this young lawyer, Edward "Ted" Lamb, in recent years has become chairman of the board of the Seiberling Tire and Rubber Co., of Akron, and is the head of the Edward Lamb Industries, of Toledo. He is a nationally known industrialist, an internationally famed sportsman, and a self-made millionaire a good many times over. Back in 1952 he was a lawyer, as was I, in Ohio; and he inspired me to do my utmost for ESTES KEFAUVER. Of course, the kingmakers of that time were too powerful. ESTES KEFAUVER—as was the situation on frequent occasions during his long life of truly dedicated public service—was fighting against well-nigh insurmountable odds. However, he was always cheerful and forthright; he never looked behind, to see whether he had a following host. He was always looking ahead, for the welfare of the people of the United States. He would have made a great President of the United States.

He was as towering a figure in ability and integrity, as he was in stature. His leadership, his counsel, his undaunted courage, and his presence among those of us who serve as Members of the Senate were highly valued. He has been, and will be, greatly missed in this Chamber.

To his lovely wife, Nancy, their children, and the other members of their family, we extend our deepest sympathy. There is no real consolation one can offer on the death of a beloved husband and father. However, there has been bequeathed to them a priceless gift—a name that always will stand for courage, dedication, unsurpassed integrity, and fighting for democracy—ESTES KEFAUVER.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this will not be a long speech. There is no need for one from me. The grief occasioned by Senator KEFAUVER's death has been crystallized into words by men more articulate than I.

President Kennedy has said that the Nation is deprived of one of its finest leaders.

The distinguished minority leader has described Mr. KEFAUVER as "a man with deep convictions, a rare persistence and a tremendous courage."

David McDonald of the United Steelworkers called him "a true friend of labor and all mankind."

Ambassador Stevenson said, "The people have lost a gallant champion and I have lost an old friend and a comrade in arms."

Those last words—when I read them—were among the ones that touched me most deeply because they so exactly reflected my own feelings.

There was a long list of true and touching comment. It was all eloquent, it was all sincere and it all came from men important in the affairs of the Nation.

And yet I know that many here will agree with me that important men are not best qualified to eulogize this Senator. He was courtly and considerate to all but he was never eager to seek the favor of important people.

It would seem to me far more useful to seek out judgments on the man from farmers and housewives and lathe operators and shipping clerks.

I know of one such simple testimonial. A telephone repairman in Michigan said it and it was simply—"What a shame. He was such a good man."

An eloquent comment, I think, from a man unpracticed in phrasemaking. It is not a exaggeration to say that the people thought of ESTES KEFAUVER as a protector.

Common people everywhere—and perhaps not without some justification—have the feeling that there are great and powerful forces alined against their best interests.

But having a man like ESTES KEFAUVER around did a lot to relieve their feeling of helplessness. Because he was a crusader—against crime, against monopolies, against bigotry—and when he crusaded, he crusaded because he was angry.

But we can write this down about him: His outrage never diminished his sense of fairness. And this perhaps more than any other characteristic was the source of his greatness.

Senator KEFAUVER and I very rarely found ourselves opposed on any issues. But whenever such an occasion did occur, whenever I found that his position differed from mine, I reexamined my reasoning very carefully before finally casting an opposing vote. But, as I say, it did not happen often.

Certainly, I am proud to recall that I worked with him very closely on the drug bill during those bleak days in the last session when support for this legislation was something short of overwhelming. But he stood firm and finally the thalidomide episode dramatized the righteousness of the cause.

Senator KEFAUVER instrumented a great tradition in this body and there are many of us who hope fervently that he can be somehow continued.

Certainly, the battles he fought deserve to go on with the same vigorous, decisive spirit. This, in truth, would be the greatest tribute we could give the man.

His was a greatness we shall not see often. Any man can be envied his friends. But only when a man is truly great will you find many who will—as I do—envy him his enemies as well.

I promised a short speech. This one has been perhaps too long already. Because when we get down to it, what more is there to say than: "What a shame. He was such a good man."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I should like to join my distinguished colleagues in the Senate in honoring the memory of my friend—a great American—the gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER, whose sudden passing in August shocked and saddened us all.

I had know ESTES KEFAUVER just the few short years since I came to the Senate in 1959. We served together on the Judiciary Committee. But I soon discovered one did not need to know ESTES KEFAUVER long to learn and appreciate his outstanding traits.

His rugged and sturdy visage was matched by his rugged and sturdy individualism.

He was impelled by a crusading spirit to fight for his beliefs, his credo, his program.

He never dodged controversy. He seemed to thrive on it.

He was tenacious, moving with a dogged persistence, which was at once the admiration and inspiration of his supporters and the despair of his opponents. He was indeed a worthy adversary.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a hard worker. He never shirked his duty as he saw it, and many times during a session of Congress he was in the forefront fighting for a cause dear to his heart.

ESTES KEFAUVER was able to strike a kinship with the man in the street. He championed the underdog, the oppressed, those in the minority. This in no small part explains his wide support among the people of Tennessee, who elected him and reelected him to Congress beginning in 1939. It explains in no small part why he won the vice presidential nomination of his party in 1956.

Yet, despite his great party loyalty, he retained his right to be independent when he differed with his party. For this, he won wide acclaim.

It is a pity such a man was stricken in the very prime of his life.

So we say our last "aloha" to him, a dedicated American and fine public servant.

My wife Ellyn and I appreciate the great sense of loss his family must feel and we extend to Mrs. Kefauver and their children our heartfelt condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, over our years of service together in the Senate, I came to know ESTES KEFAUVER as a friend. I respected his deep faith in the people and his political courage to speak out against wrong no matter where it occurred, no matter in which administration it occurred. In his devotion to duty and in his unceasing exertions as a legislator, he kept the public trust which the people of his own State successively and continuously recognized when they sent him first to the House of Representatives and then to the Senate. Later, across this great land, ESTES KEFAUVER, in various campaigns for national office, utilized a unique symbol of the Tennessee frontier—the coonskin cap—which so fittingly linked ESTES with the hopes, aspirations, courage, and progressivism of people in all walks of life.

Lawyer, public servant, scholar—honored to be elected vice president of the American Political Science Association—and friend of countless students, ESTES KEFAUVER, in his first years in Washington, coauthored a readable and noteworthy book entitled a "Twentieth Century Congress."

In the midst of the Second World War, he fought as a Member of the House for a resolution to permit Cabinet officers to come before the full body on a regular basis and submit to questioning on the activities of their departments. At an early date, he demonstrated that not only should Congress be responsive to the people but that the Executive should also be responsive, or at any rate, respond to Congress. He never lived to see adopted this or many of the other reforms he proposed in his desire to make Congress responsive to the needs of the people; perhaps, most of us will never live to see that day. But if that day should ever come, it will be due to the diligence and the faith of men like ESTES KEFAUVER.

I was honored repeatedly over the years to coauthor with him and others in both parties a constitutional amendment to revise the long-archaic electoral college system so that it might reflect the will of the people on a proportional basis. Someday, Mr. President, that too shall come to pass and much credit will be due to the long hours and untiring efforts of the late Senator from Tennessee. Through years of public hearings he aroused the informed opinion of our Nation, those in the universities, those in journalism, those in public life—to the need for this change so that no longer would the will of our citizens be frustrated by the election of a President who had not received the support of a majority of the people: an event which has occurred more than once in the history of our Republic. He once described the outmoded electoral college as a loaded pistol pointed at our system of Government.

Its continued existence—

He said—

is a game of Russian roulette. Once its antiquated procedures trigger a loaded cylinder, it may be too late for the needed corrections.

ESTES KEFAUVER was colorful, he was a scholar, he was a fighter, but above all else he remained a kindly man. To his beloved wife, Nancy, and his family, Mrs. Kuchel and I extend our deepest condolences.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, often a thing that seems trifling at the time looms large in retrospect. I am thinking of this Senate Chamber on Thursday, August 8, as I came back here from the Moscow treaty signing mission.

In his last hour on this Senate floor—even as the shadow of tragedy was gathering around him—Senator ESTES KEFAUVER interrupted the major speech he was making—to welcome me back and to hope that I was feeling as well as I looked.

I am proud that the RECORD perpetuates his compliment and our friendly responses of that day. For the incident was in the character of ESTES KEFAUVER who always found time to be considerate, courteous, and kind however the tide of debate might surge upon the Senate floor.

A devoted, dedicated, untiring advocate of causes in which he believed, the tall son of Tennessee will be missed from the American scene. Few Americans were known so universally, so personally, so intimately. For ESTES KEFAUVER seems to have been at the front door of all America so that the people might know him at firsthand.

Honored so constantly by the people of his native State, there as few so honored by the people at large in an era when the country's best competed for the country's favor.

In whatever post fate held for him, the people were sure of a conscientious servant and we who served with him admired him for his conscience and loved him for his companionship.

Silent thousands gathered by the old family home around his flag covered casket for the last rites. Their very presence spoke an eloquent eulogy for our colleague who was everybody's neighbor.

Out of the sincerity of our hearts we speak our sympathy for his dear ones

and our deepest sorrow for a great American who has earned his rightful rest in the very bosom of the Tennessee he loved and served so well.

May he rest in peace.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, ESTES KEFAUVER was a truly great Senator and a very valued friend of mine.

From the time that both of us were elected to the Senate in 1948, we had something in common. That year smear charges were made against me—specifically that I voted the Marcantonio line. I answered those smear charges with a devastating refutation pointing out that on some of the votes my opposition sought to smear me on as voting the same way that Representative Marcantonio did, so did the then Republican National Committee chairman, Representative B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee.

The same charges were made against ESTES KEFAUVER in his campaign—and so I sent him my documented refutation of the smear charges. When we met at the opening of the 81st Congress and were first sworn in as Members of the U.S. Senate, ESTES KEFAUVER told me that he had taken what I had sent him and had used it to very effective advantage.

So while I grieve the passing of a true and deeply valued friend, I do find some solace in the memory that this great statesman of such tremendous courage found that I gave him effective ammunition to back up that courage at a most crucial time in his career.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on two earlier occasions in the Senate, on August 26, 1963, and September 24, 1963, I have paid tribute to our late colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER.

Besides my own remarks, I called attention to an article that appeared in the New York Times August 12, 1963, entitled "The Observer" and to a resolution approved by the City Commissioners of North Dakota's largest city, Fargo.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks, the article and the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the little people of America lost their foremost Washington lobbyist last month when ESTES KEFAUVER died.

The voice of the organized interests comes through clear and strong to Congress. The collective voice of the little people of the Nation is muffled and diffused. Representing them can be a lonely, frustrating task.

That was the role ESTES KEFAUVER undertook, tirelessly and valiantly. And the little people knew and understood that he was their advocate. The people of my State of North Dakota certainly did, because I witnessed their warm response to the man.

In the truest sense, ESTES KEFAUVER was a U.S. Senator. His constituency was not confined to Tennessee. It included the entire Nation.

ESTES KEFAUVER always was concerned about the underdog. As a southern Senator, it required no small amount of courage for him to support civil rights legislation.

He bothered to worry about the consumer—about his drug bills and his utility bills. In this latter endeavor he had a strong ally in my illustrious predecessor from North Dakota, Senator William Langer. Together they waged the successful battle to kill the Dixon-Yates contract, which would have undercut the public power yardstick in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

ESTES KEFAUVER took on organized crime. And he was unrelenting in his campaign against the evils of economic concentration and monopoly.

I am proud to have been a member of the small band of Senators ESTES KEFAUVER led last summer in the battle against turning over the communications satellite system to a private corporation.

He went down fighting on this issue, for he was struck by his fatal heart attack on the Senate floor while seeking an amendment to the NASA authorization bill to require reimbursement to taxpayers for research and development which will benefit the private communications satellite corporation.

On the communications satellite question, ESTES KEFAUVER was on the losing side, but I have every confidence that the wisdom and rightness of his position will be fully appreciated in the years to come.

As the stalwart champion of the little people, ESTES KEFAUVER sustained many disappointments and defeats, but having waged the good fight, he accepted them with grace.

The likes of ESTES KEFAUVER will not be seen in the U.S. Senate for a long time. He was a man of heroic dimensions, and it was a privilege to have served in the Senate with him.

OBSERVER

WASHINGTON, August 11.—He was an egghead masquerading as a yokel and what he wanted was the Presidency. For 6 years, with little more than a coonskin cap and the stamina of a drayhorse, he kept the most skillful politicians of the Democratic Party in a nightmare.

Up and down the American folkways he plodded with his huge right hand dangling limp before him, ready for deposit in the claw of anyone who crossed his path. He would hand them the hand and look through them and murmur, "Ah'm ESTES KEFAUVER and Ah'm runnin' for President. Will you he'p me?"

From Harry Truman in the White House down through the bull-roast-and-clambake crowd, the party professionals despised him. He was a maverick.

END OF A MAVERICK

"Always running for President," his colleagues in the Senate said with an inflection that meant, "he doesn't belong." The southerners viewed him as a traitor to the cause, a southerner seduced by ambition into espousal of civil rights and other unsouthern flapdoodle. His TV investigation of the mobs, which had publicized certain ugly facts about the relationship of dirty money and urban politics, had won him the lasting hatred of the big-machine politicians.

Campaigning across the country on a chain of outstretched hands, KEFAUVER found the opposition of the professionals a boon of sorts. He could say with Liberace, "Nobody loves me but the people." And so, it seemed, the people did. But conventions are purely professional institutions and both times—in 1952 and 1956—the professionals had their revenge.

In 1956 he managed to win the sop of the vice-presidential nomination, and the professionals assigned him to the obscurity of campaigning in the deep-corn country.

The campaign was a model of disorganization. He fell hours behind schedule, kept audiences waiting until midnight until finally, out of the storm, groggy with fatigue, that distant dreamy look on his face, he would stumble into the hall to be greeted by his dismayed local agent.

"What kind of audience you got here?" he would ask as he moved in his stately stiff walk down the aisle, giving them the hand-flapping motion that passed for a wave. "Indians," his adviser told him one night. "What's their problem?" KEFAUVER asked. "Damn it, man. They're Indians. Isn't that enough?"

EGGHEAD IN COONSKIN

The irony of KEFAUVER was that the coonskin cap, by which the country at large knew him, was a fraud. It implied a log cabin rustic bred to the cracker barrel circle, but it concealed one of the authentic egg-heads of American politics. Behind the homespun facade was an upper-middle-class family background, a university education, a law degree from Yale, marriage to a moneyed Scottish beauty, and a quality of introspection so deep that he was most enigmatic to those who knew him best.

In the Dixon-Yates affair he was a match for the canniest minds of Wall Street in the intricacies of high finance. In private conversation he was given to a mordant, ironic humor far deadlier to the politician than Adlai Stevenson's good-humored wit, which was said to have offended the voters.

None of this showed on the public facade. To the country he remained the mountaineer in coonskin, exuding the smell of the old hills. Subconsciously or by design, he exploited the Lincolnesque in his figure and towered among his "little people" as a symbol of all those virtues associated in the national memory with log cabin roots.

"Will you help me?" went the pitch. "I grew up in a little, small town, and I have the same ambitions, the same aspirations that most of you have."

INNATELY THE BACKWOODSMAN

And yet, if the facade was all wrong, there was a germ of essential truth in the coonskin, for he had the backwoodsman's innate distrust of big business and the "interests" and an admirable zest for stepping on rich, fat toes.

Those who trailed him on his quest for the Presidency will remember him for a time to come, standing on the old-fashioned bandstands in courthouse squares murmuring, "You'll help me, won't you?" And, "If you can't give me your votes, remember me at least in your prayers."

RUSSELL BAKER.

DEATH OF SENATOR KEFAUVER—RESOLUTION

President Lashkowitz offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

"Be it resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo:

"Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, distinguished senior U.S. Senator from the State of Tennessee, has passed on to his eternal rest, unexpectedly shocking and saddening the entire Nation and freemen everywhere; and

"Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, during his lifetime, distinguished himself as the foremost fighter for good clean government and was renowned as a fighter for the rights of the individual human being without regard to race, color, or creed; and

"Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER waged a courageous lifelong battle against injustice and human suffering and fought continually for a better society for all mankind; and

"Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, during the course of his distinguished career visited the city of Fargo, N. Dak., on many occasions and had earned the admiration, respect, and friendship of many citizens of our city including Mayor Herschel Lashkowitz, who in 1952 earnestly fought to advance Senator KEFAUVER to the Presidency of the United States and received the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER at a historic gathering in the Red

River Valley near Buxton, N. Dak., at which nearly 30,000 people were in attendance, at which time Senator KEFAUVER convinced the people of this area of his knowledge and understanding of our problems and of his deep interest and concern for the well-being of this area; and

"Whereas in the year 1957, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER earnestly and devotedly took the floor of the U.S. Senate championing the cause of disaster-stricken Fargo in its recovery efforts following the tornado disaster of 1957; and

"Whereas Senator ESTES KEFAUVER at all times responded to the needs of those in distress wherever the call may emanate and served nobly, courageously, and at great sacrifice to his own health and personal comfort; and

"Whereas it is the considered feeling of the Fargo City Commission that ESTES KEFAUVER has earned himself a secure niche in the history of our country as a great American statesman who served his beloved Nation and the cause of mankind with rare devotion and was indeed the very embodiment of the essence of American patriotism and was rightfully recognized as a friend of all mankind in the continuing human struggle for a better society for each and every individual human being no matter where he lives: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Fargo City Commission does hereby express their deep and profound sorrow and sadness upon the untimely passing of that great American statesman, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, who had endeared himself to the people of this area and the city of Fargo by his many acts of friendship and loyalty as manifested throughout the years; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this expression of sorrow upon the passing of our beloved friend, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, be spread upon the permanent minutes of the Fargo City Commission, and that certified copies be forwarded to the family of our dear friend, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, and that copies be furnished to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate, the congressional delegation of the State of North Dakota for introduction into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also to the Governor of the State of Tennessee and the two U.S. Senators from the State of Tennessee, with the request that this resolution be called to the attention of the Tennessee Legislature and the press, radio, and television of the State of Tennessee."

Second by McCannel. On the vote being taken on the question of the adoption of the resolution Commissioners Markey, Oakey, Lashkowitz and McCannel all voted aye.

Absent and not voting: Commissioner Hagen.

The acting vice president declared the resolution to have been duly passed and adopted.

HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
Mayor and President, Board of City Commissioners, Fargo, N. Dak.

Attest:

M. C. FREMSTAD,
Deputy City Auditor.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the sudden and untimely death of Senator KEFAUVER was a loss to not only the State of Tennessee but also to the Nation.

My first association with ESTES was as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives where he served five sessions. He preceded me to the U.S. Senate but here we had the opportunity to renew our association and I again had the pleasure of serving with him.

Senator KEFAUVER had great courage in supporting many programs that might not have been immediately popular but were in the best interest of our Nation's future. He was a man of visions with a great heart of compassion for the underprivileged, whether in this Nation or in other countries on the globe.

He was the first candidate for the U.S. Senate to endorse the program of the Atlantic Union. In Senator KEFAUVER, the Atlantic Unionists agree they had their strongest and most active leader. He and I had many discussions in regard to the program of this international organization in its effort to promote world peace.

Clarence Streit, president of the International Movement for Atlantic Union, of whose honorary council Senator KEFAUVER was a member, says of him:

Since 1948 I have been on close terms with Senator KEFAUVER. I must testify that he has never wavered on this issue and has proved time and again that he put the interests of the Atlantic Union Convention proposals above what others thought were his own political or personal interests. He stood his ground when attacked because of it, in both his campaigns for the presidential nomination, and in all his campaigns for his Senate seat.

I have been in an unusually good position during the past 15 years to form a good judgment about Senator KEFAUVER. He impressed me favorably from the start, and he has grown and grown and grown in my esteem, particularly in qualities which I rate high. These include moral courage, integrity, stick-to-it-iveness, good political judgment, sangfroid, far-reaching vision combined with a down-to-earth sense of the practical and a genuine, warmhearted interest and respect for people, individually and collectively. Practically all the articles about him that I have seen in the mass magazines and bit newspapers have shown only superficial knowledge and perception, and have badly underestimated him. His stature, I have no doubt whatever, will grow with time.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the great men Tennessee gives to the Nation have an especial quality about them. They have honesty and straight courage, simplicity, and devotion to the people. Tennessee has given us Andrew Jackson, Andrew Johnson, Cordell Hull, and now we are met to pay tribute to another great Tennessean, ESTES KEFAUVER.

The death of this great Senator from Tennessee was, of course, a personal loss to me as it was to every other man in the Senate. More than that, it was, however, in a very real sense a personal loss for the people of America. No man in modern times has known more Americans across the length and breadth of the country than has ESTES KEFAUVER; no man has been more beloved by them than was he.

I was in Indiana the weekend of his death and many, many strangers expressed to me their sorrow and personal loss at the sad news. It was, Mr. President, most impressive.

The people loved him because they sensed, they knew that his life and his career were dedicated to their interests. He fought a good fight for the people. In the tradition of Jackson and Johnson he represented them all. Not the wealthy, the powerful, the special interest groups, the minorities or the coalitions, he represented the people.

The record of his 24 years' service in the Congress stands as a greater memorial to the man than anything we can say here. His work on improving legislative processes was important. So, too, were his well-known investigations into national crime, juvenile delinquency, Dixon-Yates, steel pricing, insurance regulation. Perhaps his most lasting and significant work is that which led to congressional approval of the Kefauver drug bill only last year. Looking back it seems unthinkable that there should be opposition to a proposal requiring adequate testing of experimental drugs in the laboratory and on experimental animals before allowing them to be used on human patients. There was opposition, however, and it was only because of the dogged and relentless work of the late Senator from Tennessee that the bill became law. It was his work.

It will be a long time before we again have such a man as ESTES KEFAUVER in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the death of our beloved colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER, removed from the Senate one of its most colorful and distinguished Members. ESTES had many truly remarkable qualities. Among them was his devotion to the cause of good government. He spent much of his lifetime fighting corruption and racketeering in and out of Government. He was one of the most relentless antagonists of monopolistic practices in industry. The Senate committee dealing with monopolies, which he headed, established a nationwide reputation.

ESTES KEFAUVER will go down in history as one of the more able and hard-working Members of the Senate. Few, if any, Senators ever won as many friends throughout the United States as he.

In my own State of North Dakota he had a very large and devoted following. I know of no one who ever came to our State who was so well received. One of the nicest tributes that has come to my attention was given to our late colleague by the city of Fargo. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the Fargo City Commission and a letter from Fargo's very distinguished mayor, Herschel Lashkowitz.

Mr. President, I join with other Senators today in their expression of sympathy to his wife, Nancy, and all of his wonderful family.

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

CITY OF FARGO, N. DAK.,
September 16, 1963.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: I enclose herein a resolution which was prepared by myself and was adopted by the Fargo City Commission

expressing our heartfelt sympathy on the untimely passing of that great America, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER.

We here in Fargo, N. Dak., felt particularly close to Senator KEFAUVER because of his many visits over the years in which he established strong and enduring friendships. We also recall with deep appreciation the efforts that he exerted in behalf of our city in 1957 when our community was stricken with the great tornado disaster that year.

Senator KEFAUVER has left an indelible mark upon those who were privileged to know him. American history will record him as one of the genuine humanitarians of our time, a man who placed principle above political expediency in all of his public actions.

I sincerely hope that the enclosed certified copy of the resolution adopted by the Fargo City Commission will be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with this letter so that Americans everywhere can be reminded of the highest esteem and affection in which ESTES KEFAUVER was held by the people of the city of Fargo, N. Dak.

Sincerely yours,

HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
Mayor.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF CITY COMMISSIONERS, FARGO, N. DAK., AUGUST 20, 1963

President Lashkowitz offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

"Be it resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo:

"Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, distinguished senior U.S. Senator from the State of Tennessee, has passed on to his eternal rest unexpectedly shocking and saddening the entire Nation and freemen everywhere; and

"Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, during his lifetime, distinguished himself as the foremost fighter for good clean government and was renowned as a fighter for the rights of the individual human being without regard to race, color, or creed; and

"Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER waged a courageous lifelong battle against injustice and human suffering and fought continually for a better society for all mankind; and

"Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, during the course of his distinguished career, visited the city of Fargo, N. Dak., on many occasions and had earned the admiration, respect, and friendship of many citizens of our city, including Mayor Herschel Lashkowitz, who in 1952 earnestly fought to advance Senator KEFAUVER to the Presidency of the United States and received the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER at an historic gathering in the Red River Valley near Buxton, N. Dak., at which nearly 30,000 people were in attendance, at which time Senator KEFAUVER convinced the people of this area of his knowledge and understanding of our problems and of his deep interest and concern for the well-being of this area; and

"Whereas, in the year 1957, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER earnestly and devotedly took the floor of the U.S. Senate championing the cause of disaster-stricken Fargo and its recovery efforts following the tornado disaster of 1957; and

"Whereas Senator ESTES KEFAUVER at all times responded to the needs of those in distress wherever the call may emanate and served nobly, courageously, and at great sacrifice to his own health and personal comfort; and

"Whereas it is the considered feeling of the Fargo City Commission that ESTES KEFAUVER has earned himself a secure niche in the history of our country as a great American statesman who served his beloved Nation and the cause of mankind with rare devotion and was indeed the very embodiment of the essence of American patriotism and was rightfully recognized as a friend of all mankind in the continuing human struggle for a better society for each and every individual human being no matter where he lives; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Fargo City Commission does hereby express their deep and profound sorrow and sadness upon the untimely passing of that great American statesman, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, who had endeared himself to the people of this area and the city of Fargo by his many acts of friendship and loyalty as manifested throughout the years; and be it further

"Resolved, That this expression of sorrow upon the passing of our beloved friend, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, be spread upon the permanent minutes of the Fargo City Commission and that certified copies be forwarded to the family of our dear friend, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, and that copies be furnished to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate, the congressional delegation of the State of North Dakota for introduction into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and also to the Governor of the State of Tennessee and to the two U.S. Senators from the State of Tennessee, with the request that this resolution be called to the attention of the Tennessee Legislature and the press, radio, and television of the State of Tennessee."

Second by McCannel. On the vote being taken on the question of the adoption of the resolution, Commissioners Markey, Oakey, Lashkowitz, and McCannel all voted "aye."

Absent and not voting: Commissioner Hagen.

The acting vice president declared the resolution to have been duly passed and adopted.

HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
Mayor and President, Board of City Commissioners, Fargo, N. Dak.

Attest:

M. C. FREMSTAD,
Deputy City Auditor.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, we Missourians knew ESTES KEFAUVER as both a good neighbor and as a dear friend.

Thoughout the State he was held in the very highest regard—a reputation that he earned from a never-yielding dedication to service to his fellow man, always in keeping with the cardinal truth of man's dignity and worth.

It was my good fortune to know ESTES KEFAUVER for many years. But only after my entry into the Senate, and the privilege and honor of associating closely with him as a colleague, did I fully realize what a fearless and dedicated public servant this tall and soft-spoken man truly was. Always his own man, his decision to fight for a principle was always determined by merit—not popularity, and once convinced of a principle he would not be dissuaded or discouraged.

As a man, a father, and a public servant, ESTES KEFAUVER was the personification of honor, devotion, dignity, and selfless charity. His was a never-ending struggle to protect the individual American, and to fight his causes without pause or regard for any measure of personal danger or political reprisals they might entail.

Men possessing the qualities of ESTES KEFAUVER are rare indeed, and I know that each of us is grateful for having had him as a colleague, and above all, as a loyal friend. The big Tennessean and his constant crusade for his fellow citizens are a part of the heritage of the U.S. Senate, our American Government, and the body of mankind—but his example will surely be an inspirational guide to generations of the future long after the events of his generation are ancient history.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, ESTES KEFAUVER will be missed by millions of Americans as well as by his colleagues here in the Senate. It was not his physical stature alone, or his splendid talent as a legislator that enabled him to achieve such lofty recognition.

The reason is more attributable to a combination of poise, agility, and altruistic sincerity in dealing with people and in working for a cause. And as Robert Frost wrote in "Birches":

He learned all there was
To learn about not launching out too soon
And so not carrying the tree away
Clear to the ground. He always kept his poise
To the top branches, climbing carefully
With the same pains you use to fill a cup
Up to the brim, and even above the brim.
Then he flung outward, feet first, with a swish,
Kicking his way down through the air to the ground.

Yes, ESTES was a "swinger of birches"; for when an issue demanded, he would explore it from its earthy embodiment through its esoteric abstractions to rend full round the spectrum of considerations.

Indeed, this form was evident as ESTES KEFAUVER crusaded against crime in the United States, and devoted such effort to the problems of juvenile delinquency. It is only coincidental that it was his work in these areas that catapulted him within sight of the White House, for the Senator had that innate quality of loving and being loved by mankind.

This almost Lincolnesque Senator from Tennessee endeared himself to masses of people to an extent equaled by perhaps only a few of his contemporaries. It often seemed to me as I observed ESTES KEFAUVER, that the art of knowing people was part of his nature. Of course, that art is indispensable to a politician, but with him it was the natural thing.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN].

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of sadness and profound loss to all of us that we join together today in paying tribute to the late Senator from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER.

The news of Senator KEFAUVER's death came with a great shock to the Senate, to the Congress, and to the Nation; and when the news came, we knew that we had lost one of this Nation's greatest patriots.

Senator KEFAUVER served his State and his Nation with unusual distinction for many years and in the years that I had the pleasure of knowing him I came to admire him greatly and respect his outstanding abilities.

He was a quiet man, an humble man, and a man who dedicated his life to the principles that have made this Nation what it is today.

ESTES KEFAUVER was always a down-to-earth man, and even though he held the high position he did and the wide respect of leaders throughout the world, he always remained close to the people of Tennessee and to the surroundings from which he came.

We will all miss ESTES KEFAUVER and the outstanding work he did in many areas of public interest; but just as important, we will miss his easy manner, his kindly personality, and his gentle nature.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I want to add my word of appreciation for a courageous Senator, ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, who has departed this life. He died as he lived—in the service of his State and his Nation. He died in the position of responsibility which he loved.

As one of his colleagues in the body, I happened to know that when he was his party's nominee for the second highest position in the Nation, that of Vice President, his chief concern was the prospect of his having to give up his senatorship, had his party prevailed in the general election. His untiring work in the Senate—and especially as chairman of important investigating committees—showed his love for his position.

He made his mark in the world—and ruthless racketeers who he so ably exposed in committee hearings will not soon forget his thoroughness. His accomplishments in the performance of his duties as a Senator benefited his country—and his country owes him much.

In these brief remarks, however, I wish to speak in a more personal light. I knew ESTES KEFAUVER as a kind, thoughtful individual, a human being of warmth, a quality sometimes lost sight of because of his vigorous convictions and his willingness to fight for what he thought was right.

I admired ESTES KEFAUVER for his ability, his courage, and his honesty.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, although I know that I cannot add to the eloquent and moving tributes that have already been paid to our late departed colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER, I do want to express my deep sorrow and regret at his passing.

Senator KEFAUVER and I served and worked together on the Appropriations Committee and the Judiciary Committee. Serving on committees with a fellow Senator gives one an opportunity to more accurately judge his personal qualities, his statesmanship capacity, and his work. In the years in which I worked with Senator KEFAUVER, I learned that he always approached his duties with sincere dedication and to serve the welfare of our country according to his concepts of its best interest and security.

It was my privilege to be appointed as a member of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee at the beginning of the current session of Congress. Senator KEFAUVER had a special interest in the work of this subcommittee, and my membership on the subcommittee enabled me to observe more closely his work as chairman. Senator KEFAUVER continued to discharge his duties as chairman of this subcommittee with persistence and dedication in spite of the fact that his health was beginning to fail him. Many weaker and less resolute men would have given up under such circumstances, but Senator KEFAUVER fought on unwaiveringly with fortitude, strength, and devotion to duty.

Although Senator KEFAUVER and I disagreed on some of the important and basic questions which came before the Senate through the years, we shared a deep concern in regard to the growth of organized crime. He was one of the pioneers in our efforts to combat this menacing evil and deserves our lasting gratitude for his efforts.

I always respected him because he was true to his own convictions, he was determined in his efforts on behalf of the causes in which he believed, and he was a man who had the courage to stand alone if this became necessary to do so. He dealt with issues rather than personalities. While he fought hard for the things in which he believed, he was gracious and kindly to his adversaries, whether he won or lost. Mrs. McClellan and I express our deepest grief and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kefauver and the family.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may the RECORD show that I, too, wish to pay my respects to the memory of the late Senator ESTES KEFAUVER from the State of Tennessee.

Senator KEFAUVER'S official actions will forever be recorded in the proceedings of the House of Representatives and the Senate. It is not my purpose at this time to attempt to enumerate them or discuss them.

I do want to stress the friendliness displayed by ESTES KEFAUVER. He liked people. He was polite and courteous. He was sincere in his dealings with all because he was interested in the welfare of those about him. All of my dealings with Senator KEFAUVER were most pleasant.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Kefauver and to her children and all the other friends and relatives of the late Senator, my most sincere sympathy.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was not privileged to serve for long with Senator KEFAUVER in the U.S. Senate, but I am sure that I feel his loss as deeply as any of his veteran colleagues here.

My association with Senator KEFAUVER, and my admiration for his position in public affairs, goes back many years. In 1952, I was chairman of the KEFAUVER-for-President delegation in Wisconsin, and in a free and open presidential primary, the people of Wisconsin elected me as one of their delegates pledged to Senator KEFAUVER at the Democratic National Convention. Senator KEFAUVER swept the Wisconsin presidential primary that year, and again in 1956, and it was a great privilege for me to join with my fellow Wisconsin delegates in working for his nomination to the Nation's highest office.

The affection which the voters of Wisconsin showed for this man from Tennessee in 1952 and again in 1956 is understandable. He had a simple honesty about him which projected itself into the homes of our State. He was a rugged individualist, and this quality is greatly admired in Wisconsin. He took his stand on the side of the public interest, whether he was battling organized crime, monopoly power, or price fixing, and the Wisconsin people appreciate this kind of a fight.

They admired it in the late Senator Robert M. La Follette and in his son who carried on a similar tradition. And they saw this same dedication to what we called "the Wisconsin idea"—the notion that government is to serve the people—in ESTES KEFAUVER.

Senator KEFAUVER'S Wisconsin friends were especially impressed when he stood up for civil rights—at a time when it might have seemed far easier for him to stand silent. And certainly the swift rush of history since that time has proved how right he was.

In the all too brief time we worked together here in the Senate, I found his courage and his tenacity inspiring. I am pleased that there are Senators who will continue the Kefauver tradition.

And there are hundreds of others, in Tennessee and in Wisconsin and in all the corners of the land, who watched Senator KEFAUVER rise in public esteem and who are committed to the same goals that he fought to advance.

His passing is a great personal loss to us, but more than that, it shifts to new shoulders the heavy burden of defending the public interest in a world where this interest can too often be forgotten.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator ESTES KEFAUVER.

Though we did not always see eye to eye on the various issues, no one could ever question the glistening honor and purest integrity of ESTES KEFAUVER. I was proud to call him "friend" along with thousands of others. He had the admiration, esteem, and respect of all of his colleagues in the Senate. He was truly a man of great courage and conviction, a dedicated public servant sincerely and honestly representing the views of his constituents. His devotion to duty to his State and Nation was unsurpassed. This illustrious son of Tennessee has unquestionably made a great contribution to our American heritage.

By his untimely passing, the people of Tennessee, the State of Tennessee, the U.S. Senate, and the Nation have lost the services of a truly great American.

At this time, I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his beloved wife and family because I know that their personal loss is a great one, indeed. They have the comfort of knowing that he was a good husband, a good father, and a dedicated public servant who contributed much to America, and with devotion and

fidelity he carried out fully the duties of the high office of public trust which he occupied.

ESTES KEFAUVER had one of the most genial and affable dispositions ever possessed by a human being. He was loyal not only to his convictions—he was loyal to his friends and his country.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of our beloved friend and colleague.

The sudden and tragic death of ESTES KEFAUVER came as a personal loss to millions of people who had never met this man, but who regarded him as a friend.

ESTES KEFAUVER was the kind of man who has always won the hearts of the people. There was something of Jackson and Lincoln in him. He was a man of humble beginnings who won great victories, suffered heartbreaking defeats, but who never lost the warmth, the friendliness, and the sincerity which characterized his life.

Here, truly, was one who could walk with kings yet not lose the common touch.

He was a legendary figure and like most men who make a mighty impact on the public consciousness, he had his familiar trademarks—the friendly handshake, the quiet voice, the humble manner.

But there was much more to ESTES KEFAUVER than the public image. He was honest and he was courageous. He fought great battles in behalf of the American people with an unconquerable persistence that will be remembered when the coonskin cap and the craggy smile are forgotten.

He saw the evil of organized crime and, almost single-handedly, made the public conscious of the ugly network of entrenched crime which operates on a national basis. He saw the growing danger of juvenile delinquency and he set in motion a series of investigations and remedial programs which are now beginning to bear fruit.

He saw the moral threat which giant monopolies pose for our free, competitive system and he had the courage to investigate these great concentrations of financial power and to show how some of them were conspiring to fix prices and to strangle competition.

Many of you will remember Senator KEFAUVER's forthright campaigns for the presidential nomination. I recall the rollcall at the 1952 convention when the spokesman for one of the delegations being polled declared:

> We cast our votes for ESTES KEFAUVER, the man who takes orders from no one.

This could well serve as his epitaph. In behalf of his concept of the public interest, he fought for the welfare of the American people against the political bosses, the crime bosses, and the big money bosses—and through all these titanic struggles, ESTES KEFAUVER took orders from no one but his conscience.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a very great man; so kind that he would take to heart the problems of the most humble and obscure citizens; so generous that he had time for everyone's troubles but his own; so strong that he would do daily battle with the most powerful interests in the land; so gentle that he always shunned the harsh word, no matter how unbearable the provocation.

He was a friendly giant who poured out his great strength in behalf of the sick, the aged, and the weak.

He wanted everyone to have a fair chance in the race of life, and to his last hour he persevered in this noble endeavor.

He died in poverty.

Like a giant tree that has come crashing down to earth, his passing leaves a great void that will never be filled.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, with the passing of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who was my warm and devoted friend, the Nation has lost an able statesman and a courageous legislator. His coonskin hat was a symbol of his dedication to the traditions and heritage of our precious land. ESTES KEFAUVER was soft-spoken, but he was a leader and a champion of many worthy causes. He had foresight, and integrity, and the courage of his convictions whether his cause was popular or unpopular at the particular moment.

ESTES KEFAUVER will be remembered in history because of the causes to which he dedicated his life. To ESTES, no job was too large or too small, too important or too menial for him to tackle. His interest was the public interest, as he saw it, whether he was exposing corruption or pleading for better understanding among the nations of the free world.

ESTES KEFAUVER will be sorely missed by all who knew and admired him. The Senate, indeed the Nation, is poorer for his passing. His death has left a void in each of our hearts that only time can try to fill.

Today, as we offer a sincere remembrance to our departed colleague, we are saddened by his passing. But let us try to look beyond our own grief and be grateful for the inspiration we have all received from ESTES KEFAUVER's wonderful fighting spirit, his powerful convictions, his integrity, and—perhaps above all else—his uniquely human personality.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a great Senator from a border State who unsuccessfully sought the Presidency on three occasions said, "I know no South, no North, no East, no West to which I owe my allegiance." More than a century after Clay's remark, the same and more can well be said of ESTES KEFAUVER. He was a citizen of the world, and he was a citizen of Lewistown, Kalispell, Great Falls, Sidney, and Butte, Mont. Those towns are a long way from Tennessee. But the persons who live in those and other Montana communities share with us a deep personal loss in the death of Senator KEFAUVER, a man they had met, to whom they had talked, a man they respected and admired. The only time Montanans voted in a presidential primary they voted, overwhelmingly, for ESTES KEFAUVER.

I first met Senator KEFAUVER in those days when he was campaigning for President. I was impressed by his forthrightness, his humility, his understanding of the needs of the rank and file. Of course, I had been impressed and somewhat awed by the accomplishments of the committee he headed investigating crime.

Senator KEFAUVER was scheduled into Kalispell for a speech when he was informed in Missoula that the pilot of his chartered plane could not get the plane into Kalispell because of weather conditions. Unhesitatingly he set off in a smaller chartered plane with a handful of reporters on a trip that has become a historical saga of one of the roughest and most perilous flights that was ever undertaken.

This points up the outstanding feature of Senator KEFAUVER—his courage. He had physical and moral courage alike. Whether it was a flight to Kalispell, a struggle against crime, or a fight on behalf of the Atlantic Union, he never weighed the odds, he plunged into the struggle on the side he believed to be the right one and frequently wrested victory from almost certain defeat.

Since I came to Congress it has been my good fortune to know ESTES KEFAUVER better. My admiration and respect for his ability, his integrity, his courage, his patience and understanding has grown with closer acquaintance. Millions of Americans all over our great Nation share our grief today and speak through us their gratitude for the efforts and accomplishments of the tall Senator from Tennessee who fought so many battles in their behalf.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in the death of ESTES KEFAUVER, I lost not only a good friend, but a colleague whose political philosophy was oftentimes companion to my own.

Senator KEFAUVER and I frequently were comembers of a Senate group working for a common objective, and often it was an objective not supported by the majority. Defeat almost could be foretold.

Yet no matter how overwhelming this defeat, or how discouraged he may have been momentarily, Senator KEFAUVER always seemed the first to begin picking up the pieces, and to begin planning on another attack—another way to achieve the desired objective.

It was this resiliency—this ability to bounce back after defeat—which was one of ESTES KEFAUVER's greatest attributes. He combined with it tenacity and strength. Of ESTES it could truly be said, again and again—he has only begun to fight.

The many victories of his fighting spirit are reflected in numerous laws now on the books which make America a better place in which to live. He will probably be best remembered for the Cellar-Kefauver Anti-Merger Act, and the drug bill of 1962, which strengthened prescription drug protection, but other measures which he had a strong hand in getting through the Senate are legion.

His achievements will live in the history of our times.

ESTES KEFAUVER had ability, leadership, and great patriotism. He was completely fearless and completely dedicated. If he felt something was right, no power on earth could stop him. He was a true friend of the common man—of the average citizen—and his death was a real loss to rank-and-file America. It will be a long time before his shoes are filled.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I mourn the passing of our distinguished colleague, the late Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Before his untimely death on August 10, 1963, he displayed an apparently endless capacity for hard work.

His kind disposition and humility set examples that all Members of the Senate admired. He was diligent and energetic; he was thorough and vigorous.

Although we did not always see the issues before the Senate alike, I admired his convictions, his courage, and the diligence with which he pursued the causes in which he believed.

We shall greatly miss our colleague.

We extend our heartfelt sympathy to his family.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE].

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, today we pay well-deserved tribute to the memory of ESTES KEFAUVER, whose untimely death saddened us all.

The late U.S. Senator from Tennessee was a big man, not only in natural stature but also in the service he rendered the citizens of his State and the people of this Nation.

He moved about these Halls of Congress and across the length and breadth of this land with the slow but deliberate and determined speed of a man who knows where he is going and what he wants to do.

Here was a man who let nothing come between him and his devotion to duty and what he believed to be right. He was not to be deterred from his calling. Senator KEFAUVER had the tenacious courage of his convictions and for this he had the high admiration of his colleagues in this body and the respect of his countrymen.

A warm and friendly man who was always ready with a firm handshake and a wide smile, Senator KEFAUVER perhaps will best be remembered as a friend of the people and the champion of the common man.

It was said that he could turn his back on no man, regardless of how small or insignificant he may seem to others. Having risen from humble beginnings on a small farm near Madisonville, Tenn., to a seat in the House of Representatives and later to a position of nationwide renown in the U.S. Senate and Democratic Party, Senator KEFAUVER was himself a symbol of the sturdy stock of men and women who made this country great.

Senator KEFAUVER also won a respected place in history as the nemesis of hoodlums and racketeers whose organized crime cartels are a blight on this country and shocking to the consciences of all law-abiding people.

In the almost 25 years that he served in the Congress—10 years in the House of Representatives and 15 years in the Senate—Senator KEFAUVER made many outstanding contributions to the continuing welfare of the United States, and we all are in his debt.

Up to the end, Senator KEFAUVER occupied an active and interested place in this Chamber. He was stricken while engaged in a debate on this floor and 2 days later, his heart was stilled.

The presence of this tall and lanky man from Tennessee will be sorely missed.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The junior Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

MY ADMIRATION FOR ESTES KEFAUVER

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, each of us joined here today has his own personal sense of loss on the passing of this great statesman.

ESTES KEFAUVER was an uncommon man. He doggedly pursued causes which sparked controversy and emotion. He set for himself goals which were difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. He had an abiding sense of political and economic righteousness which sometimes left him standing alone while others retired to safer ground. He took on adversaries of enormous strength and engaged in battles which many times were never won to his satisfaction.

He encountered bitterness, frustration, and vituperation, but through it all ESTES KEFAUVER was a great gentleman. He never lost his smile, his warmth, his respect for his adversary.

ESTES KEFAUVER also never lost his grip, his tenacious role as a congressional watchdog and an independent thinker. He was at all times a liberal, perhaps one of the last of the populists—a critic, a man of action, and one whose integrity could not ever be compromised.

His concern for the common man has become a national legend. His popular identification was manifest in the tremendous popular support he received in his campaigns for the presidential nomination. His constant support for the rights of labor, for the small businessman, for the consumer, for the farmer and for community needs earned him his popular regard.

He exposed the top brass of the criminal underworld. He fought against excessive economic concentration. He fought for competition. He took the lead in examining into the causes of juvenile delinquency. He inquired into the high prices of prescription drugs resulting in the passage of drug control legislation which bears his name. He risked his own political career in 1960 by opposing forced segregation of the races. He strongly favored and worked for the TVA, rural electrification, greater aid to education, improved veterans' benefits and services, greater social security and old-age health benefits. In the foreign field, he was chairman of the political committee of the NATO Parliamentarian Conference and was a leader at the recent Atlantic Congress. As with his domestic policy, he believed in a free, competitive economic union of Western nations as a strong protection against the encroaching monopoly of the Communist world.

ESTES KEFAUVER is a symbol to those who follow him in taking up the responsibilities of government. He teaches us all that it is necessary to have healthy doubts. He teaches us not to shun controversy. He teaches us to ask the big questions and reach our solutions on the basis of tough reasoning.

I did not share the long personal association with Mr. KEFAUVER which so many Members of this body enjoyed, as I only served with him here a few months. I regret that that period was so brief. But I did share the opportunity to admire, and I hope to benefit from, his example. I shared this opportunity with millions upon millions of Americans, and we are all better for it.

As a young man and as a freshman Senator, I was keenly aware of his place in the Senate, in the Democratic Party, and in the Nation. I held him in the highest esteem. I admired his courage and I admired his sense of purpose. I admired him even when I did not agree with him.

I believe we are better for the sacrifices he gave, willingly and unselfishly, to advance his liberal philosophy which embraced the basic rights of all free men. We have his example.

It is with humility that I pay him respect today.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER].

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all of us when we are newly come to the Senate, seek out those senior colleagues we most admire as teachers and counselors in the ways of this great body. And I had always counted myself uncommonly fortunate to have as a warm, generous, and inspiring teacher, ESTES KEFAUVER.

He taught us that compromise and accommodation need not be the legislator's invariable course—that defeat, even crushing defeat, was preferable to the dilution of basic principles.

He taught us to differentiate the well-rehearsed chorus of special pleaders from the inadequately amplified voice of the individual citizen.

He did not worship togetherness when he found that the pursuit of his ideals left him virtually alone; and he revealed that there can be magnificence in defeat as well as victory.

He taught us that the romance of America transcends the sectionalism, the empty forms of tradition and even party.

He taught us by his living example the meaning of courage in a 20th century democracy.

To those who opposed him, he offered reason, not rancor. To those who labored with him he extended inflexible loyalty.

Most important, he taught us that the fortunes of narrow, special interest groups will flourish and debase our society unless we act with uncommon courage and insight to challenge them. In this, as in all things, he himself embodied the wisdom of his teaching.

These lessons—more than his tangible legislative imprint, which was great—more than his striking political image, more than his historical rank among the great legislators of our time, are his legacy to his colleagues and to his country.

I think that few have better expressed the meaning of a close association with ESTES KEFAUVER than a young man, Victor Ferrall, who served him as counsel on the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and who pays tribute to him in a forthcoming edition of the Yale Law Report.

I ask that excerpts from this article be printed following my remarks, together with a poem entitled "The Tennessean," by Kenneth W. Fitzgerald, editor of the Naturopath.

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

[From the Yale Law Report, vol. 10, No. 1, fall 1963]

CAREY ESTES KEFAUVER, 1927

(By Victor E. Ferrall, Jr.)

CAREY ESTES KEFAUVER, 1927, a Member of Congress for nearly a quarter of a century, died on August 10, 1963. He was serving his third term as U.S. Senator from Tennessee.

Two days before his death, Senator KEFAUVER suffered a heart attack on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Leading the opposition to a $50 million communications satellites research and development authorization for NASA, he was delivering the opening speech condemning what he considered a calculated giveaway of public funds to the private Communications Satellite Corp. He was commanding, to quote one of his colleagues, the same "little band of willful men" which had filibustered during the last Congress in an unsuccessful effort to block that corporation's creation.

When the attack struck, KEFAUVER paused and in a whispered aside asked a colleague to suggest the absence of a quorum, not asking for it himself so as to avoid losing the floor. When the quorum call was terminated and debate resumed, KEFAUVER, still in obvious discomfort, finished his speech. ESTES KEFAUVER fell with his boots on, protecting his right to the Senate floor. Thirty-six hours later, he was dead.

Russell Baker noted perceptively in the New York Times that there was about KEFAUVER "a quality of introspection so deep that he was most enigmatic to those who knew him best."[1] Not surprisingly, the extraordinarily popular and titillating activity of dissecting the plethora of coonskin caps, handshakes, unpopular causes, and political disappointments in order to discover the "real" or "essential" KEFAUVER has been continued by other writers, but it is not a profitable pursuit. One is all too likely to be wrong. The probability of penetrating the Kefauver enigma is little or not enhanced by proximity to the man. I shall, therefore, avoid the hypersubjective and consider only those facets of KEFAUVER which I could observe or learn about during the last 3 years.

* * * * *

Though he tried, KEFAUVER was never able to shake off the "crimebuster" label. This monolithic reputation may further have impaired his presidential aspirations, for to be President a man should be free from political overspecialization. To be President it is better to have no image at all than one too sharply defined.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, KEFAUVER conducted hearings with restraint and fairness. The procedural polarity between his subcommittee and certain other investigating committees dramatized the dilemma confronting advocates of committee procedural reform. No meaningful legislative restriction is, today, placed on how congressional committees can investigate. The inquisitorial abuses of this absence of formal restraint flow from the true adage that a Senate committee chairman can do anything with unanimous consent and almost anything without it. Nowhere in Government is caprice more thoroughly conduct-determinative than in a congressional committee investigation.

KEFAUVER was a longtime proponent of reform. But, though he shared the deep-rooted American distrust of conscience as an adequate protection of the public interest, he accepted the Wilsonian investigatory function of Congress as fundamental. * * * He, himself, practiced personal restraint at hearings, giving witnesses and their counsel free rein, often to the point of tedium. He substituted tenacity for abuse of constitutional rights.

* * * * *

During the past 8 years—as in all periods of relative opulence—antitrust has been unpopular. Indeed, in an era of "people's capitalism," it may even be that the ability of industrial oligarchs to avoid effective competition is popularly admired.

Without KEFAUVER, antitrust and the preservation of competition would, today, be of far less concern to the public than it is. He kept it before the people with his insistence on the evils of administered prices. Though a confusing and uncertain notion at best, many citizens feel they understand administered prices. It conveys to them a vague notion that in markets where structurally oligopoly, production barriers to entry and excessive product differentiation are the rule, the fruits of competition to the consumer are something less than fully ripe. This is true and it was KEFAUVER's persistence which, in large measure, made the people see it.

* * * * *

Above all, KEFAUVER conceived the ultimate end of competition to be to serve the consumer. Consumers are not a body politic. His approach to competition and antitrust, therefore, enhanced the unpopularity of his position with his colleagues. Had he subscribed to the better lobbied point of view that competition primarily serves small business, his task would have been far easier.

If, as is commonly observed, KEFAUVER was excluded from the Senate Club, this must be attributed as much to his modus operandi as a Senator as to the Lucas incident. A good Senator plays a thoroughly institutionalized "game" with clearly defined rules. As a freshman he keeps out of mischief, does not make major floor speeches, and limits his energies to local matters. He may ask thoughtful, penetrating questions in his committee assignments, but he is retiring and definitely not a leader or spokesman of a particular position—even an approved position.

After a time—perhaps 2 years—he may tackle minor national issues. He is permitted, for example, to become an aspiring champion of heron conservation, antidetergent pollution, or minor agricultural reforms. He may also deliver an occasional speech on major foreign or domestic policy, so long as he does not actively lead legislative actions.

To a very large extent, he must establish himself as a subservient and responsive follower of the Senate's established Senate leaders (vis-a-vis its administration leaders) well into his second term. In the process, of course, he also demonstrates his ability to be reelected and, therefore, probable senatorial longevity.

The Senate's memory is elephantine. If the aspiring Senator stumbles at any point along this long road of restraint, redemption is unlikely. Failure to play the "game" virtually assures exclusion from the club. Lack of club membership radically reduces effectiveness as a lawmaker.

Playing the "game" for 10 or 15 years, however, takes its toll. Surely so much calculated docility drains at least some of the conviction and vigor any Senator brings to the Congress as a freshman. When the "game" is played out, he is better able to implement his beliefs, but has, perhaps, lost some of the inner impetus to do so. The—by international standards—exceptional harmony and tranquillity of the Senate is, however, preserved. Whether the Nation is better served by a firebrand or a team player is debatable.

Clearly, though, KEFAUVER, had no doubts on this score. He entered the Senate with an explosion, immediately captured the ear of the Nation, and seldom lost it. * * * As a champion of causes more popular with the people than the Senate—of which there are a substantial number—KEFAUVER was often good for 10 more votes than any other Senator. But, this was seldom enough to win, particularly if KEFAUVER was actively opposed by a full-fledged club member.

* * * * *

In the last 2½ years, KEFAUVER's problems were further enhanced by his New Deal brand of liberalism. He was firmly rooted on the "Old Frontier." A Senator's success in dealing with the administration is by no means assured by his supporting its policies and legislation. Any administration (and I would be inclined to generalize this observation to cover almost all political groups) tends to better understand opposition, be more comfortable in the face of it, and be more willing to make concessions to gain its support, than it is willing to reward reliable followers. KEFAUVER's voting record from the administration's point of view was very good. But, had be been more cunning and a better trader in the way he cast his votes, he might well have received more administration support.

Politicians, living in a world of outstretched hands, are not comfortable with a person who helps them until they feel confident that they have identified his selfish motivation. Selfless support emanating from idealism rather than more pragmatic interests, make politicians nervous. KEFAUVER, though no exception to this rule, was himself guilty of obscuring his ends. Though he enjoyed enormous political autonomy in Tennessee, he had not become a patriarchal statesman or "taken the overview," remaining until his death actively political. He was clearly not running for President or the Supreme Court. Thus, "What is he up to now?" was the question which plagued the Senate each time KEFAUVER plunged into a new area of political unpopularity and danger.

It was his high political morality that compounded the Senate's discomfort with KEFAUVER. I suppose the ultimately politically moral man is the martyr. The martyr's credo—"No matter what you say or do, I will waver neither from the ends I seek nor the means which I have chosen"—defines the borderline between personal incorruptibility and political stalemate. Incorruptible dedication to both ends and means is philosophically attractive, but anathema to political action.

* * * * *

KEFAUVER sought and seriously considered the advice of a perfectly astonishing potpourri of corporation counsels and Capitol Hill policemen, laborers, and landowners. With respect to listening to advice, he was unalterably antifree competition. The highest bid always lost—the lowest often won.

[1] Aug. 12, 1963.

Whether this is good or bad from the long-run point of view of an effective legislature, I do not know. There can be no question, however, that KEFAUVER was unfailingly, unflinchingly honest.

As a politician, KEFAUVER genuinely led the people of his State. No one doubts that he did far more than merely mirror the popular positions in Tennessee.

* * * * *

Insofar as the people of Tennessee outstrip the South in liberality, it is, in large measure, because they were led by ESTES KEFAUVER. Together with Cordell Hull he helped make Tennessee, for example, one of the most internationally minded States in the South. Through his leadership, the State came to share his appreciation for the message of free competition. And, because he was a true leader, his popular mandate was overwhelming.

I suspect few Congressmen, in their innermost being, genuinely trust "the people." KEFAUVER did. "Let the people know the truth and they will do the right thing," was not an empty aphorism for him. His campaign to bring television into the Senate gallery was an act of faith.

The above exercise in objectivity notwithstanding, I will remember ESTES KEFAUVER with an outstretched hand, uncomfortably looking at a friend, suspecting he knew him too well to shake his hand—and probably had just shaken it, anyway. I will picture him in his cluttered office, simultaneously mastering a complicated nicety of antitrust law with incredible mental agility, trying to remember whether monopolization comes under section 1 or section 2 of the Sherman Act, and wondering if someone had sent the electric toaster he had had repaired back down to Aunt Charlotte in Madisonville. I will see him shuffling through an airport in his braces and shirt sleeves, carrying two briefcases, a bag of coats from the dry cleaners he forgot to drop off at home, three newspapers, a box of cookies old Miss Jones gave him to take to the children, and a paper cup filled with Heaven knows what. In my mind's ear, I will hear him laugh. He was the only man I ever met who laughed "ho, ho," exactly as it is written.

I would suppose that most great men are hard to know. Surely, however, few are so very hard not to love as ESTES KEFAUVER.

[From the Naturopath, September 1963]

THE TENNESSEAN

He stood, this man—
His brow brushing the misty aloofness of the stars—
He stood, alone and firm,
A man of metal and of heart—a man apart.
He stood high
And he stood strong in a lusty realm where the resolute alone belong.
He stood—with courage and with faith—
Unshaken by the wanton kiss of joy, the bitter lash of sorrow.
He stood tall—
This man whose world was big—
This man
Whose massive shoulders nudged the promise of tomorrow!

—*Kenneth W. Fitzgerald.*

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN].

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, ESTES KEFAUVER played a role in the U.S. Senate and on the American political stage which was unique. His public career was a long and yet an all too brief record of devotion, courage, and vision. He was an unswerving champion of the public interest as against the claims of selfish special interests.

He looked out on the world with eyes of peace.

He loved the American people and they returned that love in countless villages, farms, and cities across the land.

His passing was especially mourned in my home State—South Dakota.

I always believed that he and his lovely wife, Nancy, also had a special feeling of warmth for South Dakota. He was the most popular national figure ever to campaign in our State. We shall sorely miss him.

May providence sustain his widow, Nancy, his children, and his many loved ones and friends.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, ESTES KEFAUVER was a vigorous battler for the values in which he believed and his untimely passing was a great shock and a great loss to the Senate and the Nation. I came into closest association with him in our work together as members of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, which he helped to found and to which he made invaluable contributions. He was the original sponsor of the Atlantic Union Resolution when he began his Senate career in 1949, and throughout his service here he was an effective leader in the movement toward a true Atlantic partnership. During this last year, he was in the process of combining his deep interest in economic concentration and antitrust with this long dedication to the Atlantic community by holding hearings on the subject of the developing antitrust law of the European Common Market. It was with great satisfaction that he and I joined together in perfecting aspects of the drug bill enacted in 1962, particularly in ending the use of experimental drugs upon patients without their consent, which had come to light in the thalidomide tragedy and which, hopefully, the Food and Drug Administration is now policing. We did not agree on all issues, but I always found ESTES a stanch and effective advocate, in the best and finest traditions of the U.S. Senate. He was a dear and genial friend and the Nation, as well as each of us as his warm friend, mourns his loss.

Mr. GORE. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in paying tribute to ESTES KEFAUVER as our esteemed colleague in the U.S. Senate, as a former Member of the House of Representatives, as a citizen who made a great contribution to good government in his home State of Tennessee and in the United States, and as a man whose personality and friendly manner enriched the lives of all who knew and worked with him.

ESTES KEFAUVER came to be known and admired by millions of citizens for a wide variety of accomplishments. He has left a permanent record of contributions to the structure of government and to politics and to respect for the law.

I should like to single out one quality in particular which characterized the many investigations and political activities he undertook: that is his courage.

ESTES KEFAUVER was never impressed by the obstacles which existed nor was he deterred from a position which he thought right on the advice that this was an unpopular cause or that it might be politically expedient to withdraw.

He did not hesitate to investigate crime and unsavory activities even when investigations showed links with supposedly respectable groups in society. He did not hesitate to investigate corporations and business relationships if he thought them in violation of the law. He spoke out for procedural reform in the Congress. He stood firm in defense of the interest of consumers and in defense of the civil rights of all citizens. He twice sought the nomination of his party for the Presidency, and he was honored by the Democratic Party as its nominee for the vice presidency in 1956.

He had understanding of the needs of people and sympathy for their problems. He served and loved his country, but he also saw the needs of people in other nations and the benefits which could come to them and to us through a more active participation by the United States in international affairs.

He spoke out for an Atlantic Union in 1949 and he continued his efforts for a federation of freedom-loving peoples. There has been no general acceptance of the idea of an Atlantic Union, but his efforts have had an effect by widening the vision of Congress and the people. Because ESTES KEFAUVER spoke and worked for an advanced form of international community, the entire question of international relations and international commitments has been studied more broadly and more carefully.

I join with other Senators and with the many friends of ESTES KEFAUVER in expressing deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kefauver and their children.

Mr. GORE. I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, today we pay homage to a great American. ESTES KEFAUVER is gone from our midst, yet he lives on through the good works of a lifetime of struggle in behalf of every person in this Nation.

This was a man who often stood alone against great odds as he confronted and challenged dangers to our society. With gentle voice but persistent manner he moved directly toward his objectives—and he achieved results.

He was the champion of the American consumer—deeply concerned about the individual citizen's health and pocketbook. He was a crusader for the consumer interest, most recently in his one-man battle for safe and effective drugs at a reasonable price. The last legislation to bear his name will endure through the years as a monument to his efforts to improve the quality of the Nation's supply of drugs and provide protection for the Nation's consumers. Had he accomplished nothing more in his 24 years in Congress, this effort alone assured him a place in history.

But of all his attributes—of all his accomplishments—I shall remember him best as a Senator of the people—not just of the people of Tennessee, but of the Nation. He went to them and worked in their behalf. And they responded to him. They knew him when he walked down the main street of their cities and towns. They knew him as a friend—one who would help when they needed him.

No other Member of this body in recent times became better known or better loved by so many people of these United States. He dedicated his life to their interests. He was of them, by choice, and for the common good of all.

ESTES KEFAUVER's strength was rooted in his firm convictions. His guidance came from constant touch with everyday Americans. He was their servant. They—and all of us—shall miss him.

Mr. GORE. I yield now to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the sudden and untimely passing of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has shocked and saddened us all, and it is with heavy heart that I join my colleagues today in honoring his memory.

The late Senator from Tennessee left his mark everywhere—on the State that sent him to Washington, on the Senate, and upon millions of Americans everywhere.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a most distinguished Senator. He was an able representative of Tennessee, mindful always of the needs of his State. He was a man who fought always for the causes he felt were right.

Although it was never my privilege to serve on a Senate committee with ESTES KEFAUVER, he was a dear friend and I miss him very much. His great energy, distinguished service, and deep concern for the less privileged and the economically distressed made friends for him wherever he went.

Who can estimate how many Americans shook his hand and thrilled to his warm smile as he trekked across the Nation seeking support in his campaigns for the Presidency. Who can estimate how many Americans will tell their children and grandchildren that they shook the hand of a tall, sincere man who said to them: "I am ESTES KEFAUVER; I'm running for President of the United States, and I hope you'll help me."

His ability was rewarded 7 years before his untimely passing when he received from his party the second highest honor it can bestow—its nomination for Vice President of the United States.

Mr. President, the State of Tennessee and the citizens of our Nation have lost a most distinguished servant, and the Senate has lost a stalwart Member. Mrs. Cannon and I have lost a friend and we join in extending to Mrs. Kefauver and her family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE].

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleagues in the Senate today to pay tribute to a truly great American from the State of Tennessee. Much has already been said in praise and much will be said in deep respect today and in future years about the majesty of this man. Many will point in great detail to the numerous significant measures he has personally offered or sponsored during his service in the Congress of the United States. Still others will single out his lasting contributions to the effectiveness of his indefatigable work in committee protecting the rights of all individuals.

All of us will recall vividly the days when this tall American in coonskin hat and proffered handshake traveled the highways and byways of this great Nation seeking the highest office the country could bestow, not for the glory of the office but for the opportunities which he believed to be available for further service to the people.

I loved and admired Senator ESTES KEFAUVER because, like all Americans, I love and admire men of dedication to service and courage. It is relatively easy to lead a popular crusade supported by the multitude. It is comparatively easy to speak loudly when public acceptance and ovation can certainly be anticipated for one's remarks. But I believe it takes a man of great courage and integrity to speak for unpopular causes. To speak for anyone whose rights have been denied and who has been viewed with suspicion by those easily swayed by the prevailing emotions takes an extremely courageous man. To raise a voice of dissent against the virulent multitude is not for the timid.

Senator KEFAUVER lived a life of courage and service. This Nation of ours is great because we have had men who were cast in the image of the great Senator from Tennessee. Our Nation would long ago have failed to attain its potential were it not for those who chose to run against the tide when a sense of conscience and duty so decreed.

I thank our Creator for sending us such a person during this decade of darkness and tension.

We will miss Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, but his spirit will long guide us in the work which faces us in the Congress of these United States.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise at this time to mourn the loss of ESTES KEFAUVER. He always had the interests of the little man in the forefront of his superb mind, and his death is a particular loss to the little man. And, to paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, the Lord preferred the common people, because He made so many of them.

Big business and big labor had no impact upon ESTES KEFAUVER's views, his votes, or his actions. He was a man of courage and rectitude, and his loss is a very real one and deeply meaningful.

Speaking as a friend, and one who admired him very much indeed, I know how heavy my own heart is at his death. I extend all my own and my wife's sympathy to his wife, Nancy, to his daughter, Gail, who is a friend of my daughter, and to his other children. The only consolation I can offer to his family, to those closest to him, is that Senator KEFAUVER's death is a loss, not only to them, but to our Nation and to all our people; in fact, to all our whole world.

Senator KEFAUVER was a constant leader in our national strivings to eliminate unfairness and abuse. It is indicative of his zeal and of his efforts that he fought for the beliefs he cherished until the very end of his life. Truly, his life represents our highest standards of public service.

His place in this body and his influence in our lives will be almost impossible to replace. And his courage is beyond duplication.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is recognized.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, we pay tribute here today to one of the alltime stalwarts of this body, the late Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. He was a champion of the man of the street.

Though he rose from humble surroundings, like so many of the great patriots from his native State of Tennessee, he towered above the crowd, and through his tireless efforts fought those whom he felt were in a position to take advantage of the common man. His doggedness, his character, his entire life was expended in establishing a better Nation and a better world.

Tennessee has sent many outstanding servants to the U.S. Senate; it has given our Nation an outstanding President in Andrew Jackson, one who it was said was the first to recognize the common man and to rise above aristocracy. It gave us a great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and it did no less when it recognized ESTES KEFAUVER's exceptional ability.

I considered ESTES KEFAUVER a close friend. I appreciated his counsel, his friendship, and his down-to-earth interpretations of the troublesome national and international problems.

All of us have reviewed many glowing tributes to Senator KEFAUVER by the press of this Nation. One tribute from the Daily Post Athenian in his native State seemed to me to be most appropriate, and I should like to quote in part from this outstanding editorial which expresses so well my feelings toward our late distinguished colleague:

> America is mourning. One of her alltime great sons is dead.
>
> It is a long way from a rambling white house on Main Street in Madisonville, a little town in east Tennessee, to the White House on historic Pennsylvania Avenue in the Nation's Capital. But ESTES almost made it.
>
> Perhaps fate denied him the Presidency and acclaimed him spokesman for the rank and file of the country.
>
> That's what he was.
>
> From New Hampshire to Florida, from Minnesota to California, from Chattanooga to Seattle, the tall Tennessean was the voice of the man who had something to say and could not be heard above the clamor of the crowd.
>
> KEFAUVER spoke for him.
>
> His message was heard and heeded.
>
> To say that he was always liked would be an injustice to him. At times he was bitterly opposed in his contentions, but he never swerved from his course. He never violated his own conscience, and never betrayed a course he represented.
>
> These things made him a champion.
>
> Indeed, the letter T summarizes the life of KEFAUVER—tall, talented, trustworthy, and triumphant.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to pay respects to our late colleague, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, a man whose unique ability and capabilities allowed him to rise from humble origin to a position of stature in the Senate of the United States of America. His career as a public servant stretched over a great many years and was highlighted in many instances by notable investigations and Senate proceedings with him at the forefront. He was a man noted for his constancy of purpose and unswerving dedication to his goal. My relations with him were always pleasant and congenial, and I was deeply impressed with the courtesy which he displayed toward everyone he met. He was a man whose warm and friendly personality enabled him to make the acquaintance of many people from coast to coast. He seemed to thoroughly enjoy meeting and being with people.

Senator KEFAUVER had a great interest in athletics which carried over from his college days. His physical stature and appearance were the envy of men many years his junior. I offer my heartfelt sympathy to his devoted widow and family in this time of bereavement.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, few Senators have made a contribution to this Nation comparable to that of Senator KEFAUVER. Honored by election to the U.S. Senate and nomination for the Vice Presidency, he remained steadfast in modesty and the constant application of his talents to the needs of all Americans.

As one who admired his tenacity and his devotion to principle, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Senator KEFAUVER as a fighter for justice, integrity, free competition in the business world, and fair treatment for all Americans. His contributions to this body will be felt and seen for many years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the death of ESTES KEFAUVER came as a personal shock to many millions of Americans, I am sure. He was known not only as a Senator from Tennessee; he was regarded as a friend by many citizens who knew him for his tireless campaigning and his unrelenting determination to root out injustice wherever it existed.

To us in the Senate, the blow was an especially hard one. It was a privilege to work with Senator KEFAUVER and to watch him at work in this Chamber. He was the enemy of unfair advantage. He had the gift to see the right and the wrong in every situation. His basic values never changed, no matter how complex the issue was, no matter what pressures were exerted to cloud the issues.

The State of Tennessee has produced many great men. One of my heroes at college was Cordell Hull. Senator KEFAUVER was a worthy heir to Hull's ideals of service and social justice. It was an honor to serve with Senator KEFAUVER. His loss is one of the tragedies of our time.

Mr. President I also ask consent to have printed in the RECORD several editorials by New Jersey writers.

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

[From the Newark News, Newark, N.J., Aug. 11, 1963]

CRUSADER

ESTES KEFAUVER was far more than a homespun presidential aspirant in a funny coonskin hat. Behind that folksy packaging there was hard iron. Ask the racket boys whose way of life he disrupted by exposure of their underworld apparatus. They will not forget the Senator from Tennessee.

Nor will the law-abiding public. New Jersey and particularly Bergen County benefited from the Kefauver crime hearings and so did the whole country. Bergen's gambling cleanup was one response to Senator KEAFUVER's call for a war on the underworld.

He exposed gambling as the base for organized crime. "The $2 horse player and the 5-cent numbers player are not only gambling against hopeless odds," he declared, "they are also sending young people into drug addiction and young girls into prostitution. They are undermining our most sacred institutions."

The country will miss the gentleman from Tennessee.

[From the Atlantic City Press, Aug. 13, 1963]

KEFAUVER TO BE LONG REMEMBERED HERE

A courageous public champion has been taken from the national scene by the death of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER.

The tall Tennessean with the folksy, homespun manner, twice aspired to the Democratic presidential nomination and made an unsuccessful race for the Vice Presidency. He was a formidable candidate and the coonskin cap became the emblem of his grassroots campaigning.

He perhaps will be best remembered as a fervent crusader against crime and monopoly. He was chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee in 1951, when it conducted televised hearings that thrilled millions with closeups of big time racket chiefs, gamblers, and hoodlums who were among the witnesses.

Atlantic City did not escape the penetrating searchlight of the crimebuster. The committee delved into gambling operations at the shore and the implications constituted a lurid chapter which the resort would prefer to forget.

The bespectacled Senator with the southern drawl visited the city on more auspicious occasions as a convention speaker.

In recent years he had been in the public eye principally through his chairmanship of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

By a curious coincidence, his death came at a time when this area is again the scene of an investigation—this time by agents of the Internal Revenue Service.

Whatever else may be said about Senator KEFAUVER, he was a man of high principles and repeatedly refused to compromise them for political gain. He devoted his energies to the public service until his heart gave out at the age of 60.

As President Kennedy put it, the Senator's death "has deprived the Nation of one of its most distinguished leaders * * *. His devotion to the public interest made him a powerful influence for good in our Nation's affairs."

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Sunday Times-Advertiser, Aug. 11, 1963]

THE TALL SENATOR IN THE COONSKIN CAP WAS ALWAYS HIS OWN MAN

(By Sam Fogg)

WASHINGTON.—Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who died yesterday, came out of Tennessee's farm country to combat big city vice lords and business monopolies and twice seek the Presidency.

It was as the crusading chairman of a Senate Crime Investigating Committee that KEFAUVER first sprang to national prominence. The widely televised hearings were marked by KEFAUVER prodding away in a soft Tennessee drawl and getting surly, defiant responses from such crime kingpins as Frank Costello.

He first bid unsuccessfully for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1952. He made the Daniel Boone coonskin cap his symbol and as a campaigner showed an almost insatiable zest for handshaking.

At the nominating convention, however, he was passed over for the then Illinois Governor Stevenson. He was opposed by southern politicos who disliked his moderate racial rights views and by nothern city bosses who felt that his crime exposures had hurt them locally.

KEFAUVER's presidential ambitions stayed afire. In 1956 he directly challenged Stevenson's bid for renomination and the two met in a series of head-to-head primary battles. KEFAUVER won in such States as Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Maryland but was crushed in the more pivotal primaries in California, Oregon, and Florida.

Stevenson, on his renomination, declared the choice of his vice presidential running mate an open race. KEFAUVER won it in a close battle with a young Senate colleague.

BEATS KENNEDY

The latter was John F. Kennedy who this weekend was mourning a death in his own family—the loss of his newborn son.

The Stevenson-Kefauver ticket was swamped as Dwight D. Eisenhower won his second term by a wide margin. From then on, KEFAUVER moved to the back of the national political stage.

He devoted himself mainly to the chairmanship of the Senate Anti-Monopoly Subcommittee, championing the cause of the Nation's consumers. He demonstrated the same crusading vigor in denouncing the prices of drugs as he had in castigating the criminals that had once appeared before him.

The tall Tennessean had always championed the underdog and had pursued an independent course during his 24 years as a House Member and Senator.

When he first ran for the Senate in 1948, Memphis Democratic boss Edward H. Crump had taunted KEFAUVER as the "pet coon" of newspaper publisher Silliman Evans.

KEFAUVER promptly brought forth a coonskin cap and told his audiences: "There might be a ring around the tail but none through the nose."

HANDSHAKE CHAMP

KEFAUVER made the handshake a potent political weapon. He would shake hundreds of hands a day on and off the campaign trail.

But the key to his personality was his underdog role. He championed the man in the street in his battles against crime, and monopolistic practices.

KEFAUVER always had his eye on the White House. His failure to win the presidential nomination in 1952 and 1956 was a bitter pill.

But he staged an all-out fight at an "open convention" to win the vice presidential nod from delegates to the 1956 Democratic Convention, beating Kennedy.

Any lingering bitterness he may have had over the failure to win the presidential spot never showed during the Stevenson campaign.

As Stevenson's running mate he threw himself into the drive for a Democratic victory with the same tireless, folksy manner that had won him so much support from the rank and file in the past.

KEFAUVER was always somewhat of an outcast among his Senate colleagues and anathema among the party leaders.

Much of the distrust goes back to the very event that propelled KEFAUVER into millions of American homes—the nationally televised crime hearings he sponsored in 1950.

The party leaders never quite forgave the freshman Senator for quickly gaining a reputation as a "crimebuster" and were convinced that the hearings contributed to Democratic defeats in some States in 1952.

When he first came to Congress as a House Member in 1939 he established himself as an internationally minded liberal. He was 1 of 10 Members of the House named by a national magazine for outstanding work in 1946.

KEFAUVER was born July 26, 1903, at Madison, Tenn., where his family had lived for generations. He attended a one-room school there and as a boy worked in his father's hardware store and on his farm.

At the University of Tennessee, he worked his way through college and was on the football and track squads. The 6-foot-3-inch, 200-pound Senator always deprecated his athletic powers, however.

He entered Yale law school and worked his way to a law degree by waiting tables and firing furnaces.

After practicing law in Chattanooga, KEFAUVER entered politics on a modest scale. Just before his first election to the House, he served as State commissioner of finance and taxation.

He married Nancy Pigott, a vivacious Scottish girl, in 1935. Their children are David, Diane, Eleanor, and Gail.

In recent years, KEFAUVER's activities had focused on the chairmanship of the Senate Anti-Monopoly Subcommittee which conducted a wide range of hearings into reports of pricing fixing and on a wide variety of antitrust matters.

KEFAUVER's hearings on the controversial Dixon-Yates power contract publicized the circumstances under which private power companies planned to build a steam generating plant in West Memphis, Ark., to channel power into the TVA network for use by the Atomic Energy Commission. The contract was subsequently cancelled.

The subcommittee's pricing inquiry also dealt extensively with drug prices, and its hearings were in part responsible for congressional actions which tightened up on the drug industry.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished assistant majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this has been a memorable day in the Senate. It is a day that has been dedicated to a very fine, great, and good man. The works of this good man will live on for many generations, and the memory of this good man will live with us throughout our lives.

The life of a great man is very much like the course of a mighty river. It springs from humble and obscure beginnings; it gathers strength from many tributaries and refreshes all the lands it passes through; and ultimately, as it reaches the ocean, it links itself with all mankind.

So it was with our late and beloved colleague, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. At every stage of his long journey from the hills of Tennessee to the Halls of Congress, he grew in strength and stature with widening experience—and, at every stage, he gave far more in devoted service than he received in public honors.

Coming to this body at the same time he did, I can speak from 15 years of close and almost daily contact. Yet, when I cast my mind back over those years, I am amazed at all he attempted, and even more at how much he accomplished.

He attacked the underworld of gamblers and gangsters and the overworld of monopoly business with equal energy and courage. His television hearings cast a glaring and cleansing light upon the links between government and organized crime. His probes of price-rigging in the steel, electrical machinery, and other industries showed how our free enterprise system can be distorted by a privileged few at the expense of the many. Everything he did was characterized by dogged and diligent attention to detail. It was pioneering work, as well—and it blazed paths that all of us can follow.

I think today of his patient and persevering efforts to insure the highest standards of purity and safety in the drugs upon which many Americans must depend for their well-being or even their survival. It was a long and uphill struggle. I think particularly of the aid and encouragement he and his able staff gave to Dr. Frances Kelsey in her stubborn resistance to permitting thalidomide to be put on the market. Thanks to Dr. Kelsey, thousands of American children were born healthy and whole who would otherwise have been tragically deformed; and thanks to the impact of this experience, Senator KEFAUVER was able at length to secure legislation more adequately protecting the public against such risks.

I well recall the discussions and the debates on the so-called Kefauver-Harris drug bill, and I remember the tenacity that characterized the efforts of Senator KEFAUVER and the success that crowned his efforts.

Senator KEFAUVER was a faithful advovate for his State and his region of the country. He was a stanch proponent of the Tennessee Valley Authority and played a leading role in exposing the effort to erode it through what is now known as the infamous Dixon-Yates contract.

Yet from the first his horizons embraced the wider world. Before the Atlantic Community was more than a gleam in the eyes of a few far-seeing men, he sponsored the first Atlantic Union resolution—and saw it finally enacted 11 years later. Supporting NATO and seeing in it much more than a mere military alliance, he sought to give it political content by helping to found the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

I hope that in the forthcoming NATO parliamentarians' conference that the delegates from the United States will see fit to pay tribute to the leadership of Senator KEFAUVER. I believe that our friends and compatriots in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization would be appreciative of the efforts of the delegates from the United States to remind the parliamentarians once again of the work and of the vision of our departed colleague.

Zealous to protect the President's authority in foreign affairs, he threw himself into the successful fight against the so-called Bricker amendment, in which position he believed sincerely, and in which I fully concurred. That amendment would have severely restricted the authority of the President to conduct our foreign policy.

His was a full life, and he had his share of bitter disappointment as well. I often wondered from what deep sources he drew the strength to carry on. I believe that it was because he came back, over and over again, to the people of Tennessee and of all America, to commune with them and refresh his dedication to their cause. But he was no mere common denominator of his constituents' views, although he sought them and respected them. Precisely because he was so deeply and firmly rooted in the people, he could on significant occasions step out ahead of them. In the fields of civil rights and civil liberties, he took lonely and unpopular positions which time—and, I am delighted to add, the voters of Tennessee—subsequently justified.

Senator KEFAUVER was loved and respected all the way from the courthouse squares of Tennessee to the Parliaments of Europe. But I want here and now to bear witness that nowhere was he more respected, nowhere is his memory more cherished, than in this Chamber—both among those who disagreed with him and those who usually, but not always, agreed with him.

He gave himself unstintingly, generously, and indeed sacrificially to the service of the people and of the causes in which he believed. He was a true Democrat in the best sense of that word, a believer in democratic institutions and a practitioner of democratic ideas. The highest honor we can pay him is to draw inspiration from the noble example he has set us.

Mr. President, on August 12, 1963, the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO adopted a resolution of tribute to ESTES KEFAUVER. I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON ESTES KEFAUVER, UNITY HOUSE, PA., AUGUST 12, 1963

Whereas death has taken from our midst Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, a man who served his country with unusual dedication, tremendous devotion and unequalled patriotism; and

Whereas ESTES KEFAUVER was a true humanitarian, a firm disciple of democracy, a defender of consumer interests, and a warm and abiding friend of labor; and

Whereas all of America and all of the organized labor movement of this country is both the richer because of his lifetime service to the United States and the poorer because of his sad and untimely death; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO, which last February unanimously chose ESTES KEFAUVER to receive the Murray-Green Award of the AFL-CIO for his great services to the cause of humanity, joins his fellow Americans in mourning the passing of this great Senator; and be it further

Resolved, That the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO hereby determines that its Murray-Green Award will be given to the Senator posthumously; and be it further

Resolved, That the Executive Council assigns as its representative at the funeral service for ESTES KEFAUVER, a man who served with him in many battles for the public good, Stanton Smith, Coordinator of AFL-CIO State and City Central Bodies; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution testifying to our great admiration, our deep sense of gratitude, and our overwhelming sorrow be spread upon the records of the AFL-CIO Executive Council and that true copies be transmitted to the family of the late and great Senator whom we join in mourning his death, and to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like at this time to pay my respects to his wonderful and lovely wife, Nancy Kefauver, and to their fine family. We were privileged, as the Humphrey family, to be very close friends of the Kefauver family. There are no words of any tribute or memorial that can properly express the heartfelt feelings that exist between good friends.

Mr. GORE. I now yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of a great Senator, a great Democrat, and a great American, ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. His passing was a shock to the U.S. Senate, and I think I am speaking for the entire body when I say that I cannot think of a single man whose unique qualities will be more sorely missed. The late Senator from Tennessee made a lasting mark upon this body—a mark which many may strive to copy but which will never be duplicated.

ESTES KEFAUVER had a single mindedness of purpose and raw courage seldom matched by a public servant. Sometimes these qualities tried the patience of his friends as well as of his foes. But it always stood him in good stead with the little people of this country, who flocked to his coonskin standard in great numbers and with great enthusiasm. Certainly it endeared him to the hearts of his constituents who returned him time and time again to Congress.

The public image of the big man in the coonskin cap gladhanding his way about the country paints a deceptively simple picture of a complex man. ESTES KEFAUVER tried his hand at many things, and was successful in nearly all of them. His efforts as a college football player, a student political leader, and a practicing lawyer were crowned with success.

It is fitting that his first venture into politics should be against an entrenched machine. As a Representative, and later as a Senator, he continued to hammer away at any element which he considered was infringing upon the rights of the common man. No opponent was too big or too powerful—organized crime, machine politics, privilege, monpolies. As a civil libertarian or as a defender of the interests of the consumer, he had few peers.

Only in his bid for the Presidency of the United States was success denied him. He reached his political zenith on the second rollcall of the 1952 nominating convention, climaxing a spectacular rise from relative obscurity to national prominence. It is to his great credit that he took this personal setback graciously, and that he agreed to serve his party as Vice Presidential candidate in 1956.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a big man. He was big in body and possessed a big smile and a big handshake. But he should be remembered for his big heart. His love for humanity and his genuine concern for the downtrodden were unsurpassed. It was not for publicity or votes that this man drove himself beyond his physical limits in their behalf. In his mind, special interests were to be fought, and if nobody else would fight them, he would. The persistence and zeal with which he tilted with the windmills of real or imagined evil strained the slender thread of forbearance of his colleagues on more than one occasion. But the differences were not personal and did not diminish our respect for him.

Those of us who served with ESTES KEFAUVER in the House and Senate have had the real pleasure of having watched a great American of humble origin rise to national heights of fame and success, insuring as he did so a unique place in our history books. The man with the ready smile and handshake, the colorful coonskin cap, and the penchant for "going it alone" when the going got rough, is already a legend. We who pay tribute to him today can only add kind footnotes to what history has already written.

Mr. President, I extend my deepest condolences to the family of the late ESTES KEFAUVER and to the people of his beloved Tennessee.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in the passing of ESTES KEFAUVER, the Senate and the people of the United States lost an old and dear friend. His death left a void in the affairs of this Nation and in the hearts of his countrymen that can never be filled.

Although I did not share the long association with him that many of my colleagues enjoyed, I felt a great sense of deprivation and sorrow when I learned of his untimely death. I sincerely mean it when I say that I can think of no national figure who was more loved and admired by my fellow Hoosiers than was this gentle, yet dynamic, Tennessean.

ESTES KEFAUVER was always one of my personal heroes. As a freshman Senator it was natural for me to turn to him for that advice and counsel which is so necessary to those of us who are new to the ways of this body. I shall never forget the warmth and helpfulness which he showed me in my first few months in Washington. As fellow Senators, fellow Democrats, and fellow members of the Judiciary Committee, it was with a feeling of great honor that the junior Senator from Indiana was able to count the senior Senator from Tennessee among his closest associates. I shall sorely miss him.

But, Mr. President, ESTES KEFAUVER was more than a mentor and friend. Above all, he was an inspiration—a symbol of the ideal toward which all of us as representatives of the people should aspire. And, in the death of our beloved colleague, this inspiration—fortunately—lives on.

There were many characteristics of Senator KEFAUVER that helped to make him the truly great Senator and great American that he was. We have talked of many of them here: his unfailing honesty, his humility, his forthrightness, his warmth, kindness, and concern for his fellow man, his courage, and his devotion to his job and to his country. But, above all, what impressed me most was that here in ESTES KEFAUVER was a man who really cared.

Here was a man who cared about the power of organized crime and who did all he could to fight it; a man who cared when he found that many of his fellow Americans were being overcharged for vitally needed medicines; a man who cared in a real and vital way about the effects of business concentration upon our free enterprise system; a man who cared above all for the plight of the common man.

We shall pay tribute to the memory of ESTES KEFAUVER each time we cast a vote for the common man, each time our convictions lead us to overcome our fears and dare to do battle with giants, each time we take a cause to heart and fight for it until the end.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a man who cared about his fellow man. In his death we realize how much we cared about him. Let us hope that his memory will long live in the hearts of us all to give us inspiration in the years ahead.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, at the time of his death, I had known ESTES KEFAUVER longer than I had any other Member of the Senate. It was a richly rewarding and inspiring association and friendship. I am sure that I received far more than I gave to this association and friendship.

But, then, I expect that this is true of all of those who knew him as most of us did. ESTES KEFAUVER was that kind of man.

He was a common man, and yet an uncommon man. He came from the common people. While he rose from his station, he remained a man with an uncommonly common touch. Yes, he remained a common man with the addition of the glamour that comes to a man of his position.

ESTES KEFAUVER was, I believe, in the tradition of Andrew Jackson. These two Tennesseans served their State and their Nation in much the same manner and with much the same ways.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a friend of the friendless. Frustrated in many of his own goals, he never stopped fighting for the things he believed in and for his friends.

This is a better Senate, a better country, and most of us are better men because ESTES KEFAUVER came our way.

Mr. CHURCH subsequently said: Mr. President, last Thursday, the business of the Senate was suspended to permit the delivery of memorial addresses on the life, character, and public service of ESTES KEFAUVER, late a Senator from the State of Tennessee. Since it was not possible for me to be back here at that time, I wish now to speak a few words in tribute to our friend and colleague.

My quarters in the Old Senate Office Building are directly across the hall from the space lately occupied by ESTES KEFAUVER. Soon after his last successful

canvass of the Tennessee electorate, I remember stepping from my office to identify an unusual clapping sound coming from the corridor outside. It was applause. Both sides of the corridor were lined with staff people—my own, the staff people of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as well as KEFAUVER's own associates—who had turned out to greet the Senator as he strode from the elevator to his desk. This tribute, rare indeed, in the workaday world of the Senate Office Building, must have given ESTES a precious memory. The event, spontaneously set in motion by those who knew him best, could never have happened to a public idol with feet of clay.

My own closest association with ESTES KEFAUVER came as the result of our joint efforts in behalf of the resolution authorizing the Atlantic Citizens Convention. With courage and single-mindedness he worked to advance the cause of Atlantic Union, in the House and in the Senate, in good times and in bad. This aspect of Senator Kefauver's public service is well noted in a tribute to him by Elmo Roper, which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

KEFAUVER: THE IRREPLACEABLE MAN

(By Elmo Roper)

Most of us have been reared to believe that there is no such thing as the indispensable man—and yet somehow words approximating those must be found to describe Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. Certainly the phrase which all those who labored for Atlantic Union can agree to is that he was the irreplaceable man.

In writing about ESTES KEFAUVER, it's hard to know where to begin. Perhaps one should begin with his courage. He never hesitated to take an unpopular position when he believed it was the right one. He was the first man in the Congress of the United States to take a public stand for Atlantic Union—at a time when such a view made him solitary indeed. Born in the Old South, he was uncompromisingly devoted to equal rights for Negroes. However much one might have disagreed with any of his views, I doubt if anyone can be found who would deny that most of his positions required courage of the highest order.

But one might as easily begin with his loyalty, his steadfastness. Over the years he never wavered in his support of Atlantic Union, publicly or privately. Called a nigger loving one worlder, in the middle of a hot political campaign, he took the epithet calmly in stride and retreated not an inch from his convictions. Everything he ever told me he would do, during the long battle for congressional acceptance of the idea of an Atlantic Citizens Convention, he did. In a profession of easy promises, he kept every one.

Yet a very good case could be made that the first thing one should mention in connection with Senator KEFAUVER was his vision. Many years ago he realized that rivers, mountains and oceans, color of the skin and religion were unnatural boundaries for governments. To let any of them assume the unnatural importance they have come to have in this 20th century was to invite—at worst—continued wars and—at best—continued costly rivalries. In a world shrunken by fast transportation and faster communications and where men know how to destroy centuries of civilization in minutes, some stronger cement was needed to bind men together. To ESTES KEFAUVER that more binding cement was a belief in the dignity of every human being. On that foundation, he would have built a broader, more enduring government than this planet has ever seen.

Perhaps the underlying source of ESTES KEFAUVER's strength was his ability to stand alone. During his time in the Senate, he never did anything out of a desire to become a member of the club nor did he tailor his views to assure reelection to that exclusive body. He was guided solely by the inner force of his own reasoning powers—which were formidable, coonskin cap to the contrary. No outer force had the power to alter his convictions—or his actions. I suppose what I am describing is, very simply, a man of complete integrity.

Yet there was nothing out of character in ESTES KEFAUVER's walking up the streets of little towns all over America and greeting people with, "I am ESTES KEFAUVER; I am running for the Presidency and I would like to have your support." He was in tune with the aspirations of all mankind—even though he was one of mankind's most exceptional products.

And for many of us, grief over the death of a great man is compounded by the fact that he was to our cause the irreplaceable man.

Mr. CHURCH. ESTES KEFAUVER had many friends in Idaho, men, and women who gave him their commitment when he was a candidate for the Presidency. The history of the fifties cannot now be rewritten, but appropriate to ESTES KEFAUVER are the words spoken by Horatio of the fallen Prince Hamlet:

For he was likely, had he been put on, to have prov'd most royally.

Mr. GRUENING subsequently said: Mr. President, last Thursday the Senate devoted its session to paying tributes to one whom I consider one of its all-time great Senators, ESTES KEFAUVER, and I was proud to be among those who spoke. The tributes that poured forth from our colleagues were eloquent testimony not only to the esteem and admiration in which ESTES was held but demonstrated the wide range of his activities, invariably in behalf of the public interest and for a better world.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the September and October issues respectively of the publication, Freedom & Union, the first of which is entitled "Senator ESTES KEFAUVER: Trial Blazer of Atlantic Union, 1903–1963"; and the second, "How KEFAUVER Submitted First Atlantic Convention Bill," as well as an article from the former issue by Edward J. Meeman, and an editorial from the same issue by Elmo Roper entitled "KEFAUVER, the Irreplaceable Man," be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and that these be added to my tribute in the memorial volume which will contain the eulogies.

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

[From Freedom & Union, September 1963]

SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER: TRAILBLAZER OF ATLANTIC UNION, 1903–63

"The answer of the State Department to every proposal for peace, Mr. President, is that it needs time to consider the proposal. My heaven, Mr. President * * * we need to utilize the brief time that we have * * * to quit drifting and start moving. The State Department evidently does not realize that we cannot kill time; it is time which kills us. And that was never more true than it is at this very moment."

POIGNANT TIMELY REMINDER

Thus spoke Senator ESTES KEFAUVER in his speech, "Atlantic Union: The Way to Peace—Reply to the State Department," in answer to its opposition to the Atlantic Union resolution he had introduced July 28, 1949. He spoke on the Senate floor March 13, 1950—3 months before communism suddenly launched its attack on South Korea.

All that speech repays rereading now, but the paragraph quoted speaks most eloquently just today to all his generation, and most movingly to us Atlantic Unionists who know how priceless was his pioneering for Federation of the Free. No one in the prime of life can be reminded too often or too poignantly that, however much we act as though we had time to kill, all the while time is killing us, ESTES speaks to us, and to all, with new authority on this subject now. He did not kill time, he crowded great good into his years, and wisely did he do so, for now time has killed him, when only 60, at the peak of his powers.

The cause of Atlantic Federal Union suffered a truly tragic loss when his heart abruptly gave way on August 10. He had gone from the Senate floor, where he was opposing private monopoly of communication satellites, to the hospital, thinking he had only indigestion. There his heart—until then a kind heart and a stout one in every way—suddenly gave in.

WHAT OTHER SENATOR?

Nature gave ESTES great gifts; hard work developed them, and what he had already done with them promised even finer contributions to his fellow man, had he been allowed even the Biblical three score and ten. He was not a member of the Senate's famed inner club, but those who are, and all the 99 Senators, may well ask themselves: "The death of what Senator among us would have the nationwide, Atlantic-wide impact Senator KEFAUVER's has had—measured not only in front page headlines and editorial tributes but in a deep sense of personal loss felt by so many whose devoted loyalty he had won, for so many reasons, in so many places and fields of life?

ESTES was much more than one Senator in a hundred; he was one man in a myriad. He needs a Shakespeare to do him justice—and for him Shakespeare did write a eulogy. It is the tribute to Brutus which Antony paid on the battlefield where he perished. One need but omit—as I do here—its second and third lines to make even its "He * * * made one of them" refer no longer to Brutus and the conspirators, but (like all the rest) to ESTES and his work to unite the free:

"This was the noblest Roman of them all.

* * * * *

He only, in a general honest thought
And common good to all, made one of them
His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixed in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, 'This was a man!' "

THE GENTLE WARRIOR

ESTES KEFAUVER's life was gentle in the sense that he was a born gentleman, the soul of kindness. He did not learn consideration for others from a course on how to make friends. Consideration for each person he encountered, however humbled, was in him second nature—nay, true nature. He carried it to a friendly fault that has made his ready handshake legendary, and overshadowed for the public better proofs of his thoughtfulness that thousands treasure.

His life was far from gentle, however, in the sense of drifting with the current or following the way of least resistance as so many do, avoiding hard decisions, conflict, ESTES was forever paddling his canoe upstream,

even up rapids that daunted other explorers. Increasingly through his 10 years in the House and 15 in the Senate, his public life was devoted to heroic conflict. His battles were both negative and positive.

He fought against dragons as powerful as war, democratic disunion or anarchy, race prejudice, organized crime, monopoly and profiteering in steel, medicine, the high heavens of Telstars. Birth involves conflict too, and ESTES fought for creation of the Federation of the Free, for a more effective "Twentieth Century Congress"—the title of his first book—for more democratic elections (through abolishing the poll tax, reforming the presidential electoral college, etc.)

In politics as in engineering, there are two kinds of men, the kind that construct and the kind that operate. ESTES was of the rarer constructive type. His passion for building better government first showed itself at the county level when he came home from Yale to practice law. Before he died he had contributed to the creation of better government at all the other existing levels, municipal, State and Federal—and above all to the constitution of democratic government where it does not yet exist, in Atlantica. His championship of Federal Government on this international scale contributed to his election to the Senate in 1948 despite Boss Crump in Memphis—and there resulted in replacing his machine with an independent government in that city, and freeing the State government from bossism. But this is a story in itself—for a later issue.

A GIANT'S STRENGTH

ESTES had a giant's strength, without the fault that Shakespeare found in this:

O, it is excellent
To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous
To use it like a giant.

I wish Shakespeare had gone on to tell us how excellent it is to use such strength for noble ends, not to exploit the weaknesses of others for one's own profit but to find satisfactions in making the weak stronger, the fearful braver, and in freeing one's fellows from the walls of anarchy, war, and moral cowardice that hem man in, and the chains of oppression, prejudice, and ignorance that hold him down. ESTES had a giant's strength in at least two senses, physical and moral. He was weak as a speaker; he moved men by his character much more than by his speech. He was not a seminal thinker, but he had an independent mind. He was open to the ideas of others and not too proud to work for those he judged to be sound as if they were his own. And his judgment not only of ideas but even more of political situations and strategy was very good. To return to the two strengths mentioned.

MR. COURAGE

Physically, ESTES stood head and broad shoulders above most of us. His stamina carried him through three killing campaigns for his Senate seat, and the multitude of presidential primaries that he won in 1952 and 1956. Morally, his strength was even rarer.

I think of him often as Mr. Courage, for throughout the 15 years I knew him intimately he was the most consistently and outstandingly courageous man in legislative office I have yet known. Nor does my prize for courage go to him only because of the degree of it he showed in the leadership he gave Atlantic Union in Congress, as some may assume.

It has never seemed to me to take the highest courage for those who laud the commonsense of the common people, as all politicians do, to ask the voters to back the case for Atlantic Union, which is commonsense itself, to me, at least. But the record shows that they do think this requires high courage, and so I concede the point, the more readily because such courage is indeed required to continue in this course as long as ESTES did. The eulogies and editorials I have read have nearly all stressed his courage, but—with significant exceptions in Tennessee where he was best known—none even mentioned his work for Atlantic Union. This shows, at least, that there was plenty of other proof of it; the other evidence has most impressed me, too.

ESTES 83 TO 1

The ignorance, prejudice, and misguided emotions that Atlantic Union runs counter to and that so many politicians have feared to face do not seem to me so hard to overcome or so explosive as the ignorance, bigotry, and misguided emotions roused by other issues, most directly in one's own constituency. Most politicians seem to share this evaluation, judging from their fear of even irking ther constituents on matters that touch them to the quick. Yet through these minefields sown with booby-traps ESTES marched as calmly as others on a safe highway—even more serenely, if anything, than he did on the Atlantic Union road. For example, on racial issue votes, he stood out among all the southern Senators, conservatives and liberals, often alone until ALBERT GORE joined him as the junior Senator from the State already famed for Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson.

The vote that most impressed me allowed one to test ESTES against the whole field. It came when northern Democratic liberals, with whom ESTES often voted, sought during the McCarthy fever to outfox those who charged that they were soft on communism, by sponsoring a bill to outlaw the Communist Party. No one was under worse attack then as a pink than ESTES in Tennessee by those who sought his seat. The Senate approved the bill 83 to 1—and the 1 was Senator KEFAUVER. The immediate result was an astonishing victory he won single-handed, which began the next day when two Senators were brave enough to confess on the floor their consciences had kept them awake all night because they should have voted as he did. In a later issue we shall publish an article by his then Administrative Assistant, Richard Wallace, now executive director of the Atlantic Council of the United States, telling this whole heart-warming story. This demonstration of Senator KEFAUVER's courage and wisdom deserves a much more spacious monument than we can give it now.

NOT RECKLESS COURAGE

The courage that characterized Senator Kefauver was not blind or even reckless or flamboyant. It was no less deliberate than determined, as aware of the dangers as it was quiet, a courage fathered by deeply rooted values and mothered by firm faith in his fellow man.

"His critics in the Senate called him 'ESTES the Martyr,' the 'Frontiersman,' and the 'Scourge of Sin,'" the New York Times said: "They accounted him a canny politician bent on building up a personal following." Frontiersman he was indeed in spirit, but there was in him nothing of Jeremiah, still less of the martyr or fanatic. His courage came from no such sources. True, he was a shrewd politician—as I have had much more occasion to welcome than to criticize—but Congress swarms with canny politicians who seek to build up a personal following * * * by anything but the course that ESTES took. Two of many examples in my personal knowledge may show that seeking his own advantage was not his major motive.

TWO STEPS BACK FROM FAME

When ESTES gained national renown by his crime investigation I was disturbed, because I feared it would divert him too much from Atlantic Union. I expressed to him more than once my anxiety, and my belief that Federation of the Free was more worthy of his mettle. It is now forgotten that at the height of the fame his Crime Investigation Committee had brought him, he resigned as its chairman. He tied this to his responsibility as sponsor of the Atlantic Union resolution, in a statement on March 24, 1951. The Korean war was then on, and he explained to his constituents: "Tennessee boys are dying on foreign battlefields and I believe this plan I proposed may provide the answer we pray for. I consider it my bounden duty to turn my efforts and time from local and national crime to international crime."

Freedom & Union featured this on its May 1951 cover, but the mass media gave it scant if any attention. The cause to which he turned has brought Senator KEFAUVER so little publicity, thus far, that, as has been noted, outside Tennessee his obituaries rarely mentioned his Atlantic Union role. Such was this "canny politician bent on building up a personal following."

The second example I would cite came in 1959. The outlook for congressional approval of the Atlantic Convention proposed—which Foster Dulles had blocked when he became Secretary of State—had improved enough to make its supporters, including Senator KEFAUVER, believe it might win, and therefore should be reintroduced. Far from seeking to cash in on his early work, he advised the resolution's supporters that, because of hostility he had roused on other issues and the fact that he was not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, it would be wiser to get a member of that committee to introduce it.

In the interest of the resolution, he stepped aside for Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who became its chief sponsor, and Senator FRANK CHURCH, who became its floor manager. ESTES continued to work as hard for it in the ranks as when he was out in front. Without him it would not have passed the Senate as it did in 1960—and I happen to know that it was his influence behind the scenes that gave it the Republican support it needed to clear the Rules Committee and reach the floor of the House, where its victory was clinched. Such was the character of ESTES KEFAUVER.

WHERE WE DIFFERED

Devotion to principle did not blind him to the values of compromise. In my view he was too ready, after the failure of the first years of head-on onslaught for the Atlantic Union resolution, to follow those who urged that the way to get it through was to water it down. At times I differed strongly with him on strategy. We agreed on the need to accept some compromises to get action while insisting on enough of the essential to make the action worthwhile. We differed only on the degree this involved. I was readier than he to risk losing the battle than to win it in a way I thought risked losing the war.

There was truth in both views: The resolution did win approval, as he hoped, in the weakened form that he found safe—and that in the end I supported, partly from respect for his judgment and partly from necessity. But, as I feared, the resulting convention held in January 1962 fell woefully short of what we both had sought. Though ESTES would go farther than I in such compromising, I know his willingness came from no weakening of his devotion to Atlantic Union.

STARTING KEFAUVER SERIES

The story of Senator KEFAUVER's work for Atlantic Union is too great to be told now, and too impressive, inspiring and filled with human interest not to be told later. And so, in succeeding issues, we shall tell more of it. We shall accompany the series with documents, beginning now, where we give the text of his first major Senate speech on Atlantic Union. Only 11 days after his

death, the New York Times found occasion to note: "The loss of Senator KEFAUVER seems greater today than it did when death struck him down." As the true story of his work for Atlantic Federation becomes better known, that comment will swell into a chorus, and his stature will loom even greater.

HIS 1948 COMMITMENT

In his hometown, Madisonville, Tenn., named for the "Father of the Federal Constitution," where ESTES was buried, he made on June 5, 1948, his first public commitment to Atlantic Union. Announcing his candidacy for the Senate, he said:

"I have studied the matter very closely. I am convinced that the one real way that we can have peace in the world is to join in a kind of federation with the other freedom-loving peoples.

I feel that the statesmen of these democracies should work toward this program, just as the statesmen of our Nation worked toward building 13 States into the Federation which grew into the great United States of America. It is going to take work, a lot of prayerful thinking, and moral and religious regeneration. But it is not only possible, it must be done."

FINAL TESTIMONIAL

Fifteen years later, I would testify in the words of Timothy: "He fought a good fight, he finished his course, he kept the faith." And I would add these words with which the Associated Press ended its report of the burial of Senator KEFAUVER on August 13:

"As thunder rolled, the coffin was removed by an Air Force honor guard to the graveside. Lightning flashed as the casket was lowered, and when the family turned from the grave, a heavy downpour began."

In a way that would have seemed fitting to the ancients, the noblest Roman of them all passed, into history.

CLARENCE STREIT.

[From Freedom and Union, October 1963]

HOW KEFAUVER SUBMITTED FIRST ATLANTIC CONVENTION BILL

Senator KEFAUVER introduced in the Senate the first Atlantic Union resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) on July 26, 1949, on behalf of 20 Senators, a bipartisan group which grew to 21 a little later when Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY (now assistant majority leader) joined it. It comprised 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans—the latter including Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

The identical resolution was introduced the same day in the House, where its leaders thought it better strategy to limit sponsorship to these five: Hale Boggs (Democrat of Louisiana, now assistant majority leader), Clifford Davis, Democrat of Tennessee; Walter H. Judd, Republican of Minnesota; George A. Smathers, Democrat of Florida; now a Senator; and James W. Wadsworth, Republican of New York.

Of the 26 who cosponsored the resolution in both Houses only 8 now remain in Congress: Senators FULBRIGHT (now chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee), LISTER HILL, HUMPHREY, SMATHERS, JOHN J. SPARKMAN, MILTON R. YOUNG, and Representatives BOGGS and DAVIS. In reporting the introduction of the resolution, the September 1949 Freedom and Union said:

"The first official step toward union of the free has been taken, at long last * * * Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, pioneer free federalist in Congress, introduced this resolution * * * on behalf of the largest number in that body to back any proposal in this field. The group is impressive for its quality, too. Outstanding among the influential leaders in it is Senator Walter F. George, Democrat, of Georgia, rated as one of the three most powerful men in the Senate.

"He is not only chairman of its important Finance Committee but ranks next to Chairman Connally in the Foreign Relations Committee to which this resolution has been referred.

"Impressive, too, is the resolution's sponsorship in the House. There its outstanding leader is a Republican James Wadsworth of New York. A veteran of the Spanish war, he has at 72, the distinction of being the only Member of the House (where he has served since 1933), who has also served in the U.S. Senate (1915–27). [He] is acknowledged to be one of the most influential men in both Houses.

"The Atlantic Union resolution is off to a flying start—but it is not a day too soon that it has come officially before Congress and the world. It is now a little more than 10 years since the United States was first publicly urged to invite the other North Atlantic democracies to a Federal Constitution Convention.

"More than half of that decade was spent in world war, at a cost of millions of lives, thousands of billions of dollars. The war ended in complete military victory, in 'unconditional surrender,' and in the U.N. and a flock of other world organizations.

"The net result? A figure or two may suffice. In August, 1939, the U.S. Congress passed a defense budget that then set a peacetime record; it totaled $1,614 million * * *. The 1939 figure was only about one-tenth of the U.S. defense budget 10 years later.

Federal taxes alone in 1949 were five times greater than in 1941, but the U.S. production total in the same period merely doubled * * *. This means that the tax burden on production is now two and a half times what it was. Production now is falling, but Government expenditure is still rising.

" 'Some less costly road to peace than the one we are now following must be found,' as Will Clayton says, and the road he points to—Atlantic Union—must be taken with the least delay."

The Senate held hearings on the resolution in February 1950, but the Foreign Relations Committee took no action, deciding—after the Korean war began—to wait and see. The resolution dying that session, Senator KEFAUVER reintroduced the same text in 1951 on behalf of 27 Senators, including most of the previous group plus such additions as Senators George Aiken, Frank Carlson, Richard Nixon, Herbert Lehman, Russell Long and John McClellan. The House sponsors numbered seven and included Christian A. Herter (later Secretary of State) and Mike Mansfield (now Senate majority leader).

(There follows the text of the statements Senator KEFAUVER made on the floor and to the press in introducing the resolution in in 1949, and its text in 1949 and 1951.—EDITORS.)

"Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution on behalf of a distinguished bipartisan group of Senators, to-wit: Walter F. George; Guy M. Gillette; Raymond E. Baldwin; Robert C. Hendrickson; Bert H. Miller; Harry P. Cain; Zales P. Ecton; Lister Hill; John J. Sparkman; J. William Fulbright; Burnet R. Maybank; Edward J. Thye; Garrett L. Withers; Joseph R. McCarthy; Harley M. Kilgore; Virgil Chapman; J. Allen Frear, Jr.; Frank P. Graham; and Milton R. Young.

"The resolution requests the President to invite the other six sponsors of the pact to meet with American delegates 'in a Federal Convention to explore how far their peoples, and other democracies whom the Convention may invite to send delegates, can apply between them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.'

"Its purpose is to permit timely, fruitful investigation of the possibilities of overcoming, through a federal union of the Atlantic democracies, the international difficulties we face. It aims also to give the United States and the cause of freedom and peace the maximum psychological advantages of leadership, without our writing any blank check or incurring any dangerous commitment."

AVOID PIECEMEAL SOLUTIONS

"We face in the Atlantic area, and particularly with Canada, Britain, France, and Benelux, a complex of problems—political, military, economic, monetary—which we are now trying to solve separately, piecemeal, by the ECA, the pact, rearmament, etc. We are also trying to solve them only on a diplomatic or government-to-government basis.

"Calling the proposed convention would not prevent continued efforts along these lines, but it would permit us, in company with the other pact sponsors, to try also to solve this complex of problems by tackling them as a whole, and on the man-to-man basis of our own American Federal Union system. It would commit us to nothing more than an earnest exploration of this way out.

"So great has been the success of the Federal system wherever it has been tried that for us to decide even to explore its possibilities in the Atlantic community would rouse great hope. It would seem wiser to begin this exploration now while we have time to do it carefully, rather than risk waiting until events force hasty, ill-considered action.

"The proposed resolution has the support of many eminent citizens, led by former Justice Owen J. Roberts, president of the Atlantic Union Committee, and its vice president, Robert Patterson, former Secretary of War, and Will Clayton, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

"We who sponsor this resolution in both Houses of the Congress represent the people of many States, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the center to the high North and the Deep South, from the Smokies to the Rockies. We include members not only of both the great parties, but of nearly every important school of thought from conservative to liberal in each of them. Some of us voted for the Atlantic Treaty with great hope, and some with deep misgivings.

"The list of Senators sponsoring this resolution, while diverse in interest and thought, are towers of strength in this great body. Indeed, there is not a Senator in this group who does not have a better claim to the honor of filing this resolution than I do.

"Diverse as this group is, we are united in believing that it is high time we Americans began to explore in a Federal Convention how far we can extend the Federal principles of the United States between the free peoples of the North Atlantic. Even those of us who have the greatest hope in the North Atlantic pact and in the United Nations agree that in a period so full of peril as the present we dare not neglect to explore so promising a way as Federal union to strengthen the dikes against war, depression and dictatorship."

This is the text of the statement to the press Senator KEFAUVER made after introducing the Atlantic Union resolution in the Senate, July 26, 1949:

"I have today introduced in the Senate a concurrent resolution on behalf of Senators (same list as in preceding statement made on the floor), inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a Federal Convention.

"We believe this resolution is in the great line of American history.

"This is a resolution to explore—and what is deeper in America than the spirit of exploring? It was by exploring that brave men discovered this New World. It was by calling a Federal Convention in 1787 to explore how the 13 Original States could be united more effectively than by the feeble Articles

of Confederation that our Founding Fathers discovered the fruitful principles of free Federal union which they embodied in our Constitution—now the world's oldest written Constitution and the one that has brought more freedom, peace, and prosperity to more men and women than any form of government ever did in human history.

"Well, the resolution we sponsor is to explore the possibility of applying these same Federal union principles to unite the democracies of the New and the Old Worlds in a great union of the free—to explore whether we may not thus find, and lead humanity along, the way to that better, happier, freer world which mankind has been vainly seeking by other routes, and for which the lives of so many men have been sacrificed in two World Wars in our time."

[At this point the statement inserted several of the paragraphs of the above speech which Senator KEFAUVER made on the floor in introducing the resolution—EDITORS.]

"Too often already our hopes have failed us. Too often since Pearl Harbor we have been forced into precipitate action by the failure of our hopes. We, too, can be forced to offer union overnight, as the British were at Dunkirk,—but this is not the way our forefathers built this great Union of ours. It is easy to speed from makeshift to makeshift, but to build an enduring union, to build anything enduring, takes time.

"Whatever we may think of the North Atlantic Treaty, it does gain us time. The question is: how shall we use this time? We who sponsor this Atlantic Union resolution agree in proposing that we use that time to begin without delay to explore the possibilities of oceanic federation now, while we can explore them with careful prudence.

"We should stress that this proposal does not prevent us from continuing the present efforts to solve by other methods the problems confronting us. But why should these efforts prevent us from exploring the Federal Union solution? When our scientists tackled the problem of harnessing atomic energy, they tackled it in four different ways at once. Should we not learn from that example?

"The fact is that we Americans face in the North Atlantic area with Canada, Britain, France, and Benelux, not one problem but a complex of problems.

"Not only are we still relying on the piecemeal technique which Secretary Marshall justly condemned in his celebrated speech, but we are confining our efforts to the diplomatic, or government-to-government approach. We approached this complex of problems piecemeal first on a universal government-to-government basis, through Bretton Woods, the International Bank and Fund, the United Nations, the International Trade Organization, the Baruch plan. When that approach didn't work, we got down to the heart of the problem in the North Atlantic area—but still we tackled each side of it separately on this government-to-government diplomatic basis, in the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, the rearmament program.

"The Atlantic Union Resolution would not, I repeat, prevent continued efforts along these lines, or any of the variations of them that have been proposed in other resolutions. But it would permit us to try also to solve this complex of problems by tackling them (1) as a whole; (2) in company with the Canadian, British, French, and Benelux democracies with whom we share most closely these economic, military, monetary, and atomic problems, and who sponsored with us the North Atlantic Pact; and (3) on the man-to-man Federal Union basis of our own U.S. Constitution."

SHOULD TRY AMERICAN APPROACH

"Surely this practical, 100 percent American approach should not be the one approach to the problem that we should refuse even to try.

"This is the approach that led our forefathers to our Federal Constitution. Much was said of that Constitution in our recent debate in the Senate on the Atlantic Pact, but as I pointed out then it seemed to have been forgotten that our Constitution is itself not a domestic but a foreign policy. It originated as a fundamental foreign policy to govern the relations of sovereign States with each other. It began as an answer to the type of problem we and the other Atlantic democracies now face, how to secure our liberty without another war.

"Our fathers took the Federal Convention road that led to our Constitution when attempts to solve piecemeal their political, economic, and monetary problems failed. We forget that an alliance—the Articles of Confederation, in some respects stronger than the North Atlantic Treaty—failed miserably even among 13 States whose people had more bonds in common than the 12 signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty.

"The dangers of war, depression, unemployment, inflation, led these earliest Atlantic democracies to meet in a Federal Convention in 1787 'as the deputies of 13 independent, sovereign States.' There they worked out our Federal Constitution as the solution of their economic, political, monetary, moral, and spiritual complex of problems, as their common foreign policy, the basis of their future relations with each other.

"Whereas the Articles of Confederation, like the North Atlantic Treaty, formed a mere alliance of governments, the Constitution of the United States formed by a Federal Union of their people. By it they divided powers between the democratic Union government and the separate democratic State governments, with a view to securing thereby the freedom, prosperity, and peace of all their citizens, and keeping all governments, State or Union, obedient to them.

"This citizen-to-citizen Federal Union policy made the people of the 13 States strong enough to survive the Napoleonic wars. With it they put the dollar, then not 'worth a continental,'—on a solid foundation, changed bankruptcy to boom, converted depression into the most fabulous prosperity humanity has ever known.

"Since then, every generation of our people—with one exception—has gone on extending to more States and more men this policy of Federal Union—this policy of an expanding common free government, a common defense force, a common currency, a common postage stamp, a common free market, a common bill of rights, and a common guaranty that the people of each State in the Union, strong or weak, should govern themselves as they pleased in every field they did not expressly transfer to the Union.

"The one exception, the one generation that has not extended the area governed by this Federal Union policy that converts foreign relations into domestic relations and aliens into citizens, that generation is our own. We have forgotten that our Constitution began as a foreign policy, as a solution of an interstate economic, monetary, political, and moral problem. We have tried everything but this—and for all our plans and policies, all our debts and all our dead, we find ourselves today, after two world wars, with recovery receding and bankruptcy threatening part of the free, facing a more dangerous depression, a more formidable dictatorship, a third and more disastrous war.

"Is it not time to remember that our Constitution is a great foreign policy, and to explore how we can apply its principles to unite all the free?

"This resolution would but carry out the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty. By its second article we are now committed, as are all its parties, to 'contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being.' How can we Americans prove more convincingly that we are determined to carry out this treaty than by inviting its cosponsors to study with us the Federal Union principles on which our own freedom is based?

"The application of these federal principles among the Atlantic democracies raises, of course, difficult problems. But it would seem foolish to let one's attitude toward this resolution depend on such questions as how the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of an Atlantic Union should be formed, and exactly what powers should be transferred to it, and by what transition measures, and what powers should be guaranteed to each nation in the union. These questions deserve earnest consideration, but to let anyone's answer to them prevent us from calling the convention would be the height of folly. The only answers to these questions that can have real weight are those that a federal convention itself reaches.

"EXPLORE NOW OR WAIT FOR CRISIS?

"The only question this resolution raises really is this: Is it wise, or unwise, to call a Federal Convention to bring us answers to all these other questions? Shall we now finally begin to explore the one way out of our troubles that we have not yet even explored? Or shall we continue to neglect this way which all our history teaches us to trust? Shall we begin this exploration now, while we have time to do it carefully? Or shall we take a chance, wait until events force us to move?

"That, I submit, is the only question today—and all the unhappy surprises we have suffered in recent years would seem to leave but one wise answer to that question.

"All this resolution commits us to is to explore earnestly and honestly the possibility of federating with other democracies on the basis of our own constitutional principles. True, a Federal Convention implies a constitutional convention, but impressive as that term is, such a convention cannot possibly commit those who call or attend it to anything more than a serious effort to work out a better system of governing their mutual relations than the existing one. Democracy itself forbids any democracy to commit its people to any constitution before they have seen it. Democracy requires us and every democracy to reserve to the people the right to ratify or reject any agreement or constitution a Federal Convention may draft.

"By calling this Federal Convention we can lose nothing whatever, and we can gain more than anyone can imagine.

"So great has been the success of the federal union system wherever tried, so immense is its prestige, that for us merely to offer to begin to explore its possibilities in the Atlantic community would awe dictators and put new heart in the free more than anything else within our practical reach. By this act we thus tackle, too, the moral and spiritual side of our problem.

"In World War I we sought freedom—but without union. We came to World War II, and again we sought freedom—without union.

"In the hall where the Senate now sits, Daniel Webster first enunciated the immortal principle of 'Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable.'

"It moves me deeply as a southerner, speaking today for so many northerners, too, to propose on behalf of us all this resolution that returns to the principle that made us a people, and that proclaims over the ocean, 'Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable.' "

[From Freedom & Union, October 1963]

TEXT OF ORIGINAL (1949) ATLANTIC CONVENTION RESOLUTION

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have declared themselves "determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law," and "resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security"; and

Whereas they have agreed in article 2 of that treaty to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being" and to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them"; and

Whereas the principles on which our American freedom is founded are those of Federal union, which were applied for the first time in history in the U.S. Constitution; and

Whereas our Federal Convention of 1787 worked out these principles of union as a means of safeguarding the individual liberty and common heritage of the people of 13 sovereign States, strengthening their free institutions, uniting their defensive efforts, encouraging their economic collaboration, and severally attaining the aims that the democracies of the north Atlantic have set for themselves in the aforesaid treaty; and

Whereas these federal union principles have succeeded impressively in advancing such aims in the United States, Canada, Switzerland, and wherever other free peoples have applied them; and

Whereas the United States, together with the other signatories to the treaty, has promised to bring about a better understanding of these federal principles and has, as their most extensive practitioner and greatest beneficiary, a unique moral obligation to make this contribution to peace; and

Whereas the United States and the other six democracies which sponsored the treaty have, by their success in drafting it and extending it to others, established a precedent for united action toward the attainment of these aims, and the creation of a free and lasting union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet with delegates of the United States in a federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

KEFAUVER WILL BE BEST REMEMBERED FOR PIONEERING ATLANTIC UNION

(By Edward J. Meeman)

A great heart snapped because it tried to do too much.

Though he seemed to do it all easily, there must have been a strain which did not show on the surface.

I was one of many whom ESTES KEFAUVER took inside that big heart, and I feel that I learned to know him well.

I first met him when he was representative from Chattanooga. What he talked about, and earnestly, was the need of reforming the procedures in Congress, ideas which he expressed in his book, "Twentieth Century Congress."

Then and there I decided he was a statesman, for there were few votes to be gained by reforming the rules of Congress.

So when he told me he was going to run for the Senate, and asked me to get some Memphis people together to meet him, I was glad to do so.

He said he would fight Ed Crump, the political boss and dictator of Memphis.

"Don't do that," I advised. "One candidate after another has made Crump the issue and that negative policy has failed.

"Just come to Shelby County and present yourself and your program, appeal to the people for their votes as you have a right to do. Don't fight Crump, but if Crump fights you, as I think he will, fight back."

Crump did blast ESTES KEFAUVER, and the candidate fought back. Crump likened him to a pet coon, that goes rummaging in the bureau when you are not looking.

"I may be a pet coon," ESTES rejoined, "but I am not Mr. Crump's pet coon."

The battle was on.

I learned ESTES was about to put on a coonskin cap.

"Don't do that," I pleaded. Such showmanship was distasteful to me.

He ignored my advice, and the whole world knows how effective the stunt was.

ESTES KEFAUVER won. The Crump dictatorship which had ruled Memphis with an iron hand, and had handpicked governors and senators, was smashed, though Crump continued to be a political leader of prestige until his death.

A statesman, they say, must first prove to be a politician who can get elected.

But once elected Senator KEFAUVER proved he was at heart a statesman.

To get the essential support of Edmund Orgill, Memphis wholesale hardware merchant, Senator KEFAUVER had to convince Mr. Orgill he was for Atlantic Union, for it was only to advance this cause that Mr. Orgill was willing to enter politics.

Senator KEFAUVER did pledge himself to advocate Atlantic Union.

But, if he had been merely a politician, how easy it would have been for him to make one speech, introduce a resolution for it, say, "I'm sorry but you see the time is not ripe," and abandon the effort.

But ESTES had become convinced that organic union of free democratic nations of North America and Western Europe was necessary to overcome communism.

He worked for it, fought for it. When, in campaigns, demagogues attacked him for it, he did not flinch.

He was a speaker in demand throughout the country. He could choose his own subject, and often he chose to speak in behalf of Atlantic Union.

He was the principal architect and the leading American figure in organizing the NATO Parliamentarians Conference which has been meeting every year since 1955, the Atlantic Congress of 1959, and the Paris Conference of 1961.

There is an Atlantic Council at work today, with all three living ex-Presidents as its honorary chairmen, and Senator KEFAUVER gets the credit.

The "Parliament of Man" he achieved before his death. The Federation of the Free should come soon from causes he set in motion, and be his monument.

Senator KEFAUVER's exposure of gangsters and his fight on monopoly were spectacular.

But I will wager that he will have a great place in history as the statesman who, more than any other, pioneered in behalf of the Federation of the Free.

KEFAUVER, THE IRREPLACEABLE MAN

(By Elmo Roper)

Most of us have been reared to believe that there is no such thing as the indispensable man—and yet somehow words approximating those must be found to describe Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. Certainly the phrase which all those who labored for Atlantic Union can agree to is that he was the irreplaceable man.

In writing about ESTES KEFAUVER, it's hard to know where to begin. Perhaps one should begin with his courage. He never hesitated to take an unpopular position when he believed it was the right one. He was the first man in the Congress of the United States to take a public stand for Atlantic Union—at a time when such a view made him solitary indeed. Born in the Old South, he was uncompromisingly devoted to equal rights for Negroes. However much one might have disagreed with any of his views, I doubt if anyone can be found who would deny that most of his positions required courage of the highest order.

But one might as easily begin with his loyalty, his steadfastness. Over the years he never wavered in his support of Atlantic Union, publicly or privately. Called a "nigger-loving one-worlder," in the middle of a hot political campaign, he took the epithet calmly in stride and retreated not an inch from his convictions. Everything he ever told me he would do, during the long battle for congressional acceptance of the idea of an Atlantic Citizens Convention, he did. In a profession of easy promises, he kept every one.

Yet a very good case could be made that the first thing one should mention in connection with Senator KEFAUVER was his vision. Many years ago he realized that rivers, mountains and oceans, color of the skin, and religion were unnatural boundaries for governments. To let any of them assume the unnatural importance they have come to have in this 20th century was to invite—at worst—continued wars and—at best—continued costly rivalries. In a world shrunken by fast transportation and faster communications and where men know how to destroy centuries of civilization in minutes, some stronger cement was needed to bind men together. To ESTES KEFAUVER that more binding cement was a belief in the dignity of every human being. On that foundation, he would have built a broader, more enduring government than this planet has ever seen.

Perhaps the underlying source of ESTES KEFAUVER'S strength was his ability to stand alone. During his time in the Senate, he never did anything out of a desire to become a "member of the club" nor did he tailor his views to assure reelection to that exclusive body. He was guided solely by the inner force of his own reasoning powers—which were formidable, coonskin cap to the contrary. No outer force had the power to alter his convictions—or his actions. I suppose what I am describing is, very simply, a man of complete integrity.

Yet there was nothing out of character in ESTES KEFAUVER'S walking up the streets of little towns all over America and greeting people with, "I am ESTES KEFAUVER, I am running for the Presidency and I would like to have your support." He was in tune with the aspirations of all mankind—even though he was one of mankind's most exceptional products.

And for many of us, grief over the death of a great man is compounded by the fact that he was to our cause the irreplaceable man.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] was unable to be present today. He asked me specifically to express his own sorrow and his tribute to the late Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, but also to say that at a later date he would express his tribute.

Mr. President, on behalf of the family of the late Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, I

wish to express their gratitude to the many Senators who paid tribute to his life and his service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that sundry editorials and resolutions from among the many published throughout the country, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Nashville Tennessean]

A DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANT

Upon learning of the death of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, a great many Americans across this broad land knew they had lost a great and stalwart friend in Congress.

Senator KEFAUVER had so often spoken and fought for the consumer—the little man—that innumerable people across the Nation owe him a debt of gratitude.

The tall man with the rough-hewn features belonged to Tennessee, but in a larger sense he belonged to the Nation and the countless people who had shaken his hand in primary campaigns and watched his work in the Senate.

A national magazine once said of him in an editorial: "We are not among his constituents but we wish we were. He is the Senate's ablest investigator. In defense of the general public interest he has been diligent, inventive, intelligent, reliable and, above all, courageous."

For almost a quarter of a century, the senior Senator from Tennessee has battled patiently, continuously, and sometimes alone for the people of his State and Nation and, through his connections with the Interparliamentary Union of the Atlantic Alliance, the world.

His efforts were in behalf of their pocketbooks, their homes, their farms, and cities, their basic freedoms, their health and hopes of living in a peaceful world.

Senator KEFAUVER went to Washington believing deeply in certain progressive principles. He was determined to do something about them, and the broad sweep of his record attests to how much he did. He went about his work calmly and conscientiously, and that record has been one of courageous resistance against all sorts of pressure, threats, intimidations, and enticements.

He had his share of defeats, legislative and political. And he knew how to take them with dignity. He saw his hopes go glimmering on the floor of the 1952 Democratic convention, and again in 1956. But he took his reversals with characteristic calmness and in good spirit.

The Senator retained from his presidential battles a most devoted personal following which existed to the day of his death. A Tennessean, visiting in almost any State from New Hampshire to Oregon is certain to find Kefauver admirers.

It is no particular mystery how Senator KEFAUVER was able to retain such a strong grip on the public's affections. Much of the strong feeling aroused by this tall Tennessean with a sincere smile and a hearty handshake was his sense of conviction and dedication about political goals—no matter whether it was a presidential primary or getting to the bottom of drug prices.

Senator KEFAUVER was in effect the underdog fighting for all other underdogs. He was a David among the Goliaths of the trusts, the oil cartel, the big pharmaceutical interests, or the crime syndicate. He plunged into fights where there seemed to be no hope of winning, where lesser men would have faltered and turned back.

In his struggles he incurred some powerful enmities, beginning with the machine of "Boss" E. H. Crump, of Memphis, and being added to when he launched the 1951 Senate crime hearings. In that inquiry he proved that racketeers were infiltrating the big city political machines. His trampling on political toes was to haunt him later, but he suspected as much in the beginning and wasn't deterred.

It was the forthrightness and conviction of Mr. KEFAUVER that cemented a friendship between him and the late Silliman Evans, Sr., publisher of this newspaper from 1937 to 1955. Mr. KEFAUVER wanted to have a greater part in the fight against "Boss" Crump, and decided to give up his House seat and run for the Senate.

He approached Mr. Evans for advice and was told he could count on the newspaper's support if he would make one promise—to shake 500 hands a day until election time. It was a promise Mr. KEFAUVER kept and the Nashville Tennessean became the first major newspaper to give him editorial support for the Senate.

The subsequent victory was political history in Tennessee, and the campaign symbol of a coon-skin cap—made in response to a Crump remark about pet coons—was fixed in the political scene.

This newspaper did not always agree with Mr. KEFAUVER, or he with it. But on basic principles there never was a quarrel. There was never anything but pride for a Senator who ranked with men like George Norris, Bob LaFollette, and others in the quality of statesmanship.

There were occasions when Senator KEFAUVER stood alone or almost alone on a point of legislation, urging in his calm voice a course of wisdom and restraint. In the end, not only the Congress but his critics saw the pertinancy and wisdom of his view.

For example, he fought Senator John Bricker's efforts to hamstring the President's treaty-making powers. Of his stand, Senator KEFAUVER said: "It will not be popular, but I cannot in good conscience idly stand by without opposing what I consider a dangerous amendment which would seriously injure our foreign relations."

His fight lasted for 2 years and in 1954 President Eisenhower came out strongly against the amendment, and it quietly died.

As a Senator, Mr. KEFAUVER will be remembered as one of the all-time greats. As a friend, he will be remembered for countless incidents of thoughtfulness and kindness to so many.

He was a relaxing person with whom to visit, for his most striking characteristic was his unhurried pace, his calm manner and methodical speech. He had that quality of being able to sustain two levels of thought, and his concentration at times was such it was mistaken for absentmindedness or deep gloom.

He could chat with a friend in the folksy, homespun language of the general store, or in legal language while exploring the complex mazes of antimonopoly law. With equal facility he could discuss farm problems at the courthouse square or debate with parliamentarians in Europe's gilded halls.

He was a Roosevelt Democrat, a Truman Democrat, a Stevenson Democrat, and a Kennedy Democrat. And many who followed him in his support of others were first, last, and always Kefauver Democrats.

Senator KEFAUVER's death will be mourned throughout the State and Nation and across the sea. Tennessee's loss is the Nation's loss and that of freemen everywhere.

A courageous and dedicated fighter has fallen. The gaping void left by his passing will not be easily filled, for such men come along but seldom.

Senator KEFAUVER has, by his total commitment to public service, human welfare, and better government, left his mark on the pages of contemporary history and in the hearts of all his countrymen.

[From the Chattanooga Times, Aug. 11, 1963]

KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE, 1903–63

On the threshold of another quarter-century of internationally recognized service in the U.S. Congress, ESTES KEFAUVER suddenly is cut down. A fighting heart has stopped. It is with a deep and stinging sadness that we note the death of a great Chattanoogan, Tennessean, and American.

East Tennessee courage, determination, and ability drove ESTES KEFAUVER to follow the counsel of poet John Donne: "Go and catch a falling star * * *." He reached high. And he found a towering place indeed.

Not soon will that place be filled, if ever. For his advent to the Senate 15 years ago, after a decade as the Third District Representative in the House, marks a distinct political era in State history; an era now ended.

Senator KEFAUVER's election in 1948—one of many races which stamped him as a campaigner without parallel in Tennessee, and which subjected him to fearful strain—eliminated the Nation's last statewide political machine. His service in bringing representative government to Tennessee was signal among his accomplishments.

Service had long since become his life. As a boy in Madisonville; as a popular University of Tennessee student; at Yale Law School where he paid his own way, he worked to that end.

It was in Chattanooga, as a young lawyer, that his concepts of service were refined and oriented. As chairman of the county planning commission and in numerous other activities he won, in 1937, the Jaycee Young Man of the Year award. Many more honors were to come.

By 1946 he had been named by Collier's magazine as one of the 10 outstanding Members of the House. The first of his two books (the other was "Crime in America"), "20th Century Congress," had been termed "must reading" by Bernard Baruch. In its plea for more efficient congressional machinery, it revealed him as a serious student of government with a broad grasp of the democratic function.

During his sponsorship of countless bills aimed at progress and reform, he was named by Time as one of the 10 best Senators.

And only last Thursday in the Senate, his detailed arguments on the communications satellite issue filled 10 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He went down as he would have desired, a vigorous battler for principles in which he believed. Throughout his entire career his actions were open and above board. He was not a straddler. Often, he was clairvoyant in his approach to the divisive and controversial questions, such as human relations. He earned both the enmity of powerful groups and parochial epithets of anti-South. But history will judge him, we are sure, as southern, and American, to the core.

During two mighty, fascinating efforts for the presidency, in 1952 and 1956, no one seemed for him but the people. He stormed the primaries, and lost in the smoke-laden rooms.

The voters became acquainted with, and liked, his soft tones and his unassuming directness, his gentle manner and dogged pursuit.

As Democratic nominee for vice president in 1956, he drew further distinction to his State.

He was dedicated from youth to the ideals and objectives of the Tennessee Valley Authority. And in his passing, the TVA has lost perhaps its best and most influential friend.

He took an active role in constructive legislation involving every phase of domestic life, as the news columns attest. These efforts alone, climaxed in his crime investi-

gations, made him known in every capital of the world.

But he was equally concerned with the future and strength of the free world. As an original supporter of the Atlantic Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, he styled himself forthrightly and commendably as an internationalist. Often a delegate to world parliamentary councils, he never spared himself in his hectic travels.

It was not easy to capture the essence of ESTES KEFAUVER. There were times when turmoil and relentless pressures of public life closed in around and depressed him. When the campaigns seemed to offer imposing or impossible odds, there occasionally was a withdrawal that accompanied his continuous handshaking.

Incredibly, and sustained by a basic love for people in the mass, he bounced back time and again.

From his boyhood in Madisonville, in the shadow of the Great Smokies, there was about him a friendliness, a strength, and a stern independence of thought that thrust him toward prominence.

By 1960, when he won his third Senate term, he had appeared to achieve that illusory status, political invincibility in the State—despite his implacable enemies. But his punishing life had taken its toll. And today, with 3½ years of his term yet to run, he is gone.

ESTES KEFAUVER carries with him the respect and affection of thousands, even of those who frequently disagreed with him. He has been a force for good in the Nation and in the world. As the late, conservative Republican Senator Charles Tobey, of New Hampshire, said of him, he "had in his heart a need of decency in America." We, who have followed him since the early days, shall treasure his memory.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Aug. 11, 1963]

ESTES KEFAUVER

Death has cut short the career of ESTES KEFAUVER, senior Member of the Senate from Tennessee.

While his ideologies were sometimes at variance with those of the Commercial Appeal, Senator KEFAUVER was a man of great energy and determination who made his mark in the Nation's political philosophy.

He will be long remembered for his exposure of the crime overlords, for his antitrust investigations, for his advocacy of greater cooperation among the North Atlantic powers, for unwavering support of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for his efforts to reform the electoral college and for his international services in the cause of parliamentary government procedures.

The unusually tall form with outstretched hand became known through vast areas of the country, as well as in Tennessee, in his indefatigable campaigning. He was a master of the handshake and the personal letter, and, at the other extreme, one of the first to build his political image by means of television news.

Let it also be noted that ESTES KEFAUVER was a compassionate man, willing to stop and help a person in need of his special services even when that person was among his political opposition.

ESTES KEFAUVER was distinguished as a student at the University of Tennessee, took his law degree at Yale, and became an attorney in Chattanooga. In 1939 he began to attract some statewide notice when he was named to the finance commissioner post in the cabinet of Gov. Prentice Cooper. A few months later he resigned to become a candidate for the House, following death of Representative Sam McReynolds. He won and was a Member of Congress continuously until his death.

In 1948, he won nationwide attention. E. H. Crump undertook to replace a Senator, who declined to bow out. The old Senator and the new Crump candidate divided votes previously united and the independent Member of Congress, Representative KEFAUVER, wearing a coonskin cap as a symbol of defiance, moved to the upper House.

He was untypical of Tennessee political figures and he was a "loner" in Washington, where length of service, committee compromises, and trading for votes are the normal routes to high standing.

With this background in politics it is all the more remarkable that Senator KEFAUVER twice came close to the presidential nomination of the Democratic Party. In 1952, he was the leading candidate on the first convention vote and he gained strength on the second. In the 1956 convention he defeated Senator John F. Kennedy for the vice presidential nomination.

The Kefauver appeal was that of the single human being standing up to the great strength of organized politics, and big business, and all of the other powerful forces that bear down on the individual.

He was cast in an original mold and another like him is unlikely to appear soon.

[From the Nashville Banner, Aug. 10, 1963]

SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

Shock and regret mark the passing of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, keenly felt in his home State, and shared throughout the wide circle of his personal and political acquaintance. Tennessee had not known the extent of his ill health, nor was there previous awareness—even on his part—of a serious heart condition.

His career in public life embraced more than a quarter a century, most of it in Congress; first as representative of the Third Tennessee District, and latterly in the Senate. In 1956, he was the Democratic nominee for Vice President as Adlai Stevenson's running mate.

On their senior Senator, fellow-Tennesseans had strong co victions, pro and con. His liberalism, closely allied with that branch of the national party councils, attracted its following—and repelled others. But he did not disguise extreme leanings, and made no pretense of conservatism.

Senator KEFAUVER had his place in the political history of Tennessee and the country. Constituents knew where he stood, and there was no deviation on his part. As a political strategist in his own behalf, he knew the rules of that game, and employed them expertly for his own political survival.

Tennessee knew him, boy and man, for most of his 60 years. His record in public life supplies its own basis for evaluation.

Certainly a public figure does not fall without leaving a void—and there is one today in the State's congressional delegation. To his family, the heartfelt condolences of sympathizers, everywhere.

[Telegram from the Memphis Press-Scimitar]

ESTES KEFAUVER AND THE AMERICAN TRADITION

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who died unexpectedly this morning, came nearer being elected President of the United States than any other southerner since the Civil War.

He handshook himself into presidential primary victories all over the country in 1952, and he was vice presidential nominee in 1956.

But he couldn't quite achieve the Democratic presidential nomination. In large part, this was due to the fact that he did not court the party politicians as much as he did the voters. But also it was his misfortune to make his bid at the time when Adlai Stevenson was charming the delegates. And if he had been nominated, he might well have failed to overcome another charmer—Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower—but it would have been a real fight, for KEFAUVER had his own charm, and he had dogged determination.

KEFAUVER got his big boost into the national picture right here in Memphis when, in 1948, a committee of influential and hardworking Memphians got together to help elect him to the Senate for the first time. They beat the drums for him here and carried the campaign eastward even into middle Tennessee. KEFAUVER didn't win in Shelby that first time, but he got an unusually large vote for any candidate opposed by the Shelby political machine, and it helped him win in a three-cornered race, and his victory, along with that of Gordon Browning for Governor, broke the power of the machine in both Shelby and the State.

KEFAUVER's espousal of the principle that the Western democracies should draw closer together politically and economically in order to be able to stand against Communist aggression won him the support of Edmund Orgill. Orgill, later to become mayor of Memphis, had been converted to the idea of Atlantic Union by Clarence Streit, longtime apostle of a United Atlantic Community of nations.

Orgill was a leader in the Kefauver committee of 1948.

After his election, KEFAUVER introduced a resolution calling for a convention to explore the possibilities of closer union among the peoples of the Atlantic nations. He persisted until such a convention was finally held.

As a Tennessee millhand said during KEFAUVER's third senatorial campaign in 1960, "That fellow (KEFAUVER) really done what he said he would."

KEFAUVER did a lot more in Congress.

He exposed crime in the first televised Senate hearings.

He was one of the first Members of Congress to propose legislation to modernize the electoral college and make it more representative of the will of the people in election of Presidents.

Up to his death, he was waging a continuing fight against the high price of prescription drugs.

Although he was a political power in Tennessee, and kept his own fences mended, he did not seek to form a machine to control State politics in general.

He was content to call on his forces (and they were powerful) only in his own campaigns. His reluctance to pick a Governor candidate last year made it impossible for his friends to get together on a candidate who might have defeated Frank Clement. It was too late in the campaign when he announced his personal support of P. R. Olgiati.

KEFAUVER went his own way. As he said when the late E. H. Crump called him a pet coon in the 1948 campaign, "at least I'm not Mr. Crump's pet coon." He stepped on a good many toes, but that didn't keep him from the path he set for himself.

He did not join with the many southern Members of Congress who signed the southern manifesto in protest against the Supreme Court's 1954 segregation decision. He upheld the Supreme Court decision as the final word as to what is the law of the land. That made him unpopular with many—yet he won reelection handily in 1960.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a politician and statesman in the American tradition of Abraham Lincoln and Cordell Hull. He didn't come up from a log cabin, but he lived as a youth in the upper floor of a store building in the small town of Madisonville, Tenn. He showed ambition and leadership early at the University of Tennessee, where he was graduated in 1924, holding many student offices, including presidency of the student body. He

made a name for himself in the House of Representatives where he served 10 years before aspiring to the Senate.

His shoes are big ones to fill.

KEFAUVER's heart beat sincerely for the world and its people.

[Telegram from the Knoxville News Sentinel]

ESTES KEFAUVER

As are all public figures, ESTES KEFAUVER was *controversial*. He was either admired or heartily disliked. But his admirers far, far exceeded his detractors.

Chief cause of this detraction was his bold, frank and honest position on every issue; often this placed him on the unpopular side. More often than not, however, he turned out to be right.

This Monroe County son, a graduate of both the University of Tennessee and Yale, burst on the public scene back in 1939, when he was appointed State finance commissioner by Gov. Prentice Cooper. In the brief period of his 4 months in that office he instituted a number of reforms that are still on the books. He authored the first State law providing the formula for consolidation of various local governments functions.

Then he went to Congress from the Third District, where he served brilliantly for nearly 10 years before going up to the Senate.

In the House, KEFAUVER quickly established himself as a leader of young turks who saw many weaknesses in the processes of our Government and fought for remedies. One object of a persistent attack has been the outmoded electoral college method of choosing our President. Some day that battle will be won: it is too bad KEFAUVER didn't live to see it.

In 1948 ESTES KEFAUVER teamed up with Gordon Browning, KEFAUVER running for the Senate seat occupied by Tom Stewart and Browning challenging Governor McCord. Both Stewart and McCord were stooges of Ed Crump, who at that time was political boss of Tennessee. KEFAUVER and Browning broke Crump's power and were elected.

It was in that campaign that KEFAUVER gained national attention: Crump called KEFAUVER a pet coon and ESTES capitalized on the libelous phrase by immediately wearing a coonskin cap as he stumped the State.

In his 15 years in the Senate, KEFAUVER took on the big bosses and syndicates of organized crime including the boxing and wrestling rackets; he was a major factor in breaking up monopolistic business combines: He exposed the rigged bidding of huge industrial corporations; and he authored a law (watered down by the opposition before it was enacted) bringing about reforms in the drugs-manufacturing business. He was still fighting his war on the drugs manufacturers at his death; he had through the antimonopoly committee he headed, ordered the companies to bring in their records on price-cutting practices in South America.

In 1952 KEFAUVER ran for the Democratic nomination for President, and came within an eyelash of winning it. He dared to challenge the party leadership, and that proved to be costly. "KEF," as he was called by his close friends, never quite recovered from that disappointment.

Yet 4 years later he came back and won the No. 2 spot on the national ticket with Adlai Stevenson beating out Kennedy. Of course no Democrat could have defeated President Eisenhower that year; Ike even carried KEFAUVER's own State and own voting precinct; threatening clouds of war frightened every parent in America.

Few public figures have had greater personal charm and magnetism than ESTES KEFAUVER. His handshake was his trademark; his memory for names was elephantine. During his political life of nearly a quarter of a century he wrote literally thousands of little personal notes to constituents in Tennessee and to friends all over the world.

Someday, we are confident, historians will refer to ESTES KEFAUVER as one of the outstanding congressional figures of our time.

To his lovely and capable widow, the former Nancy Pigott of Scotland and the three daughters and son, we extend deep condolences; with the vast horde of KEFAUVER friends we join in solemn salute to a dedicated public servant.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 11, 1963]

BATTLER AGAINST BIGNESS

In a period when it was unfashionable to be emotionally involved about anything, ESTES KEFAUVER would come into his Senate office and confide to his staff that he had not slept all night because of worry over some fresh aspect of the centralization of power in big government, big industry, or big labor. He epitomized all that was most valid in the old Populist tradition of concern for individual rights against the suffocating encroachments of bigness. The effervescence of his efforts made him something of an anachronism in the cool atmosphere of the New Frontier, but every American is the beneficiary of his dedication, his indomitability, and the primacy he assigned human values.

The disposition will be to remember him for his much publicized investigations—an image unjust to the substantial legislative accomplishments that are his true memorial. The Kefauver-Celler bill of 1950 tightening antitrust curbs on corporate mergers was the fruit of a 5-year drive. Similar tenacity pushed through the monumental drug reform bill last year—a task that depended for its completion on the thalidomide tragedies but that never would have been entertained at all without his persistence. At his death he was fighting for an inquiry into a trade war obstructing the distribution of low-priced U.S. drugs in Latin America. Undoubtedly the remembrance that would please him most now would be a decision by his Senate colleagues to go ahead with this project he considered essential to the basic aims of the Alliance for Progress—the same aims that illumined his life.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 12, 1963]

ESTES KEFAUVER

One element in the tragedy of ESTES KEFAUVER's death is that it occurred when the Senator was becoming an increasingly effective Member of the Senate.

The Tennessean reached a peak of popularity, no doubt, in his 1951 crime investigation which put his face before millions of television viewers. Thereafter his coonskin cap was in the presidential ring twice, and he won 14 of 17 presidential preference primaries in 1952. But political popularity is not the same thing as political effectiveness, nor does presidential ambition necessarily coincide with accomplishment.

His publicized crime hearings had rather limited immediate results, though they made it easier years later for the Kennedy administration to promote new Federal antiracketeering laws. By contrast, after 1956 Senator KEFAUVER led substantial and fruitful investigations of monopoly practices and also of the drug industry. Having apparently set presidential hopes aside, he concentrated on senatorial tasks at hand, and did well.

Senator KEFAUVER was a self-proclaimed liberal. He was a stanch supporter of the Tennessee Valley Authority for his own region, and of economic legislation benefiting other areas that remained depressed. His foreign policy views were generally enlightened. And no one could question the courage of a southern Senator who, in a vicious 1960 reelection campaign, refused to give an inch of ground to an opponent who attacked him accurately as a civil rights supporter and disreputably as "soft" on communism.

The late boss, Edward H. Crump, called Mr. KEFAUVER a pet coon of advanced causes when he ran for the Senate in 1948. Mr. KEFAUVER replied that "I may be a pet coon, but I'm not Mr. Crump's pet coon." Tennessee voters repeatedly complimented his independence of mind, and we hope the State may do as well in picking his successor.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Aug. 11, 1963]

ESTES KEFAUVER

Only hours before his sudden death at 60, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, was engaged in a spirited debate with his colleagues, this time on the subject of the new Communications Satellite Corp. As usual, though overwhelmingly outvoted on the issue, he spoke as a liberal championing the public interest against what he regarded as the forces of monopoly.

This was the position he adhered to throughout his lively and distinguished career as a Senator. There were many who thought him wrong on more than a few occasions, but he held fast to his views. And there was a time—especially after his famous televised crime investigation in 1951—when a lot of Americans began to think of him in terms of presidential possibilities.

Senator KEFAUVER frankly so thought of himself, and he made no bones about it. Tall, personable, full of vigor, and ambitious, he is said to have set his heart upon the White House as far back as his high school days. And twice—in 1952 and 1956—he did his best (and rather impressively despite the gimmick of the coonskin cap) to win the Democratic presidential nomination. But he lost out both times to Adlai Stevenson. He did manage, however, to beat out a young man named John F. Kennedy for the honor of being Mr. Stevenson's running mate 7 years ago.

It is hard to believe that this man, who only the other day was so energetically arguing for what he believed to be right, is now suddenly gone from us. Whether one agreed with him or not, he was an altogether likable and hard-working legislator respected by all his colleagues. The Senate is the poorer for his passing, and so is Tennessee.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 11, 1963]

ESTES KEFAUVER

Along with Jackson, Johnson, and Cordell Hull, ESTES KEFAUVER will go down in history as one of the memorable political figures from Tennessee. He was like his great predecessors in his Senate seat in one signal respect. During his 9 years in the House and nearly 15 years in the Senate he seldom took a sectionalist view but responded in national terms to the great issues of his time.

Millions of Americans remember ESTES KEFAUVER as the indefatigable presidential hopeful in 1952 and 1956. His large and open hand was as much a campaign emblem as his coonskin cap. Though he had broad popular support—he won 14 out of 17 primaries in 1952—he incurred the wrath of powerful Democrats through his exposure of underworld contacts with political machines. Even so, his rank-and-file following was large enough to gain him the vice presidential nomination in 1956 over John F. Kennedy.

Senator KEFAUVER was among the first to demonstrate the potency of television in politics. His homely visage and soft voice were fixed in the national mind through the televised hearings of his Senate crime investigation in 1950 and 1951. His courage and independence, no less than his halting manner, left an impression on the country—and also irked some of his colleagues in the Senate inner club.

Every legislature needs individualists as well as team players, and if Mr. KEFAUVER was a loner, his insurgency was directed to important purposes. He boldly risked ostracism by refusing to sign the southern manifesto calling for massive resistance to desegregation. As a champion of consumers, he took on steel companies, big drug firms, and even the administration in the case of the Telstar communications corporation. His Senate Antitrust Subcommittee hearings first familiarized the country with the concept of "administered prices" and his relentless effort had much to do with the adoption last year of the drug reform law.

During his years in the House, the lanky Tennessean was especially concerned with problems of procedural reform. Much of what he said then has become freshly relevant as Congress moves slowly to reconsidering the flaws in its mechanical structure.

In his zeal, Mr. KEFAUVER could be mistaken but neither his methods nor his arguments were petty. The fact that he prevailed over the entrenched Crump machine and over envenomed bigots in Tennessee spoke well for his State and his region. He was a big man, and his death leaves a big void.

[From the Daily Post Athenian, Athens, Tenn.]

"THE TALL TENNESSEAN" IS DEAD

America is in mourning.

One of her alltime great sons is dead.

Several years ago this corner dubbed ESTES KEFAUVER, "The Tall Tennessean" but we didn't know how tall he really was until his towering frame crashed in death Saturday morning and a nation felt the tremors.

It is a long way from a rambling white house on Main Street in Madisonville, a little town in east Tennessee, to the White House on historic Pennsylvania Avenue in the Nation's capital. But ESTES almost made it.

In fact, he did make it. Political powers turned him back as its occupant in 1952, but they turned him over to the people and he has occupied their hearts ever since as no man has been able to do.

Perhaps fate denied him the presidency and acclaimed him spokesman for the rank and file of the country.

That's what he was.

From New Hampshire to Florida, from Minnesota to California, from Chattanooga to Seattle, "The Tall Tennessean" was the voice of the man who had something to say and could not be heard above the clamor of the crowd.

KEFAUVER spoke for him.

His message was heard and heeded.

To say that he was always liked would be an injustice to him. At times he was bitterly opposed in his contentions but he never swerved from his course. He never violated his own conscience and never betrayed a cause he represented.

These causes ranged widely. They spread from championing TVA, battling big monopolies for the little businessman, opposing organized crime, supporting congressional reforms, revealing facts in foreign affairs on a national level to establishing a tobacco market, getting appropriations for a bridge over Tennessee River and investigating insurance claims on the local scene.

These things made him a champion.

KEFAUVER parlayed a coonskin cap and a ready handshake into a bareheaded, hard-working trademark which made him welcome on a trout stream in nearby Tellico Mountains or by a bubbling fountain in the gilded halls of Europe.

He was that unique figure in politics known as a loner, but his colleagues, both friend and foe, paid him the tribute of listening and generally voting with him.

Indeed the letter "T" summarizes the life of KEFAUVER—tall, talented, thorough, trustworthy, and triumphant.

There is a quietness now at a rambling white house in Madisonville, Tenn., and a flag of 50 stars is flying at half-mast at the White House in Washington, D.C.

It should be that way.

ESTES KEFAUVER, "The Tall Tennessean," has fallen in death.

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar, Aug. 14, 1963]

KEFAUVER'S HEART BEAT SINCERELY FOR THE WORLD AND ITS PEOPLE

(By Edward J. Meeman)

A great heart has snapped because it tried to do too much. Though he seemed to do it all easily, there must have been a strain which did not show on the surface.

I was one of many whom he took inside that big heart, and I feel that I learned to know it well.

I first met ESTES KEFAUVER when he was Representative in Congress from Chattanooga. What he talked about, and earnestly, was the need of reforming the procedures in Congress, ideas which he expressed in his book "Twentieth Century Congress." Right then and there I decided he was a statesman, for there were few votes to be gained by reforming the rules of Congress.

So when, a little later, he told me that he was going to run for the Senate, and asked me to get some Memphis people together to meet him, I was glad to do so.

He said he would fight Ed Crump, the political boss and dictator of Memphis. "Don't do that," I advised. "One candidate after another has made Crump the issue and that negative policy has failed. Just come to Shelby County and present yourself and your program, appeal to the people for their votes as you have a right to do. Don't fight Crump, but if Crump fights you, as I think he will, fight back."

CRUMP VERSUS KEFAUVER

Crump did blast KEFAUVER, and KEFAUVER fought back. Crump likened KEFAUVER to a pet coon, that goes rummaging in the bureau drawer when you are not looking. "I may be a pet coon," ESTES rejoined, "but I am not Mr. Crump's pet coon." The battle was on.

I learned that ESTES was about to put on a coonskin cap. "Don't do that," I pleaded. Such showmanship was distastful to me. He ignored my advice, and the whole world knows how effective the stunt was.

KEFAUVER won. The Crump dictatorship which had ruled Memphis with an iron hand, and the State with handpicked Governors and Senators, was smashed, though Crump continued to be a political leader of prestige until his death.

A statesman, they say, must first prove himself to be a politican who can get elected. But once elected, KEFAUVER proved that he was at heart a statesman. In order to get the indispensable support of Edmund Orgill, Memphis wholesale hardware merchant, KEFAUVER had to convince Orgill that he was for Atlantic union, for it was only to advance this cause that Orgill was willing to enter politics.

KEFAUVER did pledge himself to advocate Atlantic union.

* * * * *

[From the Delta Democrat-Times, Aug. 12, 1963]

SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

There is much talk about the new conservatism of the South. It certainly exists, but the political life of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER of Tennessee, who died Saturday, illustrated the other side of this political coin. A liberal who never backed away from the full implications of his position, he helped radically change the political structure of his home State in a way which will be hard to alter.

Senator KEFAUVER came to senatorial power, after years of relative obscurity as a Congressman, by taking on the political organization of Memphis political boss Ed Crump and decisively smashing it. Thereafter he was never seriously challenged, although he was an ardent civil rights advocate, persistent enemy of abuses in big business and a favorite of many liberals across the Nation.

He kept his political base at home secure by the kind of 18-hour-a-day, down-to-the-people kind of campaign which reached the mass of the voters even as his policies were alienating many of the men who once dominated Tennessee. He made his reputation as a battler for the little man and as an enemy of organized crime, and the people remembered this when they returned him to office again and again.

ESTES KEFAUVER came close to the presidential nomination once, as close as any southerner has come since his fellow Tennessean Andrew Johnson left the White House almost 100 years ago. He missed, as much because his style of campaigning could not be spread over 180 million people as anything else, but for a moment the Nation's highest political honor seemed within his grasp. Yet while the Nation did not elect him President, the people of Tennessee still demonstrated their loyalty by keeping him in the Senate.

ESTES KEFAUVER is dead now, cut off at an early age as it is measured in the U.S. Senate. Up to the moment of his death he was still battling for the people who elected him, fighting for a curb on what he saw as the abuse of power and control in the drug industry. In his life he proved a southerner of liberal persuasion could be elected. It is a testimonial to his influence that his death will not change this, and that his successor will almost certainly be a man whose political teeth were cut as part of his organization.

STATEMENT BY MR. ARTHUR J. FREUND, CRIMINAL LAW SECTION, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

It is with deep and profound regret that we of the Criminal Law Section of the American Bar Association note the tragic and untimely death of the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, U.S. Senator from the State of Tennessee.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a close personal friend of many of us of this section. He was a constant supporter of our efforts, and he made enormous contributions to the administration of criminal justice. He was a consistent and indefatigable advocate and statesman in the cause of equal justice under the law. It was ESTES KEFAUVER who awakened the conscience of America to the ruthless course of organized crime throughout our Nation. With great courage, he exposed to public view the most notorious participants of this dangerous and devastating group who would destroy the foundations of honest law enforcement. In this, he displayed the skill, energy and dedication, the high degree of intelligence and unceasing devotion that always characterized his long service to his State and country.

ESTES KEFAUVER has, over the years, been a devoted friend of this section of criminal law. He was frequently in consultation with us, and we often came to him for his important assistance. A great statesman in so many varied fields of government, our deceased friend was a lawyer in the highest traditions of our profession and, with all, a courteous, kindly, and friendly gentleman.

We shall miss him, and we shall miss our loyal and competent supporter, and we mourn his loss.

We convey to the widow and children of ESTES KEFAUVER our heartfelt sympathy and condolence, and we authorize our section to appropriately express our sorrow and regret of the death of this great man at the memorial exercises to be held in the U.S. Senate to mark his final departure.

RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, MEMPHIS AND SHELBY COUNTY YOUNG DEMOCRATS ASSOCIATION

Whereas the passing of a statesman of firm and uncompromising ideals, devoted to his calling, his country, and the people whom he served, is always a profound loss to the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, senior Senator from the State of Tennessee, was such a man: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Memphis and Shelby County Young Democrats Association conveys its sympathy to the family of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER on the sad occasion of his untimely death; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, for insertion in the CONRESSIONAL RECORD, and to Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS, dean of the Tennessee congressional delegation.

HAROLD C. STREIBICH,
President.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE IRISH SOCIETY OF MEMPHIS, AUGUST 18, 1963

Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, then Tennessee's most distinguished son, died suddenly at Bethesda, Md., August 10, 1963, after 24 years of superlative service to the Nation and the State of Tennessee in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas Senator KEFAUVER, as Representative and Senator always adhered to that which he believed to be right and best for the welfare of his country regardless of political expediency and was a man of outstanding moral courage and political honesty; and

Whereas this great statesman was a true friend of the Irish Society of Memphis and its kindred organizations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Irish Society of Memphis, That in the death of Senator KEFAUVER this State and this Nation have lost a capable, patriotic, and faithful official and that the society shall always honor his memory; and be it further

Resolved, That the society extends its deepest sympathy to his bereaved family and that his widow be furnished with a copy of this resolution and that copies thereof be transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States.

JOHN T. DWYER,
President.
THOMAS L. ROBINSON,
C. P. J. MOONEY,
Committeemen.

RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF CITY COMMISSIONERS, FARGO, N. DAK.

Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, distinguished senior U.S. Senator from the State of Tennessee, has passed on to his eternal rest unexpectedly shocking and saddening the entire Nation and free men everywhere; and

Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, during his lifetime, distinguished himself as the foremost fighter for good clean government and was renowned as a fighter for the rights of the individual human being without regard to race, color, or creed; and

Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, waged a courageous lifelong battle against injustice and human suffering and fought continually for a better society for all mankind; and

Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, during the course of his distinguished career visited the city of Fargo, N. Dak., on many occasions and had earned the admiration, respect, and friendship of many citizens of our city including Mayor Herschel Lashkowitz, who in 1952 earnestly fought to advance Senator KEFAUVER to the Presidency of the United States and received the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER at a historic gathering in the Red River Valley near Buxton, N. Dak., at which nearly 30,000 people were in attendance, at which time Senator KEFAUVER convinced the people of this area of his knowledge and understanding of our problems and of his deep interest and concern for the well-being of this area; and

Whereas in the year 1957, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER earnestly and devotedly took the floor of the U.S. Senate championing the cause of disaster-stricken Fargo in its recovery efforts following the tornado disaster of 1957; and

Whereas Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, at all times responded to the needs of those in distress wherever the call may emanate and served nobly, courageously, and at great sacrifice to his own health and personal comfort; and

Whereas it is the considered feeling of the Fargo City Commission that ESTES KEFAUVER has earned himself a secure niche in the history of our country as a great American statesman who served his beloved Nation and the cause of mankind with rare devotion and was indeed the very embodiment of the essence of American patriotism and was rightfully recognized as a friend of all mankind in the continuing human struggle for a better society for each and every individual human being no matter where he lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fargo City Commission does hereby express their deep and profound sorrow and sadness upon the untimely passing of that great American statesman, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, who had endeared himself to the people of this area and the city of Fargo by his many acts of friendship and loyalty as manifested throughout the years; and be it further

Resolved, That this expression of sorrow upon the passing of our beloved friend, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, be spread upon the permanent minutes of the Fargo City Commission and that certified copies be forwarded to the family of our dear friend, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, and that copies be furnished to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate, the congressional delegation of the State of North Dakota for introduction into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also to the Governor of the State of Tennessee and the two U.S. Senators from the State of Tennessee, with the request that this resolution be called to the attention of the Tennessee Legislature and the press, radio, and television of the State of Tennessee.

HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
Mayor and President.

Attest:

M. C. FREMSTAD,
Deputy City Auditor.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of its business today, the Senate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, take a recess until 12 noon on Monday.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee considering the so-called arts bill of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to hold hearings on the afternoon of Wednesday, October 30.

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

DIXIE PROJECT, UTAH

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 26) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 566, H.R. 7885.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1963".

PART I

Chapter 1—Policy

SEC. 101. Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) In the chapter heading strike out the words "SHORT TITLE AND".

(b) Section 101, which relates to short title, is repealed.

(c) Amend section 102, which relates to statement of policy, by—

(1) striking out "should emphasize" in the last sentence of the seventh paragraph and substituting "shall emphasize",

(2) striking out "Finally, the" in the first sentence of the last paragraph and substituting "The",

(3) inserting "(including private enterprise within such countries)" immediately after "countries" in the first sentence of the last paragraph thereof, and

(4) adding the following after such last paragraph:

"It is the sense of the Congress that assistance authorized by this Act should be extended to or withheld from the government of South Vietnam, in the discretion of the President, to further the objectives of victory in the war against communism and the return to their homeland of Americans involved in that struggle."

Chapter 2—Development assistance

Title I—Development Loan Fund

SEC. 102. Section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general authority with respect to development loans, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(f) No assistance shall be furnished under this title unless the President determines that the project for which such assistance is requested is taken into account in the eco-

nomic development of the requesting country, including an analysis of current human and material resources, together with a projection of the ultimate objectives of the project with respect to the overall economic development of such country, and specifically provides for appropriate participation by private enterprise."

Title II—Development Grants and Technical Cooperation

Sec. 103. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development grants and technical cooperation, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 211, which relates to general authority, add the following at the end of subsection (a): "No program of technical assistance shall be undertaken under this title unless prior to the commencement thereof the recipient country shall have agreed to accept responsibility for the continuation and financing of such program after the expiration of such reasonable time, which shall not exceed seven years, as shall be specified in the agreement, or unless such program is scheduled for completion within such time."

(b) In section 212, which relates to authorization, strike out "1963" and "$300,000,000" and substitute "1964" and "$225,000,000", respectively.

(c) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) strike out "use, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, funds made available for the purposes of section 211 for" and substitute the word "furnish".

(2) In subsection (b) strike out "to use" and "foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act, for purposes of subsection (a) of this section and for" and substitute "to furnish" before the word "assistance".

(3) Add the following new subsections:

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, such amounts as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the purposes of this section, which amounts shall remain available until expended."

"(d) The President is authorized to use, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act, for purposes of this section."

Title III—Investment Guaranties

Sec. 104. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) In the first sentence after "wholly owned" insert "(determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the parent corporation)".

(2) In paragraph (1) strike out "$1,300,000,000" in the proviso and substitute "$2,500,000,000".

(3) In paragraph (2) strike out "fraud or misconduct" in the second proviso and substitute "fraud, misconduct, or negligence".

(4) In paragraph (2) strike out "1964" in the fourth proviso and substitute "1965".

(b) Amend section 222(a), which relates to general provisions, by striking out "section 221(b)" and substituting "sections 221(b) and 224".

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by striking out "section 221(b)" in both places it appears and substituting "sections 221(b) and 224".

(d) Amend section 222(d), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

"(d) Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under sections 221(b) and 224 of this part, sections 202(b) and 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(b)(3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (exclusive of informational media guaranties), shall be paid first out of fees referred to in section 222(b) as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds, if any, realized from the sale of currencies or other assets acquired in connection with any payments made to discharge liabilities under such guaranties as long as such funds are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds heretofore appropriated for the purpose of discharging liabilities under the aforementioned guaranties, and thereafter out of funds realized from the sale of notes issued under section 413(b)(4)(F) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(c)(2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and finally out of funds hereafter made available pursuant to section 222(f)."

(e) Amend section 222(e), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

"(e) All guaranties issued prior to July 1, 1956, all guaranties issued under sections 202(b) and 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and all guaranties heretofore or hereafter issued pursuant to this title shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States of America. Funds heretofore obligated under the aforementioned guaranties (exclusive of informational media guaranties) together with the other funds made available for the purposes of this title shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims in accordance with section 222(d) of this part."

(f) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b) strike out "$60,000,000" and substitute "$150,000,000".

(2) Strike out subsection (c).

Title V—Development Research

Sec. 105. Section 241 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development research, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section heading and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into the problems of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control."

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

Sec. 106. Title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 251, which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) In subsection (e) strike out "economical" and substitute "economically".

(2) In subsection (f) strike out "Agency for International Development" and substitute "agency primarily responsible for administering part I".

(3) Add the following new subsection (g):

"(g) In order to carry out the policies of this Act, the President shall, when appropriate, assist in promoting the organization, implementation, and growth of the cooperative movement in Latin America as a fundamental measure toward the strengthening of democratic institutions and practices and economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress."

(b) Amend section 252, which relates to authorization as follows:

(1) Insert the following after the words "available until expended": ": *Provided*, That any unappropriated portion, not to exceed $50,000,000, of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year. The funds appropriated pursuant to this section".

(2) Strike out "and which" before ", except for".

(3) Insert following "1963" the second time it appears the words "and not to exceed $75,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in fiscal year 1964".

(c) Amend section 253, which relates to fiscal provisions, by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "All receipts in foreign currencies from loans made under this title or for nonmilitary assistance purposes under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or any Act repealed thereby, shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 612 of this Act or the provisions of any other Act, be available, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, for loans on such terms and conditions as the President may specify to carry out the purposes of subsection (g) of section 251 of this title, and the President may, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, reserve such currencies in such amounts (not to exceed $25,000,000 in any fiscal year) and for such periods as he shall determine to be necessary to provide for the programs authorized by said subsection (g)."

(d) After section 253, which relates to fiscal provisions, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 254. Restrictions on Assistance.—None of the funds made available under authority of this Act may be used to furnish assistance to any country covered by this title in which the government has come to power through the forcible overthrow of a prior government which has been chosen in free and democratic elections unless the President determines that withholding such assistance would be contrary to the national interest."

Chapter 3—International organizations and programs

Sec. 107. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended by striking out "1963" and "$148,900,000" and substituting "1964" and "$136,050,000", respectively.

Chapter 4—Supporting assistance

Sec. 108. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out "1963" and "$415,000,000" and substituting "1964" and "$400,000,000", respectively.

Chapter 5—Contingency fund

Sec. 109. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended by striking out "1963" and "$300,000,000" and substituting "1964" and "$175,000,000", respectively.

PART II

Chapter 1—Policy

Sec. 201. Chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, hereby redesignated "Policy" and section 501, which relates to short title, is hereby deleted.

Chapter 2—Military assistance

SEC. 202. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 504(a), which relates to authorization, strike out "the fiscal years 1962 and 1963" and "$1,700,000,000 for each fiscal year, which sums" and substitute "fiscal year 1964" and "$1,300,000,000, which", respectively.

(b) In section 510(a), which relates to special authority, strike out "1963" in the first and second sentences and substitute "1964".

(c) In section 511, which relates to restrictions on military aid to Latin America, strike out "$57,500,000" and substitute "$50,000,000, of which $25,000,000 may be available during each fiscal year for assistance to an international military force under the control of the Organization of American States".

PART III

Chapter 1—General provisions

SEC. 301. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 601(b), which relates to encouragement of private enterprise, is amended as follows:

(1) At the end of paragraph (3), strike out "and".

(2) In paragraph (4), strike out "wherever appropriate" and insert in lieu thereof "to the maximum extent practicable", and strike out the period at the end thereof and substitute a semicolon.

(3) Add the following new paragraphs at the end thereof:

"(5) take appropriate steps to discourage nationalization, expropriation, confiscation, seizure of ownership or control, of private investment and discriminatory or other actions having the effect thereof, undertaken by countries receiving assistance under this Act, which divert available resources essential to create new wealth, employment, and productivity in those countries and otherwise impair the climate for new private investment essential to the stable economic growth and development of those countries; and

"(6) utilize wherever practicable the services of United States private enterprise (including, but not limited to, the services of experts and consultants in technical fields such as engineering)."

(b) Section 611(b), which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended by striking out "circular A-47 of the Bureau of the Budget" and substituting "the Memorandum of the President dated May 15, 1962".

(c) Section 612, which relates to use of foreign currencies, is amended as follows:

(1) Insert "(a)" after the section heading.

(2) Add at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In order to provide for the foreign currency needs of United States citizens for travel or other purposes, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available for sale for United States dollars to such citizens, at United States embassies or other convenient locations, foreign currencies acquired by the United States through operations under this Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or any Act repealed thereby, or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, which (1) he determines to be in excess of the needs of departments and agencies of the United States for such currencies, and (2) are not prohibited from such use or committed to other uses by agreement heretofore entered into with another country. United States dollars received from the sale of foreign currencies under this subsection shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

(d) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba and certain other countries, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended as follows:

(i) Insert "(1)" immediately after "(a)".

(ii) Add the following new paragraph (2) at the end thereof:

"(2) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act shall be used to furnish assistance (except under section 214) to any country which, by failing (beginning not later than sixty days after enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963) to take such steps as are appropriate:

"(a) permits the further carriage by any ship or aircraft under its registry, to or from Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime or any other Communist regime, of any military personnel, or any arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, or any articles, materials, or supplies, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended; or

"(b) permits the further carriage by any ship under its registry, to or from Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime or any other Communist regime, of any other equipment, materials or commodities, unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is important to the security of the United States and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however,* That this subparagraph (b) shall not apply with respect to the fulfillment of firm commitments of the United States made prior to the date of enactment of this paragraph, nor to military sales under section 508.

The restrictions contained in this paragraph (2) may not be waived pursuant to any other authority contained in this Act or any other provision of law."

(2) Subsection (e) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The President shall suspend assistance to the government of any country to which assistance is provided under this or any other Act when the government of such country or any government agency or subdivision within such country on or after January 1, 1962—

"(1) has nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

"(2) has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

"(3) has imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned,

and such country, government agency, or government subdivision fails within a reasonable time (not more than six months after such action, or, in the event of a referral to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States within such period as provided herein, not more than twenty days after the report of the Commission is received) to take appropriate steps, which may include arbitration, to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange, equivalent to the full value thereof, as required by international law, or fails to take steps designed to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, or conditions, as the case may be; and such suspension shall continue until the President is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken, and no other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

"Upon request of the President (within seventy days after such action referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States (established pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1954, 68 Stat. 1279) is hereby authorized to evaluate expropriated property, determining the full value of any property nationalized, expropriated, or seized, or subjected to discriminatory or other actions as aforesaid, for purposes of this subsection and to render an advisory report to the President within ninety days after such request. Unless authorized by the President, the Commission shall not publish its advisory report except to the citizen or entity owning such property. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amount, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Commission to carry out expeditiously its functions under this subsection."

(3) Add the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(i) No assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis under this Act to any economically developed nation capable of sustaining its own defense burden and economic growth, except (1) to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963, or (2) additional orientation and training expenses under part II hereof during fiscal year 1964 in an amount not to exceed $1,000,000.

"(j) No assistance under this Act shall be furnished for projects establishing or otherwise assisting government-owned manufacturing, utility, merchandising, or processing enterprises in any country or area, except where it clearly appears that goods or services of the same general class are not or cannot be adequately provided by private businesses located within such country or area."

Chapter 2—Administrative provisions

SEC. 302. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)(2) strike out "two shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretaries" and substitute "one shall have the rank of a Deputy Under Secretary".

(2) In subsection (a)(3) strike out "nine" and substitute "ten".

(3) In subsection (b) strike out "paragraphs (2) and" and substitute "paragraph".

(4) In subsection (d)(1) after the words "Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance," where they first appear insert "who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,", and strike out "$19,500" and substitute "$20,000".

(b) Amend section 626(b), which relates to experts, consultants, and retired officers, as follows:

(1) Strike out the entire first sentence.

(2) In the second sentence strike out "Nor shall such service" and substitute "Service of an individual as an expert or consultant under subsection (a) of this section shall not".

(c) In section 631, which relates to missions and staffs abroad, add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) The President may appoint any United States citizen who is not an employee of the United States Government or may assign any United States citizen who is a United States Government employee to serve as Chairman of the Development Assistance Committee or any successor committee thereto of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development upon election thereto by members of said Committee, and, in his discretion, may terminate such appointment or assignment, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Such person may receive such compensation and allowances as are authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, not to exceed those authorized for a chief of mission, class 2, within the meaning of said Act, as the President may determine. Such person may also, in the President's discretion, receive any other benefits and perquisites available under this Act to chiefs of special missions or staffs outside the United States established under this section."

(d) Amend section 635, which relates to general authorities, as follows:

(1) Amend section 635(g) by striking out the word "and" at the end of subparagraph (4); by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and by adding the following new subparagraph:

"(6) in the case of loans under part I (except under section 205), shall establish terms which shall include (A) interest at a rate not lower than three-fourths of 1 per centum per annum during the five-year period following the date on which the funds are initially made available under the loan, and not lower than 2 per centum per annum thereafter, and (B) repayment on an amortized basis, beginning not later than five years after the date any funds are initially made available under the loan, and ending not later than thirty years following the end of such five-year period."

(2) Add the following new subsections:

"(k) Any cost-type contract or agreement (including grants) entered into with a university, college, or other educational institution for the purpose of carrying out programs authorized by part I may provide for the payment of the reimbursable indirect costs of said university, college, or other educational institution on the basis of predetermined fixed-percentage rates applied to the total, or an element thereof, of the reimbursable direct costs incurred.

"(1) No loan or grant in excess of $100,000,000, and no agreement obligating or committing the United States to make a loan or grant in excess of $100,000,000, for the financing of any particular project shall be made or entered into under part I unless such loan, grant, or commitment shall have been specifically submitted to the Congress and specifically approved by Congress."

(e) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out "1963" and "$53,000,000" and substituting "1964" and "$52,000,000", respectively.

Chapter 3—Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 303. Section 644(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to definition of defense services, is amended by inserting "including orientation" after "training" the first time it appears.

SEC. 304. Section 645 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to unexpended balances, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 645. UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Unexpended balances of funds made available pursuant to this Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or Public Law 86-735 are hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated, and may at any time be consolidated, and, in addition, may be consolidated with appropriations made available for the same general purposes under the authority of this Act."

PART IV—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 401. The Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes (Public Law 86-735, 22 U.S.C. 1942 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(a) Insert following the enacting clause "That this Act may be cited as 'The Latin American Development Act'".

(b) In section 2 strike out "$500,000,000" and substitute "$675,000,000".

SEC. 402. Section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-794, approved October 11, 1962) is amended as follows:

(a) Insert "(a)" before the words "The President shall".

(b) Add the following new subsection:

"(b) The President may extend the benefits of trade agreement concessions made by the United States to products, whether imported directly or indirectly, of a country or area within the purview of subsection (a), when he determines that such treatment would be important to the national interest and would promote the independence of such country or area from domination or control by international communism, and reports this determination and the reasons therefor to the Congress."

SEC. 403. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1691 (et seq.)), is amended as follows:

(a) Section 104(e) is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out "25 per centum" and substitute "50 per centum".

(2) Insert after the words "such firms" a comma and the words "and cooperative enterprises,".

(3) Strike out "United States agricultural products" and substitute "United States agricultural and industrial products".

(b) Section 106 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "For the purposes of this title and title IV, the term 'surplus agricultural commodity' shall include any domestically produced fishery product if the Secretary of the Interior has determined that such product is at the time of exportation in excess of domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars."

(c) The amendment made by subsection (b) of this section shall not be effective for purposes of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, until January 1, 1965.

WALTER FRANCIS DILLINGHAM

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a towering, dominant figure in Hawaii's history has passed from the scene. On Tuesday, Walter Francis Dillingham—builder extraordinary, outstanding civic leader and philanthropist—died in Honolulu at the age of 88. His was a life of unsurpassed activity and vigor, and a lifetime of deeply dedicated service to the greater growth and prosperity of his island community. His unbounded energies and talents overflowed to industrial enterprises in the far corners of the globe.

A native son of Hawaii, he lived a life that spanned the full spectrum of Hawaiian history. He was born and raised under a monarchy; he saw the transition of his beloved islands to a republic, to an incorporated Territory under the American flag, and finally to the full stature of a State of the Union. He left his imprint on each period.

He was born in Honolulu on April 5, 1875 during the reign of King Kalakaua. His mother, Emma Louise Smith Dillingham, was the daughter of New England missionaries who came to Honolulu in 1833. His father, Benjamin Franklin Dillingham, arrived in Hawaii at the age of 21 from Cape Cod in 1865.

Walter Dillingham attended Punahou School in Honolulu and Newton High School in Massachusetts. Later, he attended Harvard University with the class of 1902.

In 1904, Walter's father suffered a severe illness and it became necessary for the son to take over the management of his father's business which was in a critical financial stage.

Although not yet 30 years of age, Walter carried the business through the trying financial period and within a few years, assured its success.

He became closely associated with Pacific coast finances, a relationship that proved valuable in the later promotion of many Hawaiian projects.

Throughout the years, he carried on the traditions inherited from his distinguished father, who was known as Hawaii's Empire Builder.

He married Louise Olga Gaylord on May 2, 1910.

During World War I, Walter, a member of the Officers Reserve, was called into the service. Stationed in Washington, D.C., he was detailed to organize training for the Motor Transport Corps.

At the beginning of World War II, the commanding general of the Hawaiian Islands assigned him to organize the Port of Honolulu Army, Navy, and civilian transportation, and, later, to headquarters office of food production for the islands.

All members of his family were in war service during World War II. His son Henry Gaylord, a captain in the U.S. Air Force, was killed in action in July 1945.

Upon his father's death in 1918, Walter succeeded to the presidency of Oahu Railway & Land Co. and other allied Dillingham interests.

The Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd., of which he was president for many years, promoted and carried out all major harbor developments and land reclamation projects in the Hawaiian Islands, including the opening up and development of Pearl Harbor and its naval station. He transformed duckponds and swamplands into house lots, commercial property, and parks; arid areas into rich sugar lands.

Before the start of World War II, by contract with the U.S. Government, Hawaiian Dredging Co. was one of three contracting firms which developed military bases throughout the Pacific.

He practiced the philosophy that in an organization, men should work with, rather than for, management.

He was also connected with the early development of the Los Angeles Steamship Co., which later merged with Matson Navigation Co. He organized the Dillingham Transportation Building, Ltd., which in 1930 constructed a splendid office building in Honolulu as a tangible monument to his father.

He was the guiding hand at the helm of a score of enterprises. These firms laid much of the economic foundation upon which Hawaii grew and prospered in the 20th century. They ranged from banking, newspaper publishing, sugar and coffee production, trusts, insurance, shipping, interisland tug and barge service, dredging, land development, property management, ranching, shopping centers, office buildings, and many more.

In the postwar years, his vision scanned the horizons beyond Hawaiian shores. His firm performed Government jobs in the forward Pacific areas, in Asia and beyond, to as far as the Persian Gulf and the Suez Canal. Today his family corporation is building an airport in Malaya, modernizing an Australian railroad, and dredging an Indonesian harbor. Recently it exchanged 27 acres of Honolulu waterfront for a choice acre of downtown San Francisco and 118 acres of producing sugarcane for an apartment building in Dallas.

Years ago, during a cholera epidemic, he was drafted as an agent of the board of health. He did similar service during a bubonic plague. He led the fight against these dreaded diseases of old with the vitality that characterized his concern, down through the years, for ever greater advancement of the Hawaiian Islands.

His prowess as an athlete in his younger years was widely known, notably in polo. He helped organize and captained many victorious polo teams and played in a number of tournaments on the mainland.

Busy and full as his industrial career was, community service also occupied a large part of his life. His civic and philanthropic interests involved him closely with local and national youth groups, veterans' affairs, educational foundations, chambers of commerce, professional societies, and numerous Government boards and committees.

His philanthropies were numerous, widespread, and generous. The large and imposing Dillingham Transportation Building in downtown Honolulu, which he built, was given to the Kauikeolani Children's Hospital. His magnificent Diamond Head mansion called La Pietra, where distinguished visitors from all over the world were entertained, has been given to Punahou School, his alma mater, the oldest American school west of the Rockies. He had been a trustee of Punahou for over 60 years and chairman of its board since 1945.

Even in his sunset years, Walter Dillingham maintained an active pace. Almost till the very end he moved about in the community he loved so dearly. He was at his office the day before he died.

It was less than 2 weeks ago that I greeted him and shook his hand at a testimonial dinner for Hawaiian Republican legislators, whom I addressed. He carried his fourscore and 8 years on a stalwart frame. He stood tall and erect, a giant among men in stature, as well as in achievements.

All the people of Hawaii mourn his passing. To his charming and gracious wife Louise, equally loved and respected by the people of Hawaii; to his sons, Lowell Smith and Benjamin Franklin II, who are carrying on in the finest tradition of the family; to his daughter, Elizabeth Louise—Mrs. Myron A. Wick, Jr.; to his respected and distinguished brother, Harold, and sister, Mrs. John P. Erdman; and to other members of this illustrious family, we extend our deepest sympathy and heartfelt condolences.

We say to them, mourn not too deeply, for a man like Walter Dillingham can never die. Too much of him lives on eternally. His memory is now enshrined forever in the hearts and minds of the people of Hawaii.

He was a giant whose equal we shall not soon see again. Fortunately for Hawaii and for the Nation we had such a man.

With deepest respect and affection, we say aloha and farewell to a beloved Keiki Hanau O Ka Aina—son of the land—Walter Francis Dillingham.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS IN GUAM, THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. HUMPHREY. 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. 567, H.R. 2073.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2073) to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) upon the request of the Governor of Guam, the Governor of the Virgin Islands, or the Governor of American Samoa, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the government of the territory concerned whatever right, title, or interest the United States has in particular tracts of tidelands, submerged lands, or filled lands in or adjacent to the territory, subject to the limitations contained in this section. The term "tidelands, submerged lands, or filled lands" means for the purposes of this Act all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line three geographical miles distance from the coastlines of the territory, as heretofore or hereafter modified by accretion, erosion, and reliction, including artificially made, filled-in, or reclaimed lands which were formerly permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters.

(b) No conveyance shall be made pursuant to this section unless the land proposed to be conveyed is clearly required for specific economic development purposes or to satisfy a compelling public need.

(c) No conveyance shall be made pursuant to this section until the expiration of sixty calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain) from the date on which the Secretary of the Interior submits to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate an explanatory statement indicating the tract proposed to be conveyed and the need therefor, unless prior to the expiration of such sixty calendar days both committees inform the Secretary that they wish to take no action with respect to the proposed conveyance.

(d) Conveyances pursuant to this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may deem appropriate, and shall be made without reimbursement or with such reimbursement as he may deem appropriate.

(e) The governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa shall have proprietary rights of ownership and the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and the development of the lands conveyed pursuant to this section, but the Secretary of the Interior and such territorial governments shall not have the power or right to convey title to such lands unless the Secretary of the Interior (1) determines that such right to convey is necessary and (2) advises the committee of such determination in the manner described in subsection (c) of this section, and (3) unless the Secretary of the Interior, in proposing to convey such lands to such territorial governments, and such territorial governments in proposing to convey such lands to a third party or third parties pursuant to this section, shall publish notice of such proposed conveyance at least once a week for three weeks in a daily newspaper or newspapers of general circulation in the territory affected by the proposed conveyance. Such published notice shall include the names of all parties to the proposed contract of conveyance, the purchase price, and a general summary of the boundaries of the tract or tracts proposed to be included in the conveyance.

(f) There shall be excepted from conveyances made pursuant to this section all deposits of oil, gas, and other minerals, but the term "minerals" shall not include sand, gravel, or coral.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall have administrative responsibility for all tidelands, submerged lands, or filled lands in or adjacent to Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, except (1) lands conveyed pursuant to section 1 of this Act, (2) lands that are not owned by the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, and (3) lands that are within the administrative responsibility of any other department or agency of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, for so long as such condition continues. In exercising such authority, the Secretary may grant revocable permits, subject to such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, for the use, occupancy, and filling of such lands, and for the removal of sand, gravel, and coral therefrom.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority heretofore conferred upon any department, agency, or officer of the United States with respect to the lands referred to in this section.

SEC. 3. (a) Nothing in this Act shall affect the right of the President to establish naval defensive sea areas and naval airspace reservations around and over the islands of Guam,

American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands which he deems necessary for national defense.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of the lands conveyed pursuant to section 1 of this Act and the navigable water overlying such lands, for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power, or shall be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation, or to provide for flood control, or the production of power.

(c) The United States retains all of its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of the lands conveyed pursuant to section 1 of this Act and the navigable waters overlying such lands, for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources not in derogation of United States navigational servitude and rights which are specifically conveyed to the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa, as the case may be, pursuant to section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, as the case may be, shall have concurrent jurisdiction with the United States over parties found, acts performed, and offenses committed on property owned, reserved, or controlled by the United States in Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. A judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa shall be a bar to any prosecution under the criminal laws of the United States for the same act or acts, and a judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of the United States shall be a bar to any prosecution under the laws of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa for the same act or acts.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the President may from time to time exclude from the concurrent jurisdiction of the government of Guam persons found, acts performed, and offenses committed on the property of the United States which is under the control of the Secretary of Defense to such extent and in such circumstances as he finds required in the interest of the national defense.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain portions of the committee report on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the committee report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purposes of H.R. 2073, as amended, are: (1) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain tracts of submerged lands surrounding the territories of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, upon request of the respective Governors, when the lands are required for a specific economic development or to satisfy a compelling public need, and (2) to grant these governments concurrent jurisdiction over persons found, acts performed, and offenses committed on lands which are owned, controlled, or reserved by the United States in and around these islands.

LAND TRANSFERS

On January 31, 1958, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior held, in his decision (65 I.D., No. 5), that title to the tidelands and submerged lands adjacent to the unincorporated territories of the United States is in the United States; that lands resulting from the filling of tidelands and submerged lands occupy the same status; and that all such tidelands, submerged lands, and filled lands are held in trust by the United States for the use of all of the people, and are not to be granted away in the absence of specific authorization by the Congress. There has been no specific authorization by the Congress permitting the conveyance of or transfer of control over such lands to the territorial governments or to any other parties, except for Public Law 86-664, by which particular filled, submerged, and tidelands were granted to the government of Guam, to be used for certain public purposes. In light of the absence of any general authorization from the Congress, and in light of the Solicitor's 1958 opinion, there is no authority at this time under which any Federal agency might lease or transfer any such land to any of the territorial governments or to any private party. There is consequently no means by which the territorial governments can be encouraged either to develop these lands themselves or to persuade others to do so. There is no incentive to reclaim land which the territorial governments all sorely need and which could, in many instances, be filled at a reasonable cost.

The existing situation poses serious problems for Guam and the Virgin Island, and it will pose equally serious problems for American Samoa to the extent applicable. Guam has a total land area of only 206 square miles and a population of 67,000, giving it a population density of 321 persons per square mile. The Virgin Islands area is 133 square miles, its population 32,100, and its population density 241 persons per square mile. American Samoa's area is 76 square miles, its population 20,100, and its population density 264 persons per square mile. (By way of contrast, the United States, exclusive of Alaska, has an area of slightly over 3 million miles, a population of about 186 million, and a population density of about 62 persons per square mile.)

These figures by themselves make evident the importance of each acre of land that can be reclaimed in Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa and the importance of clearing up title problems and other obstacle that may impede such reclamation as far as the Congress can do so. Add to this that the most valuable and, sometimes, the only feasible sites for many purposes are shoreline locations, and the importance of this becomes still clearer.

Witnesses before the committee presented convincing testimony that certain tracts of submerged areas offered attractive economic development possibilities after filling, if title to the lands could be transferred to the affected territory.

In section 1 of the bill as amended, the committee recommends language which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make conveyances of specific tracts of tidelands, submerged lands, or filled lands when requested by the Governor of the territory. No conveyance may be made until the expiration of 60 calendar days from the date on which the Secretary submits to the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs an explanatory statement indicating the tract to be conveyed and the terms and conditions thereof. Excepted from all conveyances are oil, gas, and other minerals, but not including sand, gravel, or coral. Once lands have been conveyed the territory shall have proprietary rights of ownership, but not the right to convey to a third party unless the Secretary determines that such a right is necessary and so advises the congressional committees, and unless he publishes notice to this effect in a daily newspaper in the affected territory together with full details of the proposed conveyance.

Section 2 of the bill, as amended, puts administrative responsibility in the Secretary of the Interior for all tidelands and submerged lands not conveyed by section 1, except lands owned by the United States or lands within the administrative responsibility of another department.

Section 3(a) provides that nothing in the act will affect the President's power to establish naval defensive sea areas and air reservations around the three territories when he deems it necessary for defense purposes. Subsections (b) and (c) of this section preserve in the United States the same powers with respect to the use and improvement of submerged lands for navigation, power, national defense, flood control, and international affairs as were reserved by the Submerged Lands Act of 1953 in the case of the States.

JURISDICTIONAL PROBLEMS

The House Interior Committee, in its Report No. 222 accompanying H.R. 2073, described the nature of legislative and judicial jurisdiction problems in the territories by the following examples:

"Before this proposed legislation was prepared * * * conferences were held with representatives of the Department of Justice, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Interior. There is general agreement that a long-neglected field of uncertain jurisdiction between the territorial governments and the United States should be clarified by the Congress. The following specific cases will illustrate the problem:

"In *Velasquez* v. *People of Puerto Rico* (77 F. 2d 431 (1935), cert. den. 296 U.S. 602), the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico had been assaulted in his chambers which were located in a building on land owned by the United States. The assailant was prosecuted by Puerto Rico and convicted but the court of appeals held that Puerto Rico had no jurisdiction to prosecute as the land upon which the offense was committed was under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.

"While this provision was under discussion a representative of the Judge Advocate of the Navy had under consideration a situation in which the master of a ship in the Navy harbor in Guam was attacked by a merchant seaman. The Supreme Court has held that the military has no jurisdiction to proceed against civilians under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The Guam police were called but refused to take any action upon the ground that they had no jurisdiction to arrest on a military reservation. This was an offense against the United States and could have been prosecuted by the U.S. attorney but a proper complaint would have been required.

"A taxi fare was taken by the driver to a war-dog cemetery in Guam which had been reserved to the United States under the organic act. There he struck her with a tire iron, placed her in the trunk of the taxicab, drove into a civilian area and threw her over a cliff. If the deceased had died in the war-dog cemetery there is a question as to whether the government of Guam would have had jurisdiction to prosecute him for murder as was done. As the judge in this case, both the attorney general of Guam and the U.S. attorney shared my concern as to jurisdiction. Because of some evidence in the case I held that the deceased was alive when she was driven off the reservation.

"Shortly after the above cases a man lying on a beach with a woman companion was murdered and the woman seriously injured. The accused was prosecuted by the Government of Guam but if the beach was below the high water mark the land would have been owned by the United States and possibly under its exclusive jurisdiction.

"Similar jurisdictional questions arise in the application of civil laws. Guam has a divorce law which requires a 1 year's residence before an action for divorce may be filed. Many divorces have been granted to members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees who reside on reservations. There is respectable authority which holds that in these circumstances no residence can be acquired. There is the possibility that future problems involving estates of divorced persons or the legitimacy of children of second marriages may arise. The pilot case in this field as regards territories which have been given control over property owned by the United States is *Gromer v. Standard Dredging Co.* (224 U.S. 362, 369 (1912), in which the Supreme Court held that 'the relation of Congress to all territorial legislation is similar [certain organic acts of the States being cited] and thus it may be said that the exercise of local jurisdiction for ordinary municipal purposes over a reservation in a territory is valid until or unless disapproved by Congress.' But of course the Supreme Court held * * * that the United States owned submerged land from the low water mark in *U.S. v. California* (322 U.S. 19 (1947))."

Section 4 of H.R. 2073 provides for concurrent jurisdiction by the territorial governments and by the United States over areas within the territories that are owned by the United States. It also provides safeguards against double jeopardy. Legislative clarification of this subject is most desirable because of the uncertainty that has existed in the past.

AMENDMENTS

As passed by the House of Representatives, H.R. 2073 would have placed all of the submerged lands surrounding the territories under the control of the territorial governments with certain exceptions. The bill has been amended to provide that only such tracts as may be needed by the territories shall be conveyed, when justified. It is believed that this method of transfer will result in more orderly economic development in the offshore territories.

The committee has deleted two sections from the House-passed bill relating to amendments to the Organic Acts of Guam and the Virgin Islands that would convey certain property to the two territories. All of the information sought by the committee on the subject could not be made available at this time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain submerged lands to the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes."

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 568, S. 569.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S 569) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958, in order to extend the provisions of title II relating to the cancellation of loans under such title to teachers in private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher learning.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment at the top of page 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Sections 511 and 611 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are amended by inserting before the word "public" the following: "private nonprofit or".

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 section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "elementary or secondary school in a State" and inserting in lieu thereof "or private nonprofit elementary or secondary school in a State, or in an institution of higher education".

SEC. 2. Sections 511 and 611 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are amended by inserting before the word "public" the following: "private nonprofit or".

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the pending bill, which was introduced by me and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], was unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill is designed to eliminate certain inequities in the National Defense Education Act which adversely affect education.

Under present law, not to exceed 50 percent of a National Defense Education Act student loan can be canceled if the borrower, after graduation, becomes a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school.

S. 569 would extend this loan forgiveness clause to student borrowers who later teach in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools or in institutions of higher learning.

This change is in harmony with the philosophy of the National Defense Education Act and is important to the future of American education.

Many highly respected organizations have endorsed an extension of the loan forgiveness clause because they recognize that there is a great need for more and better teachers at all levels of education.

STIPENDS FOR TEACHERS ATTENDING INSTITUTES

S. 569 would bring about another significant change in the National Defense Education Act by letting private school instructors receive the stipends now given public school teachers at special federally-supported institutes in counseling, guidance, and language instruction.

At the present time, public school teachers attending these institutes are eligible to receive $75 a week and an allowance of $15 a week for each dependent. Very few private school teachers attend these institutes because they are not eligible for stipends.

S. 569 would remove this inequity by providing the same benefit to all teachers, public and private.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

COMMITTEE ACTION

In executive session on September 25, 1963, the committee added to S. 569 as introduced, a new section 2 incorporating the text of S. 571. The bill as amended, if enacted, would—

A. In section 1, extend the benefits of the loan forgiveness provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, now available only to those borrowers who subsequently teach in a public elementary or secondary school, to (1) those who teach in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools, and (2) to those who teach in institutions of higher education; and

B. In section 2 extend the stipend benefits under titles V and VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, now available only to public elementary and secondary school teachers, to those who teach in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATION

Section 1

Title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended, presently provides that not to exceed 50 percent of a National Defense Education Act loan advanced to a student who becomes a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school can be canceled at a rate of 10 percent of the balance (including interest) outstanding on the first day of teaching for each academic year of service.

S. 569, if enacted, would extend this principle to an individual who enters upon a teaching career in a private nonprofit elementary or secondary school or who engages in teaching in an institution of higher education.

The provisions of section 1 were contained in S. 3326 of the 87th Congress which was favorably reported to the Senate on September 28, 1962 (Rept. No. 2190). It passed the Senate on September 29, 1962. S. 3326 was not acted upon by the House of Representatives in the closing days of the second session and the legislation therefore died.

S. 580, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, introduced on January 29, 1963, carried the proposed language in section 195(b)(3). Seventeen days of hearings on several bills, including S. 569 and S. 571, and on the various provisions of S. 580 were held by the committee between April 29, 1963, and June 27, 1963. In the course of the hearings testimony was heard in support of the proposal from many witnesses. (See pps. 607, 676, 723, 1047, 1085, 1414, 1632, and 3278 of the committee hearings.)

In light of the testimony the committee is of the view that section 1, whose benefits would accrue to the individual and enactment of which would provide a needed incentive to staff all segments of American education at all levels, is justified.

The continuing shortage of teachers extends to private nonprofit as well as to public schools and to all levels of our educational system. This amendment to title II of the National Defense Education Act would encourage college students to consider careers in teaching in all types of schools and at all levels.

Section 2

Titles V and VI of the National Defense Education Act now provide that public school personnel attending institutes under these titles are eligible to receive weekly stipends of $75 and an allowance of $15 a week for each dependent. Private school personnel attend institutions without charge, but do not receive stipends. Section 2, if enacted, would remove this differential treatment by providing the same benefits to all who participate.

The provisions of section 2 were contained in S. 580 (see above) and in S. 571, introduced on January 29, 1963. It is the committee view that equitable treatment be accorded all participants in the institute programs under these titles of the National Defense Education Act.

Estimated cost of the bill, if enacted

	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
New obligational authority:					
Title II student loans:					
Cancellation of student loans (teachers in private nonprofit schools and teachers in higher education institutions)	$52,000	$75,000	$120,000	$165,000	$225,000
Titles V and VI, stipends to teachers in private nonprofit schools	[1] (302,400)	[1] (302,400)	[1] (302,400)		

[1] Amounts would not represent additional obligational authority since the authorizations are not increased. The additional cost would be absorbed through a reduction in the number of institutes. The number of private school teachers is estimated at 360, the number presently enrolled in the institute program.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to extend the provisions of title II relating to cancellation of loans under such title to teachers in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education, and to authorize for teachers in private nonprofit schools certain benefits under the provisions of titles V and VI of such Act provided for teachers in public schools."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order that Senators may be on notice, and for the purpose of the RECORD, debate on the foreign aid bill will begin on Monday. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], will open the debate. My understanding is that his presentation will be followed by that of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I anticipate that other Senators may wish to speak on the bill.

It is the intention of the leadership to proceed with the foreign aid bill until the Senate completes consideration of it, which I hope will be next week.

Senators should therefore adjust their time and schedules accordingly. We feel that this is very vital legislation. The majority leader is desirous that debate be concluded and that all amendments be voted on next week.

No request will be made at this time to limit debate on the bill. That request will be presented after the debate has proceeded for some time. This is very important legislation.

A CALL FOR ACTION—THE WHEAT ACT OF 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a special agricultural wheat conservation program for the 1964–65 crop years.

Mr. President, we are faced with a great challenge this autumn—how to be of maximum assistance to the 1.8 million wheatgrowers and other farmers and ranchers of this Nation. I have given considerable thought to this matter and have discussed it with farmers of my State of Minnesota and throughout the Nation at every opportunity since the referendum on the Wheat Act of 1962. I also have taken the matter up with leaders in agriculture abroad, since our policy with regard to wheat could have a direct bearing on our commitments under the International Wheat Agreement.

I have asked myself this basic question: How can we harmonize the many-sided intensely expressed views so that any compromise that might emerge represents a constructive consensus? Will the emergent legislation be an improvement over the current status for the wheatgrower?

If we are to understand each other, we must first understand the position of the wheatgrower.

We all recall the wheat referendum that was held on May 21 of this year. There was much sincere work on both sides in an effort to affect the referendum, which was for the 1964 crop. Wheatgrowers rejected it at the ballot box. Whether we agree with the verdict or not, the decision has been made in the traditional democratic method. Therefore, we must be very careful to avoid even the appearance, much less the reality, of a punitive response.

It may be recalled—and I am sure Senators do recall—that, immediately following the vote on the wheat referendum, I urged that we look forward to a program affecting wheat farmers that would maintain farm income and would, to the best of our ability, prevent a further accumulation of unneeded production.

There are some who say, "Let us not as legislators take any action, and the wheat farmers will vote differently in 1964." To those people, I say that the farmers deserve better of us than that kind of talk or inaction. To those people, I point out that, under present law, the referendum for the 1965 crop must be held not later than June 14, 1964—a date when very little of the 1964 crop would have been harvested, and farmers would not have yet experienced the expected lower prices. For these and other reasons there is no assurance that the verdict will be any different next year than it was this year. I do not intend to stand idly by and watch with any degree of equanimity the indicated lower returns to our wheat farmers during the July 1964 to June 1965 period—and even possibly beyond that.

After careful research and much discussion relating to the wheat production problem and the price problem affecting it, I am convinced that, unless Congress takes some action in the coming months, farmers will suffer a serious drop in farm income. I recognize that the current increase in exports—and this year, by the way, there is a tremendous export program, even beyond that of the sales of wheat, or the projected sales of wheat, to the Soviet bloc countries—can affect the price of wheat. It can lift it. But with the surplus carried over, plus the crop of the year 1963, plus what appear to be even bigger plantings for 1964, the price of wheat could well go down to $1.25 a bushel, and the effect of such a drop upon our economy would be serious. It would affect not only the wheat farmer; it also would affect every merchant, every manufacturer, every businessman, every bank, and every lending institution throughout the Nation. It would affect workers, as well.

The farmer of America is one of the largest users of steel products, petroleum, chemicals, electricity, household goods, and many other products. Unless farm income is good, other people are affected adversely. There is an interdependence in our economy. That interdependence is clear and unmistakable when it is related to the farm income and the utilization or consumption of manufactured or processed goods.

What are the consequences, therefore, of inaction or the failure to act?

First, in order for a farmer to be eligible for price support in the 1964 program,

he must stay within his share of a 49½ million-acre allotment. There are no marketing quota penalties for overplanting the allotment. Price support will be around $1.25 per bushel. Therefore, the market price for wheat will likely be below the 1963 levels, especially at harvest time when many farmers are forced to sell.

Second, it must be remembered that in 1957 and 1958, laws were enacted covering the determination of future wheat acreage allotments. Under those provisions, the farm wheat history is only the allotment if the acreage allotment is exceeded. On the other hand, farmers who stay within their allotments receive credit in the determination of future allotments, not only for the acreage harvested, but also for the acreage diverted.

Thus, a producer who exceeds his allotment accumulates smaller acreage history relative to his allotment than a farmer who plants within his allotment.

Third, under the conservation reserve provisions of the soil bank, a farmer forfeits his payment if he exceeds the larger of the wheat acreage allotment or 15 acres.

Fourth, the President has delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority vested in him by Congress under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended. This action was necessary because disapproval of marketing quotas in the 1964 wheat referendum introduced uncertainties in domestic and world markets.

Wheat prices in the United States could fall below levels equivalent to minimum prices specified for sales under the International Wheat Agreement. I would expect them to do so unless Congress should act.

If exports by the United States at such prices were permitted, the result would be the collapse of the agreement. So a failure to act in the coming months might not only seriously affect the domestic economy and very well rub out all the good of a proposed tax reduction; it also would seriously jeopardize the International Wheat Agreement and throw the world market into an uproar. I do not believe this point is well understood by Congress. There has been so much discouragement in Congress over the inadequacies of farm programs, and the apparent lack of effectiveness of some of the programs, that we have tended to run away from the realities of the current agricultural situation. We tend, more or less, to ignore what would be the consequences of the failure of Congress to act on wheat legislation. I repeat, failure to act would result in a sharp drop in farm income at home. It could result in the utter and complete destruction of the International Wheat Agreement. This would mean there would be jungle warfare among all the wheat-producing nations in the foreign markets. In that kind of struggle, the American farmer would be the victim. Let us face our responsibilities.

Mr. President, the U.S. wheat producer is the most efficient and best producer in the world. It would avail him little in the way of expanded markets to be forced to sell at the low International Wheat Agreement prices. There would be worldwide repercussions in the wheat markets, which in turn would disrupt our relations with our good friends in Canada, Australia, and Argentina, and many of our European friends.

Facing this alternative, the executive branch would have to engage in a massive interference in the commercial export trade. It likely would require an export market takeover by the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to live up to the International Wheat Agreement. This series of events would mean even lower prices for our wheatgrowers. This might very well spell the end of the private commercial wheat market by the merchants who handle wheat in the normal commercial channels. I do not believe we should permit this to happen. We must not allow this series of unfavorable events to occur.

There are benefits as well as obligations under the International Wheat Agreement. Benefits to exporters include the obligation of importing countries to purchase a specified share of their requirements at prices within the range of $1.625 to $2.025 for No. 1 Manitoba northern wheat in store at Fort William-Port Arthur, Canada.

We shall reap some of these benefits in the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, which only last year became a member of the International Wheat Agreement. The International Wheat Agreement will provide a fair price for many of our wheat producers. But if the domestic price in the United States collapses and we produce an overwhelming abundance of wheat in addition to our present carryover, it will mean the entire structure of world prices will collapse. The $1.25 price support of wheat, which is the present law, as a result of the rejection of the referendum, will mean chaos in the international wheat markets unless Congress takes affirmative action before the forthcoming crop.

The United States expects not only to fulfill its obligations by not exporting at prices below the minimum, as required by the World Wheat Agreement, but also to continue to realize the benefits of the agreement by exporting at prices in line with prices at which other IWA exporting countries are selling wheat. In the past year, United States sales under the IWA were made at prices near the middle of the IWA range. They ran about $1.82 to $1.85.

Before the referendum, the Department of Agriculture indicated that, in the event marketing quotas were not approved, special arrangements would be made for exports under the IWA. It also was indicated that commercial United States sales to nonmember countries would have to be at prices within the IWA range, so as not to impair the successful operation of the agreement.

Commercial exports to non-IWA countries have accounted in the past for about 25 percent of total United States commercial wheat exports. If made at prices outside the IWA range, such sales probably would break the agreement. Thus, sales to nonmember countries will be limited to the IWA price range in the 1964 marketing year.

Fifth, the income of wheatgrowers will drop by several hundred million dollars, under the alternative now in effect. This spells real trouble for the breadbasket of the Nation. It cannot occur without serious adverse economic effects on the main streets of our small towns and the factories of our cities. What we are concerned with is the economic well-being of this Nation. A rural dislocation of this dimension will cause urban factory job losses. It will cause job losses in transportation and in distribution.

Mr. President, I repeat that, while Congress gives consideration to a tax-reduction bill designed to stimulate the economy, much of the effect of the tax reduction can be erased by a sharp drop in agricultural income. We cannot afford to have such a drop in income. Furthermore, we also need the tax reduction. We need every bit of help Congress can bring to bear upon our current economic situation.

Sixth, the keenest students of agriculture warn us that the adverse economic impact of low wheat prices and lack of a better wheat program would spill over to feed-grain areas, and then to the livestock producers. So all of us have an interest in a viable wheat economy.

Low wheat prices will mean that wheat will be competitive with feed grains and will force down the prices of feed grains, and, in turn, will reduce farm income for the feed-grain producers, which, in turn—as we know from history and from experience—will increase the number of livestock, the number of poultry, and the number of swine, which, in turn, will mean surpluses, which add up to lower prices and reduced income. So we shall find that we have opened a Pandora's box of trouble, unless we can close the lid. It is all very well for people to say that the farmers should have known better when they voted in the May referendum. But there are 101 answers as to why the farmers rejected that program. However, the fact is that they did reject it; and now we in Congress have a responsibility to try to provide other alternatives. We have a responsibility to the whole country, not merely to the farmers; we have a responsibility to the total economy; and I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that, if we fail to act, we can unleash in our economy a stream of trouble which literally will flood us with low farm-commodity prices, surpluses, and a reduced income, not only for farmers, but also for millions of others.

I am convinced that this Nation is blessed with a unique opportunity to use its agricultural resources to provide maximum benefit to all mankind. The food-for-peace program has enabled us to help feed a hungry world.

It is rendering a useful and effective service. Every Member of Congress should be proud of that program. Wheat truly has been the staff of life of the food-for-peace program. Our wheatgrowers have helped push back the frontier of hunger, on the threshold of which one-third of the world's population still lives.

Certainly we must continue this great humanitarian program with its very beneficial foreign relations aspects. However, at the same time, we must be sure that reduced prices do not force the wheat farmers who make this possible into "mining" or exploiting the soil, in order to eke out a living. This would be disastrous in the long run. We must insure ourselves an adequate supply of wheat for the long pull, to feed an expanding population. For this worthy objective, we need to expand our area of conserving crops.

Mr. President, in full recognition of the fundamental responsibility to our wheat-growers, I have therefore introduced, today, on behalf of myself, my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], a voluntary wheat bill for the 1964 and 1965 crops.

We realize that this is a late date for the passage of new wheat legislation, and I have not introduced this bill as a quick and spontaneous response to what I think is a serious problem. I have introduced the bill after months of study, argument, discussion, and consideration. I have discussed the bill with representatives of every farm organization and with most of the leading farm economists; and many of those with whom I have discussed the bill have made constructive suggestions which have been incorporated into the text of the bill. The bill has met with friendly support from many of our farm economists, and is welcomed by most of our farm organizations as a constructive proposal.

The proposed legislation I have introduced represents a new and balanced approach in wheat proposals. It is not all that I would prefer. However, I am a realist; I have been here for quite a while. I served for more than 8 years on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and, since 1949, I have been in every Senate battle relating to agricultural legislation. So I know that, if we are to succeed in helping the wheat-growers, we must recognize the diverse interests that are at work and we must get the best possible legislation that will meet with friendly response among those diverse interests. If politics is the art of the possible, let all of us be of this school of realism as we contemplate agricultural policy.

Let us not dissipate our energies by making proposals that do not have a chance of passage or by making proposals that will only get headlines or that will please one particular group. Let us not dissipate our energies by fighting each other, because, in the process of doing that, we hurt each other and injure the Nation.

Fundamentally, the 2-year wheat bill I am introducing is a voluntary conservation program.

Any legislation affecting wheat production must have as its objective the maintenance of a fair price. This bill provides for $2 wheat in the domestic market and competitive prices for the world market.

It meets our needs at home and abroad. It encourages proper use of the soil, through conservation incentive payments.

It permits and encourages the farmer to use his land—and I emphasize the words "to use his land," not just to let it lie idle—by planting crops in short supply that are needed in this country—such as oilseeds—on land taken out of wheat production.

Mr. President, I believe the bill is in the interests of the taxpayers, because it would reduce overall costs. Cost estimates have been made in connection with the bill; and I state for the record that this bill would cost the taxpayers or the Government much less than would the current wheat program, and much less than the one which was rejected in the referendum. The bill provides the best income for farmers, at less cost to the taxpayers; and it permits the American wheat farmer to compete in world markets, without destroying the International Wheat Agreement.

Farmers will have an opportunity to participate in a program which is designed as follows:

First, it would expand conservation and prevent mining of the soil;

Second, it would offer cooperators higher income through a higher price support than the $1.25 a bushel now available, plus support payments, plus substantial conservation payments, plus an opportunity to obtain higher than support prices in the market;

Third, it would provide for the resumption of the use of wheat for feed in areas where it has been used historically for this purpose;

Fourth, it would minimize the amount of, or eliminate, export subsidies and diversion payments;

Fifth, it would avoid a massive governmental interference with the movement of wheat through the normal channels of trade because of our obligations under the International Wheat Agreement;

Sixth, it would induce a shift from wheat to oilseeds and other crops for which there are expanding needs—crops that are not in surplus and that have a ready market.

Seventh, it would provide as part of the legislative history that the lower market prices for wheat be reflected in prices paid by consumers. This is a consumer's bill as well as one designed to be of help to our farmers. American consumers would pay the same price for flour as consumers of importing nations. Conceivably, it could be lower.

Eighth, it would provide a program under which the more desirable grades of wheat would be sold by farmers to reflect their inherent premium values, and,

Ninth, it would provide as part of the legislative history that the executive branch do everything feasible to meet the needs of hungry people through expanded use of Public Law 480.

Those are the broad outlines of the wheat program that I am proposing for 1964 and 1965.

Now I should like to state some of the details:

First, it is a voluntary 2-year special conservation program designed to reduce Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, induce the resumption of the use of wheat for feed, and to minimize or eliminate the amount of export subsidies and diversion payments. If it works well, we can extend it and eliminate marketing quota programs permanently for wheat.

Second, the wheat base will be the 1963 allotment, but, for small growers, it will be the average acreage of wheat planted for harvest on the farm in 1959, 1960, and 1961. That will give some advantage to the small family-sized farm—the small grower, so to speak, in wheat production.

Third, price support will be provided to cooperators at the farm equivalent of the world price level or about $1.35 per bushel.

That is the loan price. That will fluctuate, because the world price fluctuates, and the tendency of the world price is to go up, so that the price support loan may be well over $1.35. In addition, a domestic consumption payment to bring average returns to $2 per bushel will be made to cooperators on one-half of normal production. In addition, an export use payment of 25 cents a bushel on one-half of normal production will be provided to cooperators only. The farmer will get these payments—not the processor, not the handler, but the farmer. The need for an export subsidy to the exporter and to the merchant, therefore, will be eliminated, and we shall be back to a program under which the benefits of the proposed legislation will go to the farmer. The payments would go to the farmer, and the merchant would have a product that he could market in world competition. Unless we act in that way, we shall become so entangled in a web of bureaucratic regulations that our merchants will not know what to do. The cotton situation is almost in that position now, and the wheat situation is not much better.

I intend in the months ahead to go back to one of my keen interests in this body, namely, to bring some sense and order out of our agricultural policy. My proposal is the first of several suggestions that I intend to make. I have hesitated to make my suggestions since I have not served during the past 18 months or 2 years on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. But my interest is in that area, and I believe I have some competence in and some knowledge of the area.

I feel that the time is at hand to try to emancipate our farmers from the constantly growing web of regulations and controls which in the long run will compel them to repudiate programs that are in their own interest. At the same time the same controls make it exceedingly difficult for our merchants, exporters, and our grain handlers to do any business anywhere in the world.

Fourth, in order to induce a shift in land use out of wheat, conservation payments will be paid directly to wheat-growers. The Secretary will be encouraged to permit such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of oilseeds in order to expand the supply of protein meals needed by an expanding livestock population. If the land is devoted to such a special crop, reduced conservation payments will be made.

I have not provided for price supports for oilseeds produced on diverted acreage, because questions have been raised as to the advisability of increasing the cost to the Treasury or the taxpayer. Therefore, in a spirit of compromise, I am willing to go along with that view, although personally I would like to see flaxseed and soybeans declared to be eligible for price supports.

If a farmer is paid for taking his land out of production and given what we call conservation incentive payments, and then the farmer decides to plant on that land oilseeds, which are in short supply, he will get income from those oilseeds. Therefore his payments from the Government for conservation purposes should be reduced.

The farmer does not desire a free ride. He wants justice. The bill provides that he shall not be treated as a special sort of individual, but must be accorded equity, justice, and fairplay in the marketplace.

In 1961, the Secretary of Agriculture foresaw the great need for an expanded acreage of soybeans. Some were critical of the price support action he wisely took to induce such increased production. This was a great act of agricultural statesmanship, for out of it came a sharp increase in production. Farmers have enjoyed higher than support prices. I quote from the August 29, 1963, issue of the Fats and Oils Situation:

> The carryover of old-crop soybeans on October 1, 1963, would be about 10 million bushels. A 10 million bushel carryover is less than 1 week's requirement for crushing and export.

We ought to have 100 million bushels in carryover as a national security reserve. We are in danger of a short supply of oilseeds at this very moment. With that wise policy, soybean acreage has gone up about 5½ million acres—acreage which probably would have been devoted to crops which now are in surplus. Had it not been for the shift of the 5½ million acres from wheat and feed grains to soybeans, our agricultural economy would be in a more serious situation than it is. The oilseeds—the flaxseed and soybean—have provided some reasonable market assurance for the farm producer, particularly in the Midwest and the South.

With this wise policy, soybeans have moved up to the No. 4 position in terms of cash receipts from sales of crops.

In my part of the country it runs about No. 2. It is becoming a very important crop, and it does not cost the taxpayer a nickel. We have had a decent program. We have had a working program.

With this wise policy, soybeans and its products are right now the No. 1 dollar earner in the export market. The sale of soybeans for dollars abroad is making a $600 million dent in our balance-of-payments deficit.

The possibility of a billion dollars a year in soybeans for export in the next 2 years is not a wild guess. It is a reality.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is one product which is not produced in Europe. European nations will not discriminate against our exports of that product. They need soybeans and soybean products very badly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly. As the Senator so aptly puts it, there is no other product today that does not suffer discriminatory treatment. If the European market and other markets of the world are to have cattle—to move into a higher standard of living, since meat products are a sort of symbol of the higher standard of living—the soybean, and particularly the soybean meal, which is a protein product, are absolutely essential. We have soybean meal and we have soybean oil, which are needed throughout the world.

Mr. President, the export demand for soybeans and soybean meal is growing at an extremely rapid rate—something on the order of 10 to 15 percent per year.

We have done some good work in market development under Public Law 480. We need to fill that demand, and we can. Certainly, the General Motors Corp. would not be foolish enough to produce Oldsmobiles if it foresaw a sharp increase in demand for Buicks.

I note for the record that the Ford Motor Co. ceased the production of Edsels when it realized that it could not sell them, and went into the production of Falcons, which it can sell.

Soybeans are marketable; and my program relating to wheat legislation would provide an incentive for some of our farmers to get out of wheat production and move into production of soybeans, to increase farm income.

Our market experts see a continued expansion in demand for soybeans and its products. Let us give the Secretary the authority provided in this bill to contract with farmers to induce a shift out of wheat into soybeans. Incidentally, there will be savings in Government costs if such agreements are made.

Furthermore, this approach fits in with the present administration policy to shift acreage from surplus crops into a use category. This makes sense and is a superior policy to that of idling acreage.

Some will question the desirability of expanding soybean production because they know that substantial quantities of cottonseed and soybean oil are moving into human stomachs under the food-for-peace program. Let us make no apologies for this great humanitarian effort with its excellent economic and diplomatic overtones. The market development features of this program have enabled us to convert from foreign currency sales to dollar markets in Spain, Italy, Japan, and several other hard currency areas. It has taken hard work, but it is paying multiple dividends.

No other product can show such good results.

Of all the crops produced in the United States, this one has the greatest growth potential. Only a few months ago Secretary Freeman indicated that he would not be concerned with a 100-million-bushel carryover to protect the American consumer and livestock feeder against a short crop. Our carryover will be only 10 percent of this level next October 1. Let us provide the legislative authority to nurture this growth.

Fifth, the objective is to reduce CCC wheat stocks by 100 million bushels per year, and the Secretary is instructed to use the above framework in developing a program to this end.

Sixth, no sales of Government stocks can be made at less than 115 percent of the support price, plus reasonable carrying charges.

The actual loan price under this program would be less than under the previous program; therefore we provide in the bill that Government stocks may not be made available at less than 115 percent plus reasonable carrying charges.

This will maximize the opportunities for the free market to function without the threat of Government interference.

Seventh, such a program also will enable us to meet our obligations under the International Wheat Agreement. The absence of a program could cause us difficulties with Canada, Australia, France, Argentina, and others. Furthermore, in the absence of such a program, to meet our obligations under the IWA, the executive branch would have to engage in a massive interference in the commercial export trade.

Eighth, it will significantly increase wheat farmers' income over the current outlook.

I believe most wheatgrowers will participate in the voluntary wheat program I have described. A substantial conservation payment for shifting wheat acreage to conserving uses—or a small payment to shift into needed crops—are desirable alternatives. The Secretary and his technical experts can figure out the rates of payment needed to reduce CCC stocks by at least 100 million bushels per year. This would result in substantial savings in storage costs. At the same time, market prices would go above support prices, since the buyers would know that the Secretary could not sell at less than 15 percent above the support level, plus reasonable carrying charges. This all adds up to a better and more sensible program.

America's wheat is a tremendous asset in the world's struggle for peace and freedom—an asset still waiting to be fully utilized with greater boldness and compassion.

Wheat is the common denominator of international life. A breakthrough in the conquest of hunger is more significant, to me, than a breakthrough in the conquest of outer space. In areas of Africa, Asia, and South America, as well as other parts of the world, wheat and its products mean far more to millions of people today than any space satellite in the sky.

Bread, not guns, may well decide mankind's future destiny.

Our reserves now, Mr. President, of food and fiber, and our ability to produce such commodities in abundance, are resources to be prized; to be used boldly and imaginatively, and not to be dribbled away. This must be conserved.

I wish to raise a word of warning and caution. I intend to address the Senate on this subject following consideration of the foreign aid program. We need

to appraise our own food resources, not in light of our immediate domestic needs, but in light of world needs for the present and for the future.

We have prided ourselves by saying that we provide a shield of military security for the whole free world. We pay for it, too—to the extent of billions of dollars. Yet the same Congress and the same Government which announce to the world that we provide such a shield or umbrella of protection for the whole free world with our military strength have never outlined a program of providing food reserves that are required, even for our own national security, much less the security of the free world. We are finding out today what a little extra food means. I have stated many times in the Senate that there will come a day when food reserves will be looked upon as a valuable asset. When I report to the Senate, within 2 weeks, on the weather cycle now prevailing, the American people will thank God Almighty that there is food in our bins. We are in a weather cycle that spells crop disaster, not only in certain sections of the United States but also in many other areas of the world. While we love to see this beautiful fall, this wonderful autumn, it spells havoc for the crops. The subsoil moisture is diminishing. Those of us who are old enough remember the dark days of the depression and the dust storms. We had better think once more of what could happen.

I remind Senators of what happened to the Soviet Union, and what happened in South Dakota and in Oklahoma in the 1930's, with the dust bowls. The production of wheat in the new lands of the Soviet Union is between 2 and 4 bushels an acre. The top soil is blowing off, as it did in parts of America. Whole areas of the world are in a drought.

Enough of that for now. I shall present statistics, tables, and maps. I am concerned. I raise my voice to few Senators in the Chamber at this moment, but at least for the RECORD I remind the Senate, and this Government and other governments, that we may very well be in a cycle that will test whether we have sufficient intelligence to provide the food reserves required to maintain a healthful standard of living. Perhaps we should remember the Biblical injunction of the 7 long years and the 7 lean. We are beginning 7 lean years, Mr. President, and we had better look forward to that unhappy situation.

Mr. President, food production in the world is barely keeping pace with the growth in population. Hunger still is the daily companion to millions of people. Where there are hunger areas, there are tension areas—and where there are tension areas, there is danger of sparks igniting into war.

In the Latin-American areas population is outstripping food production 2 to 1.

World population is growing at the fastest rate in history. One estimate puts world population at approximately 6 billion persons by the end of this century—double the population now.

We talk about the Alliance for Progress, and we say we are going to help save Latin America. We are not going to save it with dollars. We may be able to save it with soybeans or feed grains or agricultural technology and we can pour into Latin America $100 billion of gold, but until they learn how to produce food and how to better use their soil and learn the use of hybrid seeds or modern technology in agriculture, no program will help. I have repeated this statement like a broken record. I was happy to see that the President of the World Bank said the failure of the World Bank was that it had not done its job in agriculture on the world scene. This has been its limitation. George Woods announced that his organization is going to take an entirely new look at loans to governments or countries when they want credits for purposes of agriculture.

Our policies must look ahead at least as far as the lifetimes of today's children. As a nation we cannot do less than plan for survival. We must strive for nothing less than world peace. In either case, our food resources are essential. Wheat is the key. Let us be fair to the producers of this key commodity.

I believe the program I have offered today is a fair program. It is not an extravagant program. I know I shall be criticized for not having gone far enough. But it is 100 percent better than what we have. I am not going to advocate a program that is sheer demogoguery. I have examined the question in terms of programs and production figures. I think the time has come when we must come up with the facts, and quit deluding ourselves. Farmers do not believe our promises any more. They have had too much talk. What they want are statistics, facts, and programs where payments are made to them, and not to the processors, where conservation is emphasized, where the use of land is emphasized. Farmers love land, and do not like to see weed patches. They do not like to see land lying idle with nothing being done to improve its fertility. They want to use it to help make a better life. The program we have offered is a conserving program and a land-use program.

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

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the details of this proposal and a cost analysis of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk as requested by the Senator from Minnesota, and the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2258) to establish a voluntary special agricultural conservation wheat program for 1964 and 1965 crop years; to provide for the resumption of the use of wheat for feed in areas where it has been used historically for this purpose; to minimize the amount of export subsidies and diversion payments, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. BURDICK), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Wheat Act of 1963."

SEC. 3. Section 301(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsections as follows:

"(10) The term 'designated wheat base' means an acreage on the farm equal to the higher of the following acreages:

"(a) The wheat acreage allotment on the farm for the crop year 1963;

"(b) The average acreage of wheat planted on the farm in the crop years 1959, 1960 and 1961 in the case of farms on which wheat was planted under the 15-acre farm marketing quota exemption as provided by section 7 of the Act of May 26, 1941, as amended (Public Law 74, 77th Congress), prior to its repeal by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions, established crop rotation practices on the farm, and such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered but not to exceed 15 acres."

TITLE I—PRICE SUPPORT

SEC. 101. Effective with the 1964 crops, section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 105(a). Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, for the 1964 and 1965 crops, a price support loan shall be established by the Secretary at such level as the Secretary determines on the basis of the best available statistics reflects the competitive world prices of wheat. To increase the return from the domestically consumed portion of the crop, an additional payment per bushel shall be made available to cooperating producers through payments in kind, or in cash equal to the difference between $2 per bushel and the average price received by farmers for the 1964 crop but not in excess of 65 cents per bushel. Such payment shall be made on 50 per centum of the number of bushels determined by multiplying the actual acreage planted for harvest by the adjusted acreage yield as determined in section 379(f); To increase the return from the exported portion of the crop, 25 cents per bushel shall be made available to cooperating producers through payments in kind, or in cash. Such payment shall be made on 50 per centum of the number of bushels determined by multiplying the actual acreage planted for harvest by the adjusted average yield as determined in section 379(f).

"(b) If the producers on the farm elect to participate in the special agricultural conservation program, price support shall be made available only if such producers divert from the production of wheat in accordance with the provisions of such program an acreage on the farm equal to the number of acres which such operator agrees to divert, and the agreement shall so provide. In the event that the special agricultural conservation program is not in effect, the Secretary shall make price support available to wheat producers, as provided in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Beginning with the 1964 and subsequent crops of wheat, any wheat stored in order to postpone or avoid payment of a wheat marketing quota penalty under Section 6 of the Act of May 26, 1941 (Public Law 74, 77th Congress, as amended) prior to its repeal by the 'Feed Grain and Wheat Act of 1963' shall not be eligible for price support."

SEC. 102. Section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 103. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended:

(1) by striking the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That effective with the beginning of the 1964 marketing year for wheat, the Corporation shall not sell any such designated grains for unrestricted use at less than 115 per centum above the current support price plus reasonable carrying charges."; and

(2) by striking the semicolon after the words "deterioration and spoilage" in clause (d) and inserting the following: "except if the supply of any designated grain (as defined in section 301(a)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) is not in excess of a normal supply (as defined in section 301(b)(10)(A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) the Corporation shall forthwith replenish its stocks by the purchase of a quantity of the commodity equal to the amount of such commodity so sold."

TITLE II—SPECIAL AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

SEC. 201. Subtitle D of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Subtitle D—Special Agricultural Conservation Program.

"SEC. 379(a). If the Secretary finds that for the 1964 and 1965 marketing years the total supply of wheat will, in the absence of a special agricultural conservation program, be in excess of a "normal supply" as defined in section 301(b)(10)(A) of this Act, he shall formulate and carry out a special agricultural conservation program, without regard to provisions which would be applicable to the regular agricultural conservation program under which, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, conservation payments in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable shall be made to producers who divert acreage from the production of wheat to an approved conservation use and increase their average acreage of cropland devoted in 1959 and 1960 to designated soil conserving crops or practices including summer fallow and idle land by an equal amount.

"(b) The Secretary may permit such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, canary seed, soybeans, and flax and other oilseeds, when such crops are not in surplus supply and will not be in surplus supply if permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage, subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such crop shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such crops, if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses and no price support shall be made available for the production of any such crop on such diverted acreage.

"(c) The Secretary shall not permit such diverted acreage to be grazed.

"(d) The Secretary shall require the producer to take appropriate measures to keep such diverted acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents.

"(e) The acreage eligible for payments in cash or in kind under such special agricultural conservation program shall be an acreage up to the greater of forty acres or 20 per centum of the farm designated wheat base. The Secretary may, at the option of the producer, make an additional payment for the diversion of not to exceed an additional 30 per centum of the designated wheat base on the farm. The rate or rates of payment to be made by the Secretary shall be at such levels as he determines necessary to obtain desirable voluntary adjustments in wheat production, and may vary by areas and types of wheat taking into consideration carryover stocks, domestic and export outlets and such other factors as he deems advisable, and will result in an annual reduction of one hundred bushels in Government carryover stocks of wheat.

"(f) The Secretary may make such adjustments in acreage and yields as he determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production, and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop rotation practices, type of soil, soil and water conservation measures, and topography. The base period for the purpose of determining the adjusted average yield in the case of payments with respect to the 1964 crops shall be the four-year period 1959–1962, and in the case of payments with respect to any subsequent crop shall be the most recent five-year period determined by the Secretary to be representative for which statistics are available.

"(g) The Secretary may make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments to producers in advance of determination of performance.

"(h) The Secretary shall provide by regulations for the sharing of payments under this subsection among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis and in keeping with existing contracts.

"SEC. 380. Payments-in-kind may be made and such payments-in-kind shall be made through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem for the wheat which shall not be valued at nor sold for unrestricted use for less than 115 per centum of the support price plus reasonable carrying charges and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, assist the producer in the marketing of such certificates at such time and in such manner as the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes of this Act. In the case of any certificate not presented for redemption within thirty days of the date of this issuance, reasonable costs of storage and other carrying charges, as determined by the Secretary, for the period beginning thirty days after its issuance and ending with the date of its presentation for redemption shall be deducted from the value of the certificate.

"SEC. 381. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the event of a national emergency or a serious drought, flood or other natural disaster, the Secretary may place such limits on the extent that producers may participate in the special agricultural conservation program authorized by this Act as he determines necessary or he may by mutual agreement with the producer, terminate or modify any agreement previously entered into pursuant to this Act.

"SEC. 382. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this subtitle D."

SEC. 202. Effective for the 1964 and 1965 crops of wheat, the Act of May 26, 1941 (Public Law 74, 77th Congress) is not in effect.

SEC. 203. Effective for the 1964 and 1965 crops of wheat, sections 331 through 339 of part III of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, are not in effect.

SEC. 204. Effective for the 1964 and 1965 crops of wheat, section 326 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, as amended, is not in effect.

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

DETAILS OF PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR 1964 AND 1965 WHEAT CROPS

1. It is a voluntary 2-year special conservation program designed to reduce CCC stocks, induce the resumption of the use of wheat for feed, and to minimize the amount of export subsidies and diversion payments. If it works well, we can extend it and eliminate marketing quota programs permanently for wheat.

2. The wheat base will be the 1963 allotment. For small growers, it will be the average acreage of wheat planted for harvest on the farm in 1959, 1960, and 1961.

3. Price support loans will be provided to cooperators only at the world price (about $1.35 per bushel). In addition, a domestic consumption payment equal to the difference between $2 per bushel and the average 1964 crop market price, but not in excess of 65 cents per bushel, will be paid on one-half of the normal production of the planted acreage. It is anticipated that the market price will rise above the support price, which will mean a payment considerably less than 65 cents and thus reduce the cost of the program to the taxpayer. Also, an export production payment of 25 cents per bushel will be provided to cooperators on one-half the normal production of the planted acreage.

4. A "cooperator" is a person who agrees to reduce his wheat acreage by up to 20 percent from his base. The Secretary of Agriculture will determine and announce the extent of such reduction. Such determination will be based upon the indicated domestic consumption and export outlook. In addition, a cooperator must use his diverted acreage in accordance with the requirements as determined by the Secretary.

5. In order to induce a shift in land use out of wheat, conservation payments will be paid directly to wheat growers. The Secretary will be encouraged to permit such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of oilseeds in order to expand the supply of protein meals needed by an expanding livestock population. If the land is devoted to such a special crop, reduced payments will be made. Also, no price support is provided for any oilseed produced on the diverted acreages.

6. The objective is to reduce CCC stocks by 100 million bushels per year, and the Secretary is instructed to use the above framework in developing a program to this end.

7. No sales of Government stocks can be made at less than 115 percent of the support price, plus reasonable carrying charges. This will maximize the opportunities for the free market to function without the threat of Government interference.

8. Such a program also will enable us to meet our obligations under the International Wheat Agreement. In addition, the absence of a program could cause us difficulties with Canada, Australia, and the Argentine due to an unlimited domestic production and its potential impact on world markets. Also, in the absence of such a program, to meet our obligations under the IWA, the executive branch would have to engage in a massive interference in the commercial export trade.

9. It will significantly increase wheat farmers' income over the current outlook.

COST ESTIMATES

1. Assume 75 percent participation in the voluntary program.

2. Allotment would be 41 million acres.

3. Assume 25 percent reduction.

4. Allotment on participating farms would be 31 million acres.

5. Assume 30 million acres planted at average yield of 25 bushels to acre.

6. Assume 750 million bushels under price support.

7. Based on these assumptions, payment probably would be 50 cents on 375 million bushels (one-half of domestic consumption) or $187,500,000; 25 cents on 375 million bushels (one-half export), or $93,750,000.

8. Cost in direct payments: $281,250,000.

9. Assume diversion of 8 million acres at $12.50 per acre.

10. Cost in diversion conservation payments: $100 million.

11. Because the Commodity Credit Corporation will be required to sell at 115 percent of support plus reasonable carrying charges, market price will rise above support and thus there will be no cost to the Government associated with the support.

12. Total cost of program:

Direct payments	$281,250,000
Conservation payments	100,000,000
Total	381,250,000

Offsetting factors:

1. Savings to Government in storage, interest and handling: $25 million (based on reduction of 100 million bushels).

2. Government receipts of $160 million from sales of 100 million bushels at $1.60 per bushel.

3. Savings to Government as a result of reduction in export subsidy from 1963 program: $300 million.

(NOTE.—If there is no program in 1964 there will be no export subsidy, but the Government could acquire aproximately 150 million bushels under loan (due to compliance) at a cost of $187 million. Furthermore, a large supply of wheat would be fed, causing increased Government acquisitions of feed grains under the feed grains program.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very pleased that during my presentation of this message and bill I have received the additional cosponsorship of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. At least I have convinced one Senator. I thank the Senator for his sponsorship. He is an expert. He represents one of the truly great wheat-producing areas in the world.

JOINT EXPLORATION AND USE OF SPACE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and myself, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution dealing with the desirability of supporting the President in his efforts to attain an agreement with the Soviet Union for a joint trip to the moon.

I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and that it may lie on the table for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65) submitted by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators) was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, by concluding a treaty limiting the testing of nuclear devices, have created an atmosphere conducive to the negotiation of further agreements involving international cooperation in peaceful pursuits; and

Whereas President Kennedy, speaking before the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 20, 1963, alluded to the immense duplication of effort and the vast expense of a race between the Soviet Union and the United States to place a man upon the moon, and stated that "we should explore whether the scientists and astronauts of our two countries—indeed of all the world—cannot work together in the conquest of space, sending someday in this decade to the moon, not the representatives of a single nation, but the representatives of all humanity"; and

Whereas the President has been authorized by the Congress, under the terms of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, to engage in programs of international cooperation for the exploration and peaceful uses of space; and

Whereas the United States and the Soviet Union have already entered into agreements for joint space projects in meteorology, communications, and the mapping of the earth's magnetic field; and

Whereas the present United States effort to place a man upon the moon by 1970 will cost billions of dollars; and

Whereas there are competing needs of Americans for adequate housing, education, health facilities and transportation and other earthly necessities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress endorses and supports the efforts of the President to negotiate agreements with the Soviet Union and with other nations for the joint exploration and peaceful use of space, and urges the President to enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union and with other nations, through the medium of the United Nations or through other means, with a view to reaching agreement upon an international cooperative project or projects to place a man or men upon the moon, the costs of which shall be shared by all participating nations.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as the President of the United States pointed out in his fine speech before the United Nations on September 20, 1963, outer space is a fertile area for further cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States. Why should man's first flight to the moon be a matter of national competition? Why should we and the Soviets incur needless duplications of research, construction, and expenditure in this great voyage of exploration, when the cause of science and international amity would be so well served by cooperation?

I strongly second the President's suggestion, made in his recent United Nations speech, that—

Surely we should explore whether the scientists and astronauts of our two countries—indeed of all the world—cannot work together in the conquest of space, sending someday in this decade to the moon, not the representatives of a single nation, but the representatives of all humanity.

On August 8 of this year I spoke on this same subject in connection with the authorization of appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. My remarks appear at pages 14563–14564 of the RECORD.

Since that date the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has spoken on the floor in the same vein. One of my purposes in introducing this concurrent resolution is to indicate that there are many of us in this body who drastically disagree with the action taken in the other body on October 10 of this year as a step backward.

Senators will recall that first, on a division of 99 to 93, and then on a teller vote of 125 to 110, the House adopted the following amendment to the NASA appropriation:

No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any Communist, Communist-controlled, or Communist-dominated country, or for expenses of any aeronautical and space activities (as defined in section 103(1) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958) which are primarily designed to facilitate or prepare for participation in such a joint manned lunar landing.

This action was taken with virtually no debate, and with no apparent advance notice. Barely more than half the membership of the House of Representatives voted on the amendment; and it is a safe guess that virtually none of them had an opportunity to think through its implications.

I hope the Senate will strike this amendment from the bill when our turn comes and that the other Members of the House who were not present and voting will undertake to overrule, in due course, the close vote by which this amendment was adopted, when the Members of the House, I suspect, without very careful consideration, took this position in direct opposition to the program of the President of the United States, and that they will reconsider their ill-conceived views.

For this reason I hope that the concurrent resolution which has been submitted today will reasonably promptly be referred to a committee, that hearings will be held on it, and that it will go to the other body, where I hope it will receive approval, in order that the whole world and our country may know that we strongly support the President of the United States in his efforts to enhance the somewhat more friendly spirit which is beginning to appear, to melt at least a part of the cold war, and that we in our country may, in a sense, have a matching grant program with the Soviet Union, in the effort to go to the moon, and thereby save a dollar of the American taxpayer's money for every dollar the Russians pay for the same venture.

As I said on August 8, there are far too many unfilled needs in our Nation in our domestic economy, and in our efforts to raise the standard of living and well-being of our people, for us to squander somewhere between $20 and $30 billion of the taxpayers' money in an effort to acquire another prestige symbol, another status symbol, so that, like a little boy of 10 or 12 years of age, we can beat our chest and say, "Look at me. I got to the moon before the Russians."

JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE CONGRESS—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 237)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, turning to another subject, I submit and ask unanimous consent to have printed an

amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and myself when Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, which is now on the calendar, is called up by the leadership for floor action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 237) is as follows:

On page 4, line 20, strike out the subsection designation "(a)".

On page 5, line 24, strike out the word "and".

On page 6, line 4, strike out the period after the word "Congress" and insert a semicolon and the word "and".

On page 6, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following new paragraph:

"(11) The rules, parliamentary procedure, practices or precedents of each House of Congress, and the consideration of any matter on the floor of each House."

Beginning with line 5, page 6, strike out all to and including line 13, page 6.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed amendment is to reinsert in the resolution the words which were stricken out of it by the Rules Committee, which would call for a joint congressional committee to investigate the whole problem of the need for congressional reorganization and give the committee authority to investigate the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices or precedents of each House of Congress, and the consideration of any matter on the floor of each House.

This language was stricken from the resolution originally submitted on behalf of 30 Senators. It has been my view that the action of the Rules Committee was unwise in this regard. In my judgment, congressional reorganization is badly needed in the area of rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, or precedents of each House of Congress, and the consideration of any matter on the floor of each House. That provision was stricken from the jurisdiction of the proposed joint committee of the two Houses by the action of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator from Tennessee, Mr. KEFAUVER, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, took a recess until Monday, October 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 24 (legislative day of October 22), 1963:

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg III, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Rear Adm. Charles C. Kirkpatrick, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of Naval Personnel for a term of 4 years pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5141.

Having designated Rear Adm. Charles C. Kirkpatrick, U.S. Navy, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Colossians 1: 17: *He is before all things, and by Him all things hold together.*

Almighty God, our Father, on this day vast multitudes are praying for Thy special blessing on the United Nations.

We penitently confess that many of the ties that should bind together the members of the family of nations are torn apart and many hearts are broken.

Give us a stronger faith in Thy divine sovereignty for Thou alone canst inspire and sustain the United Nations in these perilous times when all mankind seems to be stumbling in darkness and groping its way.

Thou alone art the secret of its unifying and cohesive power and the prophecy of its creative and continuing ideals for without Thee its hopes are doomed and its dreams of peace will fade.

Show us how we may strengthen the bonds of international fellowship and gain for humanity a larger measure of freedom and security and a greater opportunity for growth and self-realization.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 181]

Avery
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Bolton, Frances P.
Bray
Brock
Broyhill, N.C.
Buckley
Burton
Cahill
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Collier
Conte
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Flynt
Fogarty
Fulton, Pa.
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Grover
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hoeven
Horan
Horton
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lesinski
Long, La.
McDade
McIntire
Macdonald
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Monagan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Olsen, Mont.
Passman
Patman
Perkins
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Tex.
Rostenkowski
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Shelley
Shipley
Sickles
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Steed
Stubblefield
Taft
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Tupper
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watson
Weaver
White
Wickersham
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wydler
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 279 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ASSESSMENT OF ESTATE TAXES

Mr. FISHER. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to alleviate a very serious problem which has developed in recent years. In the assessment of estate taxes it is the duty of the Internal Revenue Service to make such assessments upon the basis of appraisals of property values. Internal revenue agents are now making such appraisals at what often appears to be exorbitant levels, and in many instances upon speculative and inflated values. This trend is leading to virtual confiscation of estates, which in my judgment is contrary to the public interest.

The bill I have introduced would require the Internal Revenue Service to take into consideration, in making such appraisals, the productive capacity of farm and ranch land and other property, rather than speculative and unrealistic values. This legislation is urgently needed. It is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee will give it most serious consideration.

PEPPER: TRAVEL CURB TO STOP GOLD FLOW?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you will be interested to know that my colleague, Representative RICHARD HANNA, Democrat, of California, and I held an informal conference at Miami Beach on Friday last at which time we heard many experts in the fields of travel, tourism, and related industries give us their best thinking about the best ways and means of eliminating or reducing the balance-of-payments deficit in our country. The gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA], Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, and I have been assigned by the gentleman from Texas, Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, of the House Banking and Currency Committee, as an advisory group to explore this critical problem as it relates to the tourist industry here and abroad. Mr. WIDNALL was unable to be with us, I regret to say, because of a previous commitment.

Under the unanimous consent of the House, I place in the RECORD the following excellent article about our deliberations which appeared in the Miami Herald on Saturday, October 19, written by able John McDermott, which summarizes our 1-day conference:

PEPPER: TRAVEL CURB TO STOP GOLD FLOW?
(By John McDermott)

U.S. Representative CLAUDE PEPPER warned a congressional hearing at Miami Beach Friday that the day may come when the United States might have to restrict travel abroad as an emergency step to curtail the flow of gold from this country.

"I would hate to see this happen and I would fight it," declared the Miami Congressman, chairman of a House Banking and Currency Subcommittee studying the Nation's growing balance-of-payments deficit.

Airline officials and representatives of tourist industries, including Voit Gilmore, head of the U.S. Travel Service, testified before PEPPER and Representative RICHARD HANNA, Democrat, of California, during hearings at the Carillon Hotel.

Some highlight recommendations made to the committee included:

All-out effort by Government and industry combined to attract South American-Europe travelers to swing by the United States for a visit en route.

Repeal the old Cabotage law which prohibits foreign coastal ships to carry American passengers between two coastal ports and thus open New York-Miami sea travel to compete with the New York-Nassau runs.

Intensify efforts to interest U.S. citizens in flying U.S. airlines instead of foreign carriers.

Further removal of artificial travel barriers such as visa requirements and restrictions on duty-free purchases abroad.

Almost to a man, industry representatives hailed the work of the U.S. Travel Service. They urged that its requested budget of $4.2 million for 1963 be increased, not slashed, as Congress has indicated it will do.

PEPPER said the biggest drain on the Nation's gold reserves results from the dollars spent by tourists traveling abroad.

"Economic aid, military aid, business investments abroad and the profits which foreign firms take from their operations in this country all add up," he said.

"But research shows that tourism accounts for two-thirds of the total outflow."

PEPPER and HANNA said the United States must find ways and means for balancing this outflow with income stimulated from foreign visitors spending money here.

Gilmore said the number of foreign visitors coming to this country was up 47 percent in September. Another example, resulting from increased promotion efforts by his agency and the tourist industry is a 52-percent increase since January of travel here from the northern half of South America alone, he said.

Herb Robbins, president of the Southern Florida Hotel and Motel Association, said the Cabotage law is "outdated." It was enacted to protect American shipping from foreign vessels in coastal traffic.

"But today, there is no American shipping firm doing business coastwide between U.S. ports such as New York and Miami," he said. He predicted substantial tourism on this route if foreign carriers were allowed to carry passengers between these points.

Cyrus Collins, vice president of Pan American Grace Airways, pointed out that South America offers a huge potential for future travel business if European travelers can be induced to make a circle trip to include the United States of America.

He said that "conservatively 100,000 tourists" annually fly the South Atlantic. If these could be attracted to stop off in the United States, it would mean a $20 to $40 million increase in revenue to this country.

The subcommittee hearing was held in conjunction with the Second Inter-American Travel Seminar meeting at the Carillon.

CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months much has been said and written about crime and law enforcement in the District of Columbia. On August 12, 1963, the House of Representatives passed the omnibus crime bill which, if enacted into law, will give the Metropolitan Police Department the means to effectively combat crime in the Nation's Capital.

Under the able leadership of Chief Robert V. Murray, Washington has one of the finest and most efficient police departments in the Nation. Unfortunately, however, the work of the department has been seriously hindered by certain court decisions. Crime in the Nation's Capital is a matter of concern to every citizen in the United States. It should be of particular concern to the Congress.

Chief Murray and the members of his department must have the support of the Congress, the courts, and the citizens of the District of Columbia if the Nation's Capital is to have effective law enforcement. The omnibus crime bill passed by the House is now under consideration in the Senate. I am hopeful that the Senate will accept at this session the House version of the bill.

I was very pleased to read in the October 21, 1963, edition of U.S. News & World Report an interview which members of the magazine's staff had with Metropolitan Police Chief Robert V. Murray. During the course of his interview with U.S. News & World Report, Chief Murray answered some of the questions people have asked about his department. He also pinpointed some of the obstacles which have hindered his department in combating crime in the District of Columbia.

I include at this point, as a part of my remarks, the text of the interview with Chief Murray as carried in U.S. News & World Report of October 21, 1963, and a letter from Chief Murray to the editor of a Washington newspaper in answer to an editorial the paper carried on October 17, 1963, with reference to the interview.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 21, 1963]

WHY SO MUCH CRIME IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL—INTERVIEW WITH WASHINGTON'S CHIEF OF POLICE, ROBERT V. MURRAY

Question. Chief Murray, Washington has a reputation for being a crime-ridden city. Just how bad is the situation?

Answer. Washington, like all large cities, has entirely too much crime. But, of 16 cities with populations of 500,000 to 1 million, Washington was eighth in number of crimes, of all kinds, per 1,000 of population, in the first 6 months of this year.

Question. Did Washington rank higher in some types of crime?

Answer. In aggravated assaults we ranked first. Those are assaults with a dangerous weapon.

Question. What about street crimes?

Answer. In robberies, which include those on streets—such as mugging and yoking—we were second.

Question. Is crime getting worse in the capital?

Answer. Robberies and street crimes have picked up considerably.

Question. Has there been a change in the pattern of crime here—in the types of crimes committed?

Answer. I'll go back to 1930, when I first came to the police department. We had street crimes then. We had purse snatchings, holdups—but I don't think you had the vicious type of crime that you have now.

In other words, then they would snatch a purse and run, or they would go in a store and hold up the store owner and take the money. But now there seems to be a great deal of assault, both on the street and in the business places.

Question. Do you mean that people are being beaten up?

Answer. That's right.

Question. What do you think causes this?

Answer. It's hard to say. It may be that it's to put fear into the victim to prevent identification. It's really hard to say. There are a lot of these assaults that are without reason. In other words, they take the money from the victims without assaulting them, but then——

Question. Is it sadistic?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Could there be a racial element involved in this violence, in your opinion?

Answer. No, I don't think so, because there are as many colored victims as there are whites. Also, we had a case here in southeast Washington not too long ago where two colored officers on a patrol wagon got there just in time to catch these two fellows running away. They had beaten a man to death. The victim was white and the two criminals were white.

Question. Is there any connection between the increase in the Negro population in the District of Columbia and the increase in crime?

Answer. I would say this, very frankly, that 85 percent of the serious crimes in Washington are committed by Negroes. On the other hand, 85 percent of the victims—in homicide, rape, and aggravated assault—are Negroes, too. If you take the category of robbery, it drops down—70 percent of the victims are Negroes.

Question. When did crime begin to increase in Washington?

Answer. Back in 1957 we had crime at its lowest point in 10 years here in the National Capital. Then we had a certain court decision—the Mallory decision. After that, crime started to climb.

Question. What was the Mallory decision?

Answer. It was handed down by the Supreme Court. Andrew Mallory was arrested and charged with the rape of a woman here in 1956, and convicted by the district court. The conviction was upheld by the District Court of Appeals.

Question. Was the conviction based on a confession?

Answer. Yes, it was. But about 7½ hours elapsed between the time Mallory was brought in for questioning and the time of his confession and arraignment. [Arraignment is the appearance of a suspect before a court official, where he is informed of the charge against him and advised of his rights.] His case went to the Supreme Court and the conviction was reversed because of that 7½ hours.

The sole issue was the amount of time elapsing before his arraignment. There's never been any contention by Mallory or his attorneys that he was innocent, or that any force or duress was used to get the confession.

Mallory was released. A short time later he went to Philadelphia, broke in a house, and committed almost the same crime. He is serving 11½ to 23 years in a Pennsylvania prison. But that was under a State court. We are under Federal criminal procedures here in the Capital.

Question. Did the Supreme Court say you had to have a suspect arraigned within a specific time limit?

Answer. No, that's just it. There have been different interpretations by different judges.

Question. Is the Mallory rule your only problem of that kind?

Answer. No, a ban on investigative arrests is another. This went into effect on March 15 of this year. It's a terrific impediment to law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

Question. By investigative arrest do you mean the practice of picking up somebody to talk to him?

Answer. That's right. This was banned by an order of the Commissioners (three officials appointed by the President to govern the District of Columbia).

I don't want to appear to be critical of either the Commissioners or the Supreme Court for these decisions. We're operating as well as we can with them but we need some clarification, a little relief, and I feel the pending legislation [an omnibus crime bill] will be the answer.

Question. Was the ban on investigative arrests an outgrowth of the Mallory decision?

Answer. No. Back in 1947 a study was made by a committee from the Bar Association of the District of Columbia of investigative arrests. At that time they said investigative arrests were unconstitutional, and recommend that such arrests not be continued. Nothing was done about it.

Another study was made more recently by a committee of three lawyers appointed by Walter N. Tobriner, Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. This committee felt the police should have some alternative, but they didn't think we should have investigative arrests. Their recommendations led to the March 15 order.

Question. What has been the effect of the Mallory decision and the ban on investigative arrests, in your opinion?

Answer. They have had a direct bearing on the increase in Washington crime. Three weeks after the Mallory decision was handed down, I testified before Congress that, in my opinion, the decision would have a very adverse effect on law enforcement here, and might possibly break down law enforcement. Looking back, I don't think I'm too far off on that.

Question. Can you be specific—give some actual examples?

Answer. Recently we arrested some criminals for a major crime. Immediately we had to take them to court. We're not allowed to talk to them about any other case. We know they're implicated in other cases, including a homicide. But our hands are tied. We can't talk to them about these other crimes, because that would interfere with the preparation of the case for the particular crime they are charged with.

We have to work with the U.S. attorney's office on any case—homicide, rape, and extremely bad robbery—where someone is badly injured. We contact his office when an arrest is made and work with him, or the assistant designated, and go along with his instructions in order to meet the requirements of the Mallory decision. That is one way the decision affects us.

Now let me go into a case that shows another effect. We had this 70-year-old man who was struck in the face, knocked down on New Hampshire Avenue in the middle of the day—Sunday. The young thug went through his pockets and took what money he had. The victim went to the hospital.

Two days later a 54-year-old man was attacked in the same manner in the same neighborhood. The only description he could give was: "a young colored man, about 6 feet tall, wearing a gray sweatshirt and khaki-colored pants."

One of our detectives spent some time in the neighborhood and soon found a fellow of this description hanging around. So he picked him up and took him over to the third precinct. Within 20 minutes the suspect told the detective he had robbed both men.

The detective then took the suspect to the hospital—where the assailant identified the victim—and then to the home of the second victim, to see if they could identify him.

But when the case went to court the judge said: "Why did you take this man to the third precinct?"

The detective said: "I wanted to question him about two assault and robbery cases."

The judge said: "Well, under the Mallory decision, you should not have done this. The cases are dismissed."

Now, how do the victims and the families feel about this? The cases were dismissed because 2 hours had elapsed between the time of the arrest and arraignment.

Question. Is 2 hours too long?

Answer. This is the interpretation some put on the Mallory decision. I don't think judges are together on what the Mallory decision means. That's why I've asked Congress to correct it. Some judges say you should not question suspects at all. In other words, you should pick up a man and bring him in and charge him and take him immediately to court.

Question. How can you charge him if you don't yet know his connection with the crime?

Answer. That's it. For 101 years we've been allowed to bring people in for investigation of a felony. But we can't do that now. There's no other police department in the Nation that has to contend with that.

Question. Do you think this rule has encouraged people to go out and commit crimes because they feel your hands are tied?

Answer. Why, of course. They'll tell you this, too.

CRIMINALS LAUGH

Question. Can't you even tell a person: "Come down to the station house. We want to talk to you?"

Answer. Around here most criminals would laugh in your face if you said that sort of thing. One thing the law-abiding citizen doesn't realize is that the criminal element follows court decisions and sentences of judges much, much more closely than the law-abiding citizen does. Just to give you an example:

On last March 15, the day the order against investigative arrests went into effect, we had information from a landlady that she suspected some of her tenants were up to no good, because they had television sets, radio sets, guns in the house—and she had reason to believe they were engaged in crime.

On the way up to her place, some of the men in No. 10 precinct ran into two or three of these fellows who lived in the house. The policemen started taking their names. And one fellow said: "Wait a minute. Don't you know what day this is? This is March 15. This is the day of liberation. We don't have to give you our names, even." And he walked off.

It developed that these men had broken into quite a few places and also committed some robberies—trussed people up in their homes, including one retired lieutenant of police. But this one fellow knew enough to realize that, unless we had a charge against him, we could not bring him into the station.

Question. How long do you need to hold a man for questioning?

Answer. We say 6 hours. If they'll give us 6 hours, we'll be happy with it.

Question. Do other police departments have investigative arrests?

Answer. Oh, yes. A lot of departments can hold you for 3 days.

I was in St. Louis at a convention last October, and the police chief there was complaining because he only has a 24-hour holding law. I said: "We're trying to get 6 hours and can't get it."

I was president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police in 1960–61, and came in contact with a lot of the chiefs across the country. A great many of them found it incredible—unbelievable—that we have these restrictions on the police here in Washington.

Question. Is there any prospect of a change?

Answer. I have recommended a uniform arrest act, of the kind used in some States now. Under that a person can be brought in for investigation of a felony charge. If he's released, there's no recording that he's been brought in.

This has passed the House, as part of an omnibus crime bill. This is the third time the House has passed legislation to correct the Mallory decision. The first time the Senate also passed the legislation, but it was sent back to a conference and was struck down in the last minutes of the session on a point of order. It did not come up for a vote. On two other occasions, the House approved this legislation. However, the Senate didn't get around to finalize the action.

Question. Chief, how much has crime actually increased in Washington since the Mallory ruling in 1957?

Answer. It has increased about 50 percent. You have to go back a few years to get the picture of crime trends in Washington.

In 1953 we had 23,918 "part I" offenses. Those are defined by the FBI as criminal homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, housebreaking, grand larceny, petty larceny, and auto theft.

By 1957 we had brought these crimes down to 15,554. That was the year of the Mallory decision. Now, since 1957 we have added about 350 men to our police force, a K-9 corps (dogs), and additional equipment. We feel that, everything else being equal, we should have crime a whole lot lower.

But in 1958 we had 17,047 of these "part I" offenses; 1959—17,515; 1960—19,929; 1961—21,802; 1962—21,534. And I think that, so far, 1963 will show still another increase. I think it's going to increase as long as we have these restrictions on us.

We've also had a 14-percent decline in the clearance of cases. Where we were clearing as high as 58 percent of all crimes here, it's now down to 44 percent.

Question. What does "clearance" mean?

Answer. It means solution of a crime. We call it a solution where a person is charged and the case is presented to a grand jury. Now he may, for some reason, be acquitted in court.

LOSING A "SOLVED" CASE

Question. So you can solve a lot of cases and still lose them—the criminal can go free—under the Mallory rule?

Answer. Sure. We had the James W. Killough case, in 1960. His wife disappeared and, after about 5 days, her people persuaded him to make a report to the police. He did, but he was so vague and unconcerned about it the police were suspicious. Before they could talk to him further, he disappeared.

About 5 days later he came back—he'd been to Pittsburgh—and the police picked him up. They brought him into the homicide squad and he said: "Well, I know my constitutional rights." And he wouldn't talk about the case. They held him anyway. They knew, of course, that it was in violation of the Mallory decision. But they held him overnight.

The next morning the chief of detectives brought him in and Killough said: "Well, I'll talk about the case now. I killed my wife and buried her out on a dump. I'll go out and show you where she's buried." He took them out and showed them where the body was covered up with trash. Then they brought him in and took a statement from him—a confession. He signed it.

Then they took him before the U.S. commissioner. He was arraigned and advised of his constitutional rights—his right to counsel—and sent on to the District jail.

The next day the lieutenant from the homicide squad on the case went over to the jail to talk to Killough about the disposition of the wife's body. At that time Killough went into the confession all over again. He was indicted and convicted of manslaughter only. The case went to the Court of Appeals, and they split 5 to 4. The contention of the majority was that he should not have been permitted to confess in the jail. A second trial was ordered. The case is still pending.

Question. Why wasn't the case thrown out purely on the basis of the Mallory rule? You kept him overnight without charging him——

Answer. The prosecution didn't use that first statement by Killough. It used the confession in the jail, after the man had been arraigned and advised of his rights. Now, of course, the defense contended that this confession was obtained by a subterfuge. But it was not.

Question. Does all this mean that the police in Washington almost have to witness a crime, in order to make an arrest?

Answer. When there is physical evidence, the police can act. They've had some outstanding cases, like that of the man who stabbed a woman in a church near the Capitol. They got a thumbprint from the interior of the elevator. Another was in an apartment garage, where he forced a 60-year-old woman into an automobile and left a thumbprint on the door. The police matched the prints up. They searched 75,000 sets of prints before they identified him.

Question. That was accepted as evidence——

Answer. Oh, yes. We don't have to depend on his confession there. But, on these street crimes, they don't leave physical evidence at the scene—I mean, they don't leave fingerprints very often.

Question. Can't you investigate crimes by talking to the suspects at the scene without taking them into custody?

Answer. Well, let's be practical about it. We have advice: "Why don't you talk to these people at home? Why don't you talk to them on the streets?"

They're not going to tell you anything there. You've got to remember the kind of people you're dealing with. Just a sample: In a holdup and murder case here in the District, after the victim was shot, one of those involved stated: "I've done just about everything. Now I want to kill a cop."

If you bring suspects downtown and talk to them in an office, it doesn't mean that they're going to be mistreated or abused. But it's a different atmosphere from when they're out on the street or in their own home. I want to emphasize a point right here: When we are interrogating a suspect, there is none of this "third degree" business. Doors to the squad rooms where suspects are questioned are unlocked. The press can walk in at any time, and they do this.

Question. Can't you talk to suspects after they've been arraigned?

Answer. No. We can't talk to them about other cases in which they may be implicated, or have useful knowledge.

THE PUBLIC IS SUFFERING

Question. Is it true that, under the U.S. Constitution, no one has to talk to the police if he doesn't want to?

Answer. Oh, that's right. Way back when I was a young policeman if we had a man and he said: "I want a lawyer" I gave him the phone book. But these restrictions we're faced with now are something new.

I'm in my 34th year with the Washington police department. I've got nothing to gain. I can't be promoted or receive any raises. But I do think that the public deserves better than they're getting in the way of these restrictions that are being placed on law enforcement. I'm not suffering from it, but the public is.

Question. Is it safe to be on the streets in Washington at night?

Answer. It is as safe here as in most any other large city. You have cities with far less population that have more crime than we do.

Question. More street crime?

Answer. Well, more crime in general. But that doesn't help us any. We feel we have too much crime here and we feel that we can do a much better job about curbing it. But we do have to have some sort of tools to work with.

Question. Do you advise women to stay off the streets of downtown Washington at night?

Answer. No, I wouldn't say that. We've had cases downtown. We had a case at 10th and G Streets where two young women—earlier this year—had come out of a movie and went to their car.

A hoodlum forced them into the car at the point of a gun; made them drive around town for about 3 hours; and finally raped one of them. Then he left town. He went over to Philadelphia and attempted to hold up a couple of candy stores. The police picked him up on the street from a description—which they can do over there. He told the police that he had killed a woman here in Washington and thrown her body in the river.

When we found out about his arrest in Philadelphia, we sent our victims and witness and some of our detectives over there. They identified him right away. He admitted the case, just as the victims had reported it.

When asked why he told the story about killing a woman and throwing her body in the river, he said: "Well, I felt that if you would take me back to Washington, there would be a chance of getting off easier than in Philadelphia."

Question. Is there a trend for Negro criminals to come more and more into white areas to commit crimes?

Answer. Yes. We've found that, where Negroes have moved out into the outlying areas, we do have more crimes committed by colored out there.

Question. Do you have more crimes in those neighborhoods than you had before?

Answer. Oh, yes, definitely.

WHEN INSANITY IS CLAIMED

Question. Have court decisions on insanity hurt law enforcement?

Answer. We think they did at first. But after they got the law amended so that anyone pleading insanity would be committed and then brought back for trial if they recovered, the number of cases dropped off. I don't think it's a real big problem now.

Question. In handling crime, do juveniles or adults give you the most trouble?

Answer. Well, a great deal of crime is committed by juveniles.

Question. Who is a juvenile?

A. Anyone under age 18. In 1962, in arrests for rape, 35 percent were juveniles; in arrests for robbery, 33 percent were juveniles; in arrests for housebreaking, 34 percent; in arrests for auto thefts, 46 percent were juveniles.

Question. Are juveniles harder to convict than adults?

Answer. Again, we have a ruling here that I think is harmful. It is known as the Harley rule. Briefly, this prohibits the use of confessions, admissions, and evidence obtained as a result of a juvenile's statements while he is in the juvenile status and before the juvenile court has waived jurisdiction.

In other words, say we get a juvenile in and talk to him about a crime or several crimes and gather evidence on him, get his statements, and so forth. Then if he's waived over to the adult court, all that is wiped out. We can't use it. It's just the same as the Mallory decision, you see.

Question. Is there a rule, too, that parents must be present when a juvenile is questioned?

Answer. No. Some of them have said: "You can't ask me questions. Don't you know about the Mallory decision?" Lots of juveniles have said this.

The young criminals who commit these serious crimes on the street—a great many are juveniles, but they're as big as any man in this room. They knock down people on the street and it is necessary to hospitalize them.

They are very defiant and arrogant, particularly if they've had any court experience at all.

We've had cases many times where we've had maybe two, three, or four in a group who have committed robberies on the street—purse snatchings and what we call yoking of men, particularly elderly men. We would send the cases to court and the next thing you know, we'd pick the same juveniles up. Their first cases hadn't been called yet.

So I say that this makes them arrogant and contemptuous of law enforcement.

Question. Is that because of delays in trial?

Answer. That's right.

Question. They're out on bail or something?

Answer. No. Their case is just pending.

Question. Aren't they either in custody or on bail bonds?

Answer. No, no. If we get juveniles today, or tonight, for what would amount to

a felony—we'll say a robbery or housebreaking—we send them to a receiving home. We file papers by tomorrow morning in juvenile court. Then the case is out of our hands.

The court can release them to the parents, they can keep them in the receiving home until their case is called, which rarely happens because it may be weeks or even months before they're called. This is bad, because when the cases are pending for 6, 8, or 10 months, these young fellows forget about it and go on out and commit other crimes.

Question. Why isn't bail required, as in an adult case?

Answer. I don't know. But it's a rare occasion where bail is called for.

Question. Could you describe a case that shows the effect of the Harley rule prohibiting use of juveniles' confessions?

Answer. I know that one group that we had were arrested for snatching pocketbooks from women and also for attacking elderly men on the street. They sent some of their victims to the hospital.

Question. Was this a group of young colored people?

Answer. Yes. We got them in and sent their cases over to court—or what we call "sent a petition"—and a few weeks later we got the same fellows for the same thing.

They were very arrogant about it. They said: "Any old man or any 'winehead'"—they refer to a person that's been drinking as a "winehead"—"has got no business on the street late at night, and he should be robbed."

Question. Are these fellows still out operating?

Answer. I don't know whether the same group is. I am not being critical of the juvenile court, because I know that, when I was in the detective bureau 15 years ago, we'd have young thugs—white or colored—who were brought in for assaulting an elderly man on the street—in some cases they'd break his jaw—and I have heard them talking: "Well, they can't do anything to us. We're juveniles."

Now, with that sort of an attitude toward the courts—I think they have a far different feeling if there's a possibility they may be sent over to adult court.

Question. Would it help if you could publish their names?

Answer. I think there are some authorities who feel that would be helpful. I think Mr. Hoover (J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation), for one, feels that way.

CAUSES OF JUVENILE CRIME

Question. How do you account for such a high percentage of juvenile offenders?

Answer. I think it's due at least in part to the fact that they feel they can get away with it, even if they're caught—that there's not much likelihood there'll be any severe punishment.

Question. Do you think that the lack of job opportunities—unemployment—is a factor in why these youngsters commit crimes?

Answer. Yes, I do.

Question. If they could find regular work, they wouldn't be so likely——

Answer. I think that this is a project that should have the attention of the people who could do something about it.

Question. What about parental responsibility? Is any change in law needed there?

Answer. No. That's come up many times at our law-enforcement council and other places. My experience has been this: Most of these kids who get into trouble are from broken homes. To have a law requiring the parent to make restitution for any damage—I think that should rest with a judge. Most of the parents don't have a dime and would not be able to make any restitution.

Question. Did you say the majority are from broken homes?

Answer. A big majority, 60-some percent of the juveniles who end up in the hands of the police, come from broken homes. That follows through when they become adults. Your adult criminals are recruited right up the line from your juveniles.

One district court judge kept tally on cases in his court and something like 90 percent of them had records as juveniles.

Question. Would Washington streets be safer if you went back to more foot patrolmen?

Answer. We still feel that the foot patrolman is the best deterrent to crime.

Question. But do you have as many as you had, say, 10 years ago?

Answer. Yes. We have more. Of course, you also have the need for emergency vehicles where they can respond promptly and quickly to calls. So you have to have a balance between the footmen and motorized force.

If you had enough footmen to keep on the beat regularly, I think that would be your best deterrent.

Question. Is most of downtown Washington, say, patrolled by foot patrolmen?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How much of an area does one patrolman cover?

Answer. That would vary according to how many men you had on duty. The precinct is split up into beats. There's no set number of blocks for each beat. Some that are in highly congested or business sections are much smaller than they would be in outlying precincts.

Question. How effective is the K-9 corps of dogs in deterring crime?

Answer. I think very good. I'm very enthusiastic about the K-9 corps. A dog can do a much quicker and better job than 10 policemen in searching a building, because if there's anybody hiding there, the dog can find him much quicker than a policeman can.

We shift the dogs around wherever we may be having the most street crime. Our dogs have done some wonderful work.

Question. Do citizens come to the aid of police when they need it?

Answer. I think so.

Question. Do you detect any change in the public's attitude toward the policeman?

Answer. No.

Question. Are colored policemen more effective in colored neighborhoods?

Answer. Well, I wouldn't say they're more effective. We have quite a few colored policemen in the colored precincts, but, of course, we've got them scattered all around now.

Question. What percentage of your police are colored?

Answer. Sixteen percent.

Question. How big a force do you have?

Answer. We have a force of 2,900 men. We have an authorized strength of not less than 3,000 men, but we have the appropriation for 2,900 and hope to get an additional 100.

MAKING POLICE EFFECTIVE

Question. Is that enough—3,000?

Answer. I've been asked that question by committees of Congress that say: "Well, you need 500 more policemen." Well, 500 more policemen would help us, but that wouldn't be the answer to these restrictions that we have. I think if these restrictions were removed, a 3,000-man force could do a good job. Of course, I don't know any police chief who has ever said he had too many men, or even enough.

Question. Chief Murray, have you noticed any difference both in the crime and in the attitude of accused persons toward the police because of the civil rights demonstrations?

Answer. No, no; I haven't.

Question. With Washington getting sort of a black eye around the country—at least, you hear this—has there been a discernible drop in the number of tourists coming to visit Washington?

Answer. No. Tourists have increased.

Question. So you don't think there's any reason for people around the country to be afraid to come to Washington——

Answer. No. The convention bureau of the Washington metropolitan area had this inquiry last spring. We checked, and of more than 600,000—I forget what the exact figure is, but it's a tremendous figure—of juveniles who visited here in the year 1962, there was only one from outside the metropolitan area who was the victim of a crime. This was a 15-year-old boy who was the victim of a simple assault—he had been struck with a fist.

Question. Is it true that these visitors ought to be told to stay out of certain areas in Washington?

Answer. Most of the school groups are chaperoned, under the direction of an adult. I don't think there's too much likelihood of them getting into any trouble. If they wander off on their own, they might.

Question. Is it unsafe now to walk down a darkened street in the city of Washington after 11 p.m. alone, in almost any area?

Answer. That would be a hard question to answer in any large American city.

Question. Can you give any reason for Washington being the No. 1 city in assaults?

Answer. No, I can't. I can't really say why. I'll say this: In this list of cities that I mentioned—16 cities of 500,000 to 1 million population—we'll run pretty close with the other cities in homicides. There's no doubt about a homicide—if a person's dead, he's dead—or about stolen cars—you can tabulate those. But in aggravated assault, the figures are way off balance; we're way, way ahead of the others. Now, whether there is a different system of reporting——

Question. Different definition, maybe?

Answer. Could be.

HOW TO PROTECT YOURSELF

Question. In view of these street crimes, what advice would you give an ordinary citizen on how to safeguard himself?

Answer. I feel they should not go into areas that are dark, where they would be alone and be an easy victim for a criminal. I think that women should, wherever possible, not be alone on a darkened street. I think that that's an invitation to a criminal to operate.

As we mentioned a while ago, if youngsters wander into places that they shouldn't, they may be a victim of crime. But the way they've been traveling, in groups—the groups that have been coming in here—I think that shows there's safety in numbers.

Question. But what of the waitress, say, who works until 2 a.m. someplace and then has to go home by herself? Should she carry a gas pen or a shrill whistle?

Answer. It wouldn't hurt to have a whistle. It would be helpful.

Question. What about tear-gas pens?

Answer. There are some now that are permissible. You know, for a while they were considered a dangerous weapon, but the U.S. attorney has ruled that certain types of tear-gas pens are all right to carry. The projectile type is a violation.

Question. Would better street lighting be helpful? There are some cities that have contended that this has helped——

Answer. It would; yes. There's no question that good street lighting works against the criminal.

Question. You don't advise resisting if anybody pulls a gun on you and says, "Give me your money"——

Answer. No, no; I don't.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 21, 1963]

MALLORY AND THE CRIME RATE

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:

Your editorial of October 17 criticizes my response to the question: When did crime begin to increase in Washington? during an

interview requested by the editor of U.S. News & World Report. My answer was founded on fact.

The national crime rate has increased steadily since 1950. In the District of Columbia, we were gratified that while our serious crime (pt. I offenses) reached a peak in 1952 the number of such offenses then began to decline until the low point was reached in 1957. Beginning in 1957, our serious offenses in the District of Columbia have increased in number until we have now exceeded the previous peak year of 1952. These figures are substantiated by our statistical records, a graph of crime statistics clearly showing a downward trend to about June 1957, and a steady climb thereafter.

I did not and do not say that the Mallory decision of 1957 is the only cause of crime in the District of Columbia. I recognize, of course, and have acknowledged that there are many causes. However, I think that the concurrence in time of the Mallory decision with the beginning of the increase of crime in the District of Columbia is significant and should not be overlooked; surely, it is not fantastic to suggest that the Mallory decision is a contributing factor.

I repeat that it is not uncommon for suspects to take refuge in the Mallory doctrine to frustrate questioning by our detectives. Even juveniles have done this. I cannot agree that your phrase "semimoronic louts" applies generally to the thugs who commit so many of our street crimes. It is true that many criminals are not highly or formally educated, but from my years of experience in dealing personally with a great number of offenders, I have found that they are frequently sharp, shrewd, and calculating; and more and more, as legal restrictions are placed on police activities, suspected criminals confront our policemen with claims of the protections afforded them by legal rules.

Your editorial writer says "The notion that the semimoronic louts who snatch purses and commit assaults on the streets of Washington plan these foul deeds in advance on the supposition that they will be able to plead a Mallory defense is a notion altogether unrelated to reality." I do not claim, as you imply, that a hoodlum bent on crime says to himself "if I am arrested I can plead the protections of rule 5a of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in *Mallory* v. *United States*." A hoodlum does not think in such formal terms. I do say, though, that hoodlums know very well that if arrested under the present rules they will be shielded from effective police interrogation which might result in conviction and punishment; and this knowledge on their part that the chance of conviction is reduced does in fact embolden them to commit crime.

I have held that swift, sure punishment is one of the greatest deterrents to crime. I feel that a rule that diminishes the chance and opportunity to establish the guilt of an offender by proper interrogation will inevitably bolster his disposition to flout the law and law enforcement officers and, therefore, must have a causal effect on the increase in crime.

I base my statements on facts that I have learned in more than 33 years of practical experience in dealing with crime and criminals. I do not know what may be the basis on which your writer rests his charge that my position is "a venture into sheer fantasy."

It is true that for the first 6 months in the current year Washington stood eighth in the 16 cities with population between 500,000 and 1 million. It should be noted, however, that in 1957, we were in 12th place. From 1957 to 1962, while serious crime in these cities overall increased by 21 percent, it increased by 48 percent in the District of Columbia so that in 6 years we have moved up four notches.

This sharp trend is a matter of great concern to me. As a law enforcement administrator, I am also disturbed by the fact that we stand second in the number of robberies. In the investigation of robberies scientific evidence such as fingerprints is often not available, so that the proper interrogation of suspects, which in my opinion is impeded by the Mallory rule, is often vital. In this connection, I must also notice the alarming fact that our rate of clearance of serious crimes has declined since 1960—in other words, we are clearing a smaller percentage of the crimes reported to the Department.

I reject your suggestion that since 1957, or in any year during my career as a policeman, I have been diverted from law enforcement by lobbying activities. As the head of a police force charged with the protection of law-abiding citizens of the District of Columbia, I believe it is my duty to speak out clearly and honestly when questioned by congressional committees as to the reasons why the police department cannot cope with the rising trend of crime in our community. I shall continue to respond to requests to appear before congressional committees and I shall continue to testify honestly and frankly to the facts as I sincerely believe them to be.

I ask whether we must wait until Washington is first in crime before providing our Police Department with the right of proper interrogation which is possessed by other police forces throughout the United States, and which was available to our police force prior to the Mallory decision in 1957.

ROBERT V. MURRAY,
Chief of Police.

WASHINGTON.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA AND SATELLITES

Mr. VANIK. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that manipulators and dealers in wheat futures are greedily parlaying profits from the proposed sale of American wheat to the Soviet Union and its satellites, with the sale price of wheat futures rising almost 10 percent since the Canadian sale of wheat has been announced.

Apparently the manipulators are in the market to make a killing.

General Mills, Pillsbury and others announced price increases at 40 cents per hundred pounds on flour that was purchased and committed before the Canadian sale to the Soviets. The proposed American sale will provide even further pressure for flour price increases and the additional increase could well exceed another 2 cents per 5-pound bag. A price increase in bread is almost a certainty.

The American people should not be compelled to pay a flour tax or a bread tax on the Soviet wheat deal, particularly when our storage bins overflow with Government purchase and costly storage at the rate of $302.4 million per year. If the Soviet wheat deal means higher prices for American families, it is the straw that breaks the camel's back. We ought to forget about it.

I have today requested Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, to investigate the unjustified increase in the price of flour along with the spiraling price of sugar.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HIGHER EDUCATION BILL AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BILL

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I might say that two bills on education have been objected to on a request to going to conference on the said bills. The Committee on Rules this morning granted rules and there will be two rules filed today sending both of these bills, the higher education bill and the vocational education bill, to conference.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DULSKI. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was away from the House on Monday, October 21, and Tuesday, October 22. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea" on each of the following:

Rollcall No. 176, conference report on S. 1576, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963.

Rollcall No. 178, H.R. 8821, restoration of Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act amounts.

SOME CLARIFYING FACTS REGARDING THE CURRENT PROGRESS OF THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S CAMPAIGN AGAINST SEGREGATION

Mr. STRATTON. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] has been inserting in the RECORD in the last several days documents purporting to come from various services or

branches of the armed services with regard to opposition that they have expressed to some of the recommendations of the so-called Gesell report and by implication that they allegedly have also to the directive issued by the Secretary of Defense implementing certain aspects of that report. The gentleman has said that no one has challenged the validity of these documents. I think it only fair to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the documents to which the gentleman refers—and they are only paraphrased in his insertions in the RECORD; we do not have the original documents—are the initial comments made by the service departments at the invitation of the Secretary himself prior to the issuance of his directive of July 26. In fact, the Navy document, to which the gentleman from Louisiana referred, is dated July 23, which is 3 days before the Secretary issued any directive at all.

And I think it should also be pointed out that after Secretary McNamara issued his directive, a directive incidentally that he had prepared in the light of many of the comments from the individual services which the gentleman from Louisiana has been inserting in the RECORD, implementation of the Secretary's program for trying to reduce discrimination in the services themselves and in the areas surrounding our military bases, has been proceeding effectively, with the assistance of all three services, and without any hint of mutiny or internal service revolt of the kind which one might mistakenly get the idea from the gentleman's insertions was underway in the Pentagon.

MINORITY VIEWS FILED OPPOSING H.R. 3846

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, 13 members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, including 6 Democrats and 7 Republicans, have joined in signing minority views and dissenting views directed at H.R. 3846, the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1963.

Despite the fact that this bill has worthy objectives endorsed and sponsored by some of the Nation's leading conservation groups, the bill's provisions do violence to some of our Nation's oldest traditions and concepts regarding public lands and public waters. Without the great parliamentary skill and leadership of its distinguished sponsors in the committee, it is very doubtful that the bill would have been reported at all.

Eleven members of the committee have filed their written objections to the requirement that all proceeds from the sales of Government surplus property must go into the land and water conservation fund, which is expected to aggregate $2 billion during the next 10 years, with the addition of other revenue sources. Six members of the committee have filed written objection to the principle of imposing entrance and admission fees for the first time upon our Federal reservoirs, national forests and other recreation areas historically regarded as free to the public. Five members of the committee have indicated their written objection to the bill's departure from standard authorization and appropriation procedures.

Four members have indicated their objection to the bill's failure to provide for development of existing Federal recreation areas, and its almost total emphasis upon the acquisition of additional land, insofar as the Federal part of the program is concerned.

Those of us who oppose the bill in its present form hope and trust that all Members will examine carefully the minority views in the report on this bill. We do not believe this Congress will adopt the concept of a King's Forest and a King's Lake in dealing with the problem of outdoor recreation.

That is the concept inherent in H.R. 3846, and we hope it will receive the careful study and examination of every Member of this body.

Mr. WESTLAND. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Oklahoma in opposition to this bill, H.R. 3846. I agree the bill does have worthy objectives, but it also violates our traditional concept regarding public lands and public waters.

I agree that this bill would put the American citizen in a position of having to pay tribute to pass through what would amount to the king's forests.

It has been our concept that the American people own the forests and public lands and that they should have free access to their lands. H.R. 3846 would place their lands, so to speak, under a czar with powers to extract fees or taxes. It is a situation, Mr. Speaker, reminiscent of the king's forests which could not be crossed without the traveler paying tribute.

It is hard to comprehend the need for a family to pay such a tribute just to take a Sunday drive in October to view the changing colors of our forest landscape. It is an alien concept.

Mr. Speaker, almost 30 percent of the land in my State of Washington is federally owned. Hundreds of backroads, highways, and fire trails traverse these lands. The proposed entry fees not only would strike at the basic concept already mentioned, but also would work a hardship on the people of my district and Washington State whose livelihood depends upon these public lands.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported appropriations for the development of recreational facilities in our national forests and national parks. I believe we must plan to meet the future needs of our growing population. However, I do not believe admission fees is the proper way to provide for necessary expansion for recreational purposes.

I do not believe the people who in reality own the land should have to pay admission fees. Certainly they should have free access.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF NAVY K. M. BELIEU SUPPLIED FALSIFIED INFORMATION TO CONGRESS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Kenneth M. BeLieu, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics, under fire for sole-source procurements has furnished a committee of this Congress with falsified information and should be called up to Capitol Hill to explain his actions.

The record shows, incontestably, that those actions were designed to guarantee the sole-source award of a lucrative radio contract to a particular electronics manufacturer—a firm which BeLieu has improperly, but never so blatantly, assisted before.

If BeLieu cannot satisfactorily explain his actions, and if he insists on taking the responsibility for the falsehoods, he should be required to resign and to join his former boss, ex-Navy Secretary Korth, on the sidelines. Because, Mr. Speaker, just as Mr. Korth's improper use of the Navy yacht, the *Sequoia*, and his questionable conduct in office have damaged the Navy and this Government in one way, BeLieu's inefficiency and mismanagement have damaged it and penalized the taxpayers in another.

It is exactly this kind of sloppy work that caused BeLieu to furnish false and misleading information to a committee of this Congress while justifying Defense expenditures. He should be called back before this same committee and should be required to answer for this misinformation.

If this committee finds BeLieu was given false information by subordinates, they should be publicly identified and there should be a full-scale investigation instituted of these people. If he insists on shouldering the responsibility personally, as he has done in the past, then he should join his former boss on the shelf.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee held extensive hearings on the proposed Defense Department budget for 1964. The chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] the members of the staff did their usual excellent job. On April 9, 1963, they heard from, among others, Mr. BeLieu. He is the one man in the Navy who knows what is going to be bought, how it is to be procured and why it is needed.

Let me place in perspective just what was going on in the questioning of BeLieu. The subcommittee was disturbed

by the problem of sole source—no competition—contracts for electronics procurement and was particularly unhappy with the Navy's proclivity for handing out so many sole source contracts on what has proved to be a very costly basis.

BeLieu was being asked by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to justify the Navy's past and future actions on this subject. As indicated on page 455, part 5 of the hearings the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] said to BeLieu:

When you look over the procurements in the field of electronics and you observe the sole source nature of so many of these procurements, you find yourself a bit puzzled and shocked at the magnitude of this operation. We will present you with a list of several items in this regard.

I wish you would take these items and comment on them for the record and tell the committee whether or not you propose to change future procurement, including the fiscal year 1964 program, from sole source to competition, and where this is not proposed to be done, I wish you would furnish a carefully prepared and detailed statement as to why this is not possible.

Please observe that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] did not ask BeLieu for off-the-cuff opinions. He did not ask for facts pulled out of BeLieu's head. The chairman was concerned. He presented a specific list of inquiries and he wanted specific, carefully prepared and detailed answers.

Mr. Speaker, the answers to more than one part of Mr. MAHON's questions, as furnished by Mr. BeLieu, were false, untrue and misleading and have been so proven by the General Accounting Office.

Here is the answer supplied by BeLieu in answer to Mr. MAHON's question about the AN/PRC 38 manpack radio. It is found on page 448 of part 5 of the hearings:

The AN/PRC-38 is a military modification of Collins Radio Co.'s commercial model 618K in which the company claims proprietary rights.

The Marine Corps procures this equipment directly and not through the Bureau of Ships. Fiscal year 1963 procurement for seven units at direction of DOD for service evaluation.

Contingent upon successful evaluation, the Marine Corps plans to buy 2,266 units in fiscal year 1964. For a minimum production order of 900 units Collins has agreed to furnish to the Government their proprietary rights and data which will be available for future competitive procurements. A decision has not been made on the fiscal year 1964 quantity to be sole source. Study in progress.

Mr. Speaker, what is implied here is that Collins Radio Co. of Dallas, Tex., developed this walkie-talkie through use of their own funds. The Navy, represented here by its number one procurement man, represents this radio as a commercial model 618K and implies that it has been developed, produced and sold in a commercial market by Collins. It again infers the AN/PRC 38 to be strictly a commercial model when it says Collins "claims proprietary rights" but has agreed to furnish these rights to the Government, provided the Navy will allow it one uncontested, sole-source shot at the taxpayers' pocketbook under a contract for 900 production units of the radio.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that in such a transaction, Collins would be permitted to charge the taxpayer two to three times more than the radio is actually worth and at least double the price that would be charged in a competitive bidding situation.

But that is not the real story here.

As I read these hearings, BeLieu's statements furnished to the committee piqued my curiosity. I am intimately acquainted with Collins' remarkable record of doing business with the military. I know of their tremendous backlog of military business, and I also know their infinitesimal commercial business.

Speaking of that record, I had a Navy rear admiral tell me less than 2 weeks ago that he is consistently amazed at the way Collins anticipates and is able to get sole-source contracts to fill present and future requirements of the Navy. In the next breath he admitted that Collins seldom, if ever, wins a competitive procurement, and he admitted that at least 134 Collins employees are former Navy employees from various levels. In short, the inference here is plain—here is a company with a locked-up inside track to Navy money.

But that, neither, is the real story here.

As I said, BeLieu's statements aroused my curiosity. I therefore directed an inquiry to the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Joseph Campbell. I asked him to ascertain how many units of the AN/PRC-38 radios had been manufactured and sold commercially. I also inquired as to how much, if anything, this firm was paid by the Government to develop this so-called commercial unit and what kind of rights it was allowed to retain from what could have been a Government sponsored research effort.

You might say this was a fishing expedition and be right, but the little bent pin I threw in the Navy's pond hooked a whale of a case that would make Moby Dick look like the three little fishes by comparison.

Mr. Speaker, here are the facts about the AN/PRC-38 which prove the statements furnished by BeLieu to the committee to be false and misleading.

The Comptroller General furnished me with a copy of Marine Corps contract NOm72271 under which development of the AN/PRC-38 was accomplished and paid for by the U.S. Government. This contract with Collins covered a total of nine radio sets including three for the Army, at a total cost of $1,561,614.11. In addition, the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency, Fort Monmouth, N.J., awarded a letter contract—No. 03391—to Collins for what it calls a "continuation of research and development" for the AN/PRC-38. This contract was funded to the extent of $250,000, but, based on my past experience, will probably be raised to $500,000.

Thus, almost $2 million in U.S. tax money was spent to develop a radio that BeLieu called "a commercial model."

Under terms of these contracts, the Government should receive the entire rights, title, and interests in any inventions and patents which are involved through this development work. The taxpayers of this Nation have a right to these considerations for the tax money spent, and I know you will agree.

The Comptroller General further astounded me when he said in his October 9, 1963, letter that Collins Radio has never manufactured or sold this radio set commercially. As a matter of fact, Collins available commercial catalogs do not even list the item. In short, the Comptroller General said, this set has never been sold to anyone other than the U.S. Government.

Commercial model, indeed.

That, Mr. Speaker, is one part of my charge. Here we see the top ranking logistics man in our Navy ordered to give detailed and accurate answers to questions. This same man furnishes information that he plans to buy a commercial model radio from a producer. After considerable expense, he allows, he might just get drawings and allow competitive purchasing in the future.

When his statements are investigated, we find the radio is not a commercial model, has never been sold as such and was developed through use of taxpayers' money.

Now for another more damning part of the story. Checking further into the development contracts, I found that BeLieu's Navy "experts" did not even bother to order manufacturing drawings as a part of the development contract. They listed drawings under an option clause, but to exercise that option, the Government, which had already spent almost $2 million on the radio, had to first guarantee it would buy 900 radios and allow Collins to set the price and, second, plunk down another $50,000 for the drawings.

This kind of thing fairly makes my blood boil, Mr. Speaker. This is the kind of efficiency and reliability we have at the top of our Navy today and this is why I say BeLieu must be called back to the Hill to answer for his misstatements furnished the Defense Subcommittee.

There is even more reason for such a course of action. I have found that the AN/PRC-38 contains much equipment that has been developed and paid for before by this Government.

In studying the AN/PRC-38 I found that its specification requires that the component parts and circuitry, to a maximum degree, be identical to those in radio sets AN/PRC-41 and AN/PRC-47. These radios, too, are sole source orders from Collins, and the Government also paid for their development. Now we find Collins given another development contract for almost $2 million to repeat much of what it was paid for on earlier jobs.

Mr. Speaker, there is one more ramification to this case. When BeLieu was ordered by Mr. MAHON to answer questions, the chairman wanted reliable facts, not off-the-cuff opinions, rationalizations or outright lies.

So what happened? Someone in the Navy wrote a fairytale about the AN/PRC-38. This fable was designed to cover someone's tracks to rationalize, to mislead, to protect the individual first, the Navy second and to hell with the

truth, the committee and the poor taxpayer. The possibility that the deception would be uncovered was apparently discounted.

Still, we have to assume the Navy, as a service, wanted to supply the right answers to the committee. So what happened? Inefficiency and incompetency, that is what. I will wager that at least a dozen people, perhaps more, were supposed to have studied documents BeLieu supplied the committee. All were charged with the responsibility to see that the documents were right.

It is just as apparent as the Capitol Dome in Washington that everyone up the ladder just shuffled the papers, initialed them and passed them on. They were shuffled all the way up to the kingpin paper shuffler of them all, Secretary BeLieu, who stacked them in order and sent them to the committee.

In any event, the answers furnished establish that either BeLieu himself supplied falsified information to Congress with malice aforethought or that he is served by a chosen staff so totally dishonest and incompetent that it demonstrates his unfitness to continue as a procurement administrator.

I might add that this would not be the first time that BeLieu has deceived a committee of Congerss, nor the first time he has worked strenuously to line up a fat sole-source contract for Collins Radio. In the summer of 1962, I publicized the fact that BeLieu personally refused to permit a nationally known electronics manufacturer to compete with Collins for a $4 million production contract on the previously mentioned PRC–41 radio, even though the competitor guaranteed to do the job as quickly as Collins and for $1 million less.

BeLieu's action in that case brought an investigation by the House Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee, which issued a report ripping BeLieu for breaking Department of Defense regulations by refusing to issue bid sets to Collins' competitor. The Department of Defense later slapped the Navy back into line with the other services, and BeLieu must now issue bid sets to any interested manufacturer.

Incidentally, during the Investigations Subcommittee hearings, LeBieu personally guaranteed the Congress that the next time the PRC–41 came up for procurement, it would be open to full competition. Yet, this spring I caught BeLieu setting up another sole source contract with Collins for further production of the PRC–41, in direct violation of his solemn vow to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, such inefficiency, incompetency and prevarication are luxuries that this dead-broke Government cannot afford. And neither can it afford such people as BeLieu, whose poor management—to use the kindest phrase I can think of—has been documented again and again. That is why BeLieu should be hauled up here, compelled to explain his apparent deceiving of a congressional committee, and asked to take disciplinary action against those who are responsible. If he insists on taking the ultimate responsibility—as he has to cover his goofups in the past—then he should be retired to the Continental National Bank in Fort Worth with his former boss, Mr. Korth.

NEWS RELEASES BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, last week during a special order obtained by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK], I engaged in a colloquy with him about an impression we had that the Justice Department was issuing news releases during the course of one of its criminal cases. Yesterday I received a letter from Mr. Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General, explaining what had transpired from the Department's point of view. The letter speaks for itself and I am glad to insert a copy of it in the RECORD for the benefit of those who were interested in the matter. The letter is as follows:

Hon. THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have noted your remarks made in the House of Representatives on Wednesday, October 16, as set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day. The sequence of events concerning the filing of the motion in question with the Supreme Court on Friday, October 4, is as follows.

The papers to be filed were prepared in the Justice Department, and contact was made with the office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court to notify that office of the Department's desire to file papers on that day. The Clerk's office advised the Department that the Clerk would be in his office until a certain hour and that, if the papers were filed after that time, they could be left in the hands of another employee of the Supreme Court, who was under standing instructions to accept such documents. The motion papers were filed in this fashion and date stamped by the Court officer who received them on Friday afternoon, October 4. The Clerk had, however, already left for the day and the motion was not date stamped by the Clerk's office until Saturday, October 5. Documents have been so received by the Supreme Court on numerous occasions in the past.

At the same time that the motion was being prepared in the Department of Justice, Solicitor General Archibald Cox was attempting to reach defense counsel Jacob Kossman of Philadelphia in order to notify him of the fact that the motion would be filed, and to arrange for the most expeditious possible delivery of the motion papers to him. Solicitor General Cox reached Mr. Kossman by telephone a few minutes after a Justice Department employee had departed for the Supreme Court to file the papers on Friday afternoon. Arrangements were made between the Solicitor General and Mr. Kossman for the motion to be served by special delivery mail and this was done. In addition, the fact that the motion had been filed and the gist of the motion was conveyed to defense attorney Z. T. Osborne in Nashville by telephone by Mr. Walter Sheridan of the Department of Justice on Friday evening.

No release of information concerning the motion was made by the Department of Justice until the motion had actually been received at the Supreme Court. Then and only then were copies of the motion made available to the press—not merely to one newspaper but to reporters from both the Associated Press and United Press International. There was no premature release of information.

Sincerely yours,
NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Deputy Attorney General.

SALE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one 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, I would like at this time to invite the attention of the membership to a very serious problem. This is whether or not we ought to go to court seeking to stop the sale to Communist nations of wheat and other agricultural products.

A brief examination of Public Law 87–128 passed in 1961 shows that the Congress expressly stated in section 2(c) that it was the policy of Congress and hence of our Government "in no manner to either subsidize the export, sell or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any Communist nations."

The Attorney General's opinion to the Secretary of State on October 9, 1963, stated at page 15, that this was mere policy and did not have the effect of prohibiting commercial sales. In substance what the President's brother ruled was that the Government could ignore the express and stated intention of the Congress as to national policy.

I think we ought to find out whether we are watching a mockery being made of our laws and of the will of the Congress by the Chief Executive as he radically changes U.S. policy in the cold war without even consulting the Congress. We should consider carefully whether we can take this question to the courts for a temporary and eventually a permanent injunction to enjoin the Secretary of Commerce from issuing these export licenses in violation of the stated policy of law. I think we ought to at least determine if this can be done for if it is legally possible to enjoin our bailing the Communist system out of a hole caused by its own defects we should ask the help of the judiciary in checking these repeated usurptions of legislative power by the President with help from his brother.

If we are ever to assist oppressed peoples of this world to genuine freedom from Communist tyranny it is not by feeding and fattening Communists.

JET AGE MARKS FIFTH ANNIVERSARY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, at 7:20 p.m. on October 26, Pan American Airways jet clipper N711PA will be in the air between New York and San Juan. P.R. In the wake of this aircraft flows the entire jet age which began at this moment exactly 5 years ago, when jet clipper N711PA took off on the first scheduled jet flight under the American flag.

Since the jet clipper *America*'s flight on October 26, 1958, 340 Boeing and 189 Douglas jets have gone into service for the airlines of the world—revolutionizing travel and changing historic concepts of geography.

Pan American Airways, in these 5 years, has flown 300 million revenue miles—comparable to three trips to the sun with enough mileage left over to make 30 trips to the moon. Pan American jet clippers have carried 10,395,000 persons since the inaugural flight—the equivalent of every man, woman, and child in both New York and Los Angeles, with seats left over.

Beginning service in 1958 with the first 6 Boeings to come off the production line, Pan American now has a fleet of 66 jets with an additional 8 on order. These planes now fly for Pan American to 104 cities in all parts of the globe. Not a single piston aircraft is represented in the airline's 250 transatlantic and transpacific flights scheduled each week this fall and winter.

Although the jet carries nearly twice as many passengers at nearly twice the speed of piston aircraft, it has stimulated travel so that a greater number of jets are flying the oceans today than the number of piston aircraft in the summer of 1958. Last summer, Pan American had 206 flights each week between Europe and the United States, compared to 170 piston flights in the summer of 1958.

Since its historic first flight 5 years ago, jet clipper N711PA has compiled a performance record unequaled in the history of transportation—typifying the performance of the entire family of jet clippers.

Throughout its 5 years, this aircraft has been in continuous service, except for scheduled maintenance and modifications, flying an estimated 14,574 hours and covering 7,287,000 miles without a single major incident.

For 5 years, the aircraft has been in use an average of 7 hours and 59 minutes each day.

Despite its hours and mileage, jet clipper N711PA is as new as the moment it made its first flight and is, in fact, a better aircraft than it was in 1958, Pan American officials state.

The aircraft is "new" because of a continuous replacement of parts on a regular schedule and is "better" because of a series of modifications that have been incorporated into the aircraft by Pan American to improve operating characteristics and passenger comfort.

Jet transports have proven the most reliable and efficient "tool" for the production of transportation in the history of aviation. Pan American's jet clippers spend up to 13 hours a day in the air, covering wide segments of geography ranging to 84 lands on Pan American's 71,000-mile route pattern.

In a single month, one of Pan American's turbofan-powered intercontinental-range jets accomplished 320 hours flight time. During a month it flies 135,000 air miles.

The second stage of the jet age began last summer when Pan American made the first American-flag jet freighter flights, opening the jet age in air freight as it had in passenger travel. Today Pan American has jet freighters in service across both the Atlantic and Pacific with a fleet of 11 aircraft in operation or on order.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have long concerned ourselves with the problem of civilian supplementation through the military airlift capacity of the United States, must certainly be heartened with the Pan American jet story. The knowledge that Pan American already has 66 jet aircraft and an additional 8 on order is most comforting when it is realized that in case of national emergency, Pan American will be able to turn its entire fleet over to the Military Establishment within 24 hours. I am proud to say also, Mr. Speaker, that many thousands of dedicated Pan American employees live in my congressional district and this fact, quite naturally, makes me more interested than ever in Pan American's continued leadership in the international transportation industry.

JET AGE MARKS FIFTH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER]. I also have many thousands of Pan American employees as my constituents and I am equally proud of the many accomplishments in Pan American's Latin American Division.

By an interesting coincidence, Mr. Speaker, Pan American actually came into being on another October 26—October 26, 1927—when a very small Pan American airplane, carrying a very small contingent of passengers, and an even smaller bag of international mail took off from Key West, Fla., for a 90-mile flight to Havana, Cuba. That was 36 years ago come next Saturday, Mr. Speaker, so I share with the gentleman from New York the pride he feels in being part of a significant aeronautical anniversary.

Shortly after the Havana flight in 1927, Pan American started flying to other Caribbean islands and on down the treacherous and uncharted east coast of South America. In 1928 Pan American and W. R. Grace & Co., combined to organize Panagra which is still the premier carrier operating on South America's west coast. Panagra, as a matter of fact, equipped with Pan American's young, but rapidly growing know-how, and Grace's knowledge of the political and geographical problems existing on the west coast, was flying the route 16 years before another U.S. flag line was even considered for operations from the United States into South America.

I salute Pan American and its enthusiastic personnel, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that we will all be here together to observe the 50th anniversary of that airline, which began so modestly 36 years ago in Key West.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF OCTOBER 28, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for next week.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Prior to responding to the gentleman's inquiry may I advise that we have completed the legislative business for this week and it will be my intention to ask that we go over until Monday.

Monday is District day. There are no bills. There is the following program:

A House joint resolution to provide continuing appropriations for certain governmental agencies.

House Resolution 314, granting additional travel authority to the Committee on Education and Labor.

For Tuesday:

House Resolution 551, declaring the House delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conferences to be an appropriate committee of the House of Representatives for the purpose of implementing the act of July 11, 1956—Public Law 689, 84th Congress.

House Resolution 555, to send H.R. 6143—Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963—to conference.

House Resolution 554, to send H.R. 4955—Vocational Education Act of 1963—to conference.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 8427, improved retirement and disability system for certain employees of the Central Intelligence Agency.

This will be under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

H.R. 8195, 1-year extension of Mexican farm labor program.

This will be under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

This, of course, is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader if we are really going to get this CIA retirement bill next week. That has been floating around here for at least a week and was scheduled for consideration by the House.

Mr. ALBERT. May I advise the gentleman in that regard that it was programed at the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], who is managing the bill. It was put over solely because we were advised that the gentleman had a virus and would not be able to be present; that was the only reason for putting it over.

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

Mr. HARSHA. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Has it been decided whether on Monday—I believe the distinguished majority leader announced a resolution would come up Monday continuing appropriations?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, the gentleman from Iowa is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Is that now to be a 30-day or a 60-day continuance?

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding that it will be a 30-day or 1-month continuing resolution.

Mr. GROSS. If it is going to be a 60-day continuance, I would like to devise some way of providing a modest Christmas decoration for the House, and I would hope to have the support of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield further to me?

Mr. HARSHA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. That is the first time I have ever heard the gentleman from Iowa favor any appropriation for anything in a long time.

Mr. GROSS. I said a very modest appropriation for that purpose.

THE CORN SALE

Mr. HORTON. 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. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I find it bitterly ironic that our Government is preparing to approve the sale of corn to Communist Hungary on the very date of the seventh anniversary of the Hungarian uprising against Soviet domination.

I can think of no more cruel message nor clearer indication of abandoning democratic principle than announcing to the freedom-loving Hungarian people that the United States is observing their 1956 revolution by agreeing to the sale of corn to their totalitarian government.

Can there be any doubt that this Nation, "the land of the free and the home of the brave," is engaged in a struggle for its very existence against the evils of atheistic communism?

Despite the nuclear test ban treaty, the ban on the orbiting of nuclear weapons, the sale of wheat to Russia, the proposals for cooperation in space exploration, the Sino-Soviet disputes, have we heard "word 1" from Khrushchev which would lead us to believe that he is any less intent on communizing the world? Indeed not. In fact, we have seen the kind of "gratitude" the Communists display when we work for a relaxation of tensions. When the newspapers were reporting the President's approval of the wheat sale, these headlines were matched by those of renewed harassment of U.S. troop movements by East German border guards.

Mr. Speaker, selling corn to the Kadar regime would be rank hypocrisy. The present Hungarian Government has not forgiven nor forgotten the attempts 7 years ago to restore self-determination in this Eastern European country. The majority of political prisoners are still in jail. Those who suppressed the uprising are still in power.

If we supply any of the Communist bloc nations with commodities, we help to lessen their own need to provide them. Thus, we make a direct contribution to their strategic position by allowing a greater proportion of available resources to be devoted to the building of a mighty military machine. Why the United States should help Khrushchev in his oft-repeated vow to "bury us" is an imponderable without parallel.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to selling corn to Hungary. I urge the President to weigh carefully the full effects of this proposed transaction.

It is not in the interests of freedom, that most priceless of all human conditions, to come to the aid of a government that has murdered those who have fought for it.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1963

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 BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business order 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.

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND OTHER PUBLIC PLACES

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 781, which will clarify the right of every citizen under the Constitution voluntarily to pray and read the scriptures in public schools and other public places.

I would emphasize that this amendment does not overturn the recent Supreme Court cases on this subject. The Supreme Court has ruled, on the narrow facts involved in those cases, that no State may compel by law a religious observance such as reading the Bible, saying the Lord's Prayer or saying a prayer written by the State.

Many extreme interpretations have been taken from these decisions. The concurring opinion of Justice Douglas has reenforced the interpretations of those who wish to take an extreme view of the decisions. I offer this amendment with no disrespect intended for the Supreme Court and certainly with no remote inference that citizens should do less than respect the law of the land.

As Dean Erwin Griswold said:

> The debt which we all owe to the Court is far greater than any individual can repay. Criticism of decisions of the Court or opinions of its members should be offered as an effort to repay that debt, and with the thought that conscientious criticism may be an aid to the Court in carrying out its difficult and essential task.

I am troubled by the absolutist approach that seems to be gaining currency on the Supreme Court with reference to constitutional issues. The establishment prohibition does not mean to me religious sterility in our public schools. It does not mean that the majority must give up its cultural heritage and tradition. It is important in our educational process for minorities also to be tolerant. Learning tolerance for others is a crucial part of our educational process. As Dean Griswold put it most eloquently:

> In a country which has a great tradition of tolerance, is it not important that minorities who have benefited so greatly from that tolerance, should be tolerant, too, as long as they are not compelled to take affirmative action themselves, and nothing is done which they cannot wait out, or pass respectfully by, without their own personal participation, if they do not want to give it?

Mr. Speaker, these issues are momentous to the future of our Nation. The relationship between church and state should be defined more precisely through the constitutional process. Local school boards, school principals and teachers should be free to conduct prayers and public readings in the schools on a voluntary basis. That is the essence of the amendment I offer to make.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not pay particular tribute to the efforts of Mr. FRANK BECKER, my esteemed colleague from New York State. He has led the crusade, on an entirely bipartisan basis, to define precisely, by means of a

carefully drafted constitutional amendment, the boundaries of proper religious observances in public places.

THE CULTURAL CRISIS IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, when Newton N. Minow, then Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, criticized television as a "vast wasteland" few could foresee that the opening of the 1963–64 cultural season would find the Nation's Capital itself a cultural wasteland with the world-famous Bolshoi Ballet performing in a converted ice rink, and the members of the National Symphony Orchestra on strike demanding a living wage.

Paul A. Nagle, administrative vice president, United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL–CIO, commented cogently on this situation in a letter to me saying—

> Apparently, the citizens of Washington are able to afford to subsidize the city's vast sports stadium, but are expected to place cultural considerations in quite a different compartment.

At the present time almost any beginning Government clerk in Washington is paid more than orchestra players with years of training and experience and the finest educational backgrounds. The musicians rejected, through their union, the orchestra management's offer to raise their present pay to a level which would bring the seasonal pay of the lowest paid staff musicians in the third season of the proposed 3-year employment contract to $5,000. The musicians' present demand would bring the third-year figure to $6,000.

The greatest support that has come to major metropolitan orchestras in recent years has come from grants of public funds for public concerts from State, county, and city governments. In nearby Baltimore, Md., the resident symphony orchestra receives $140,000 a year from such sources, the Los Angeles symphony receives $155,000, the Philadelphia Orchestra $50,000, the Pittsburgh Orchestra $50,000, and the Cleveland Orchestra $35,000. The New York Philharmonic receives support from the New York State cultural fund. In a recent dispute between the Detroit Orchestra Association, the crisis was resolved when the city of Detroit pledged an additional $22,500 to the $50,000 it already gives its symphony orchestra each year. Last year a similar impasse in Chicago was resolved when the mayor of Chicago, Richard J. Daley, pledged to use the prestige of his office to raise an additional $300,000 for the Chicago Symphony Orchestra so the playing season could be extended.

The city of Washington, D.C., on the other hand, gives $8,000 a year to the National Symphony Orchestra. It is not that the municipal government of the District of Columbia lacks the power, or sufficient authority, to contribute as much to its resident symphony orchestra as other cities in our country contribute to their symphony orchestras. Actually, the basic authority for financial support of the National Symphony Orchestra and other music and art programs in the District of Columbia is amply provided in the 1942 Act of Congress establishing the District of Columbia Recreation Department, though it is possible that some refinement of this act is necessary at this time.

The Congress has not been closefisted with the budget of the Recreation Department. This is shown by the fact that its current budget is over $3 million a year. The Congress appropriates for specific items, and the current budget includes only $8,000 for the National Symphony Orchestra, the sum requested by the City's Fathers for this great orchestra.

This situation must change—and for the better. Herman D. Kenin, president of the powerful American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO, strongly favors municipal aid for the arts. As early as 1959 he said, shortly after becoming head of the musicians' union, that—

> If America is to witness a renaissance of the living arts in our time—and come it must if our national cultural heritage is to survive—much of the impetus must come from the Congress.

With regard to municipal aid for the arts in the District of Columbia Mr. Kenin said:

> The proposal is much in line with what the Federation of Musicians has been preaching for a number of years; namely, that the cultural arts must have governmental support at all levels. Such is the proven success pattern in Europe, even in the Soviet Union. Yet we in the United States, with all our vast resources, have done so very little to conserve and multiply our human resources of talent.

Mr. Kenin wrote me under date of October 23, 1963, regarding the urgent need to bring "the facts of life home to those who have the community responsibility to maintain our fine National Symphony Orchestra."

Sam Jack Kaufman, president of the District of Columbia Federation of Musicians Local 161, American Federation of Musicians, has also written me regarding the formation of an ad hoc White House Committee To Aid the National Symphony Orchestra, saying that—

> Despite the meeting of a special committee of the Recreation Board with Mr. Charles Horsky on Monday, I agree with you that permanent legislation is necessary if we are to avoid a recurring crisis each year.

This ad hoc White House Committee includes Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, and Presidential Adviser Charles A. Horsky. The musicians remember, however, that when the then Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, intervened in the Metropolitan Opera dispute the musicians actually gained very little, if anything, more than they could have gained through their own efforts.

Paul Hume, the nationally known music critic of the Washington, D.C., Post, points out that—

> The National Symphony players' problem lies less in the amount of money offered for the weeks they work than in the total number of weeks for which they are contracted.
>
> Why cannot the National Symphony build a summer concert hall, air conditioned, in which it can have concerts of such excitement that people line up in droves for tickets?
>
> Can we not do what Philadelphia, Chicago, Cincinnati, New York, Boston, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, St. Louis, Cleveland, Detroit, and other cities do—which is to find ways of using symphony musicians most of the year?

Richard L. Coe, distinguished drama critic of the Washington Post, wrote that—

> Our "Capital of the Western World" last week clinched its nickname, Hicksville-on-the-Potomac.
>
> From its own opulent theater in the capital of the U.S.S.R., a sizable company of the Bolshoi Ballet took the only stage it could get in the U.S. Capital—converted ice rink, the Washington Coliseum, born Uline's Arena.
>
> I very much resent, as a citizen of the richest country in the world, that this miserable treatment of the performing arts is the best our country's Capital can offer.

The Nation's Capital could readily be rescued from the condition complained of by Mr. Coe, and could easily provide an air-conditioned summer music hall to make long seasons for the National Symphony Orchestra possible by saving the Capitol Theater.

The House has twice passed legislation to save the Capitol Theater, and passed it unanimously, the first time on September 24, 1962, and the second time on August 26, 1963. This legislation is pending before the Senate District of Columbia Committee.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, joined Representative GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., Democrat, of Alabama, and myself in introducing similar legislation to save the Capitol Theater.

This bipartisan legislation will not conflict with the National Cultural Center; in fact, it should greatly strengthen the drive for funds on its behalf. The reason for this should be obvious, even to the most partisan proponent of the National Cultural Center. It is simply this: if we permit the destruction of the Capitol Theater, one of the finest music and concert halls in the United States today, we will not be really able to justify asking people all over the Nation to contribute money to build the National Cultural Center in the Nation's Capital.

Washington needs the National Cultural Center, if it is to discharge its great and necessary role as the leader of the free world. I voted for the National Cultural Center on August 22, 1958, when legislation authorizing it was first before the House, and I voted for the extension of the life of the National Cultural Center when this proposal was before the House on August 5, this year.

The National Cultural Center is required by law to be truly national, and to provide stages for the best of the performing arts from this and other countries. At the same time, Washington

desperately needs the Capitol Theater to fill in until the National Cultural Center is built, and thereafter to provide a suitable summer concert hall which would be air-conditioned. That this is so is shown, I think, by the fact that even though the Congress provided the Carter Barron Amphitheater in the Nation's Capital the National Symphony Orchestra has never been permitted to play there. The District of Columbia needs the Capitol Theater for its own National Symphony Orchestra and its other resident groups in the performing arts so they may grow and prosper.

Mr. M. Robert Rogers, the able manager of the National Symphony Orchestra, has suggested that the precedent for civic intervention in saving the Capitol Theater was demonstrated in New York City where Carnegie Hall was saved from destruction by the joint efforts of citizens and leading public officials. Among those active in that great civic effort were: Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mayor Robert Wagner, and, for the arts, Isaac Stern and a host of distinguished American artists.

I am pleased to say at this time that Actors' Equity Association, AFL-CIO, headed by Ralph Bellamy, has offered to launch, at the appropriate time, a national campaign for funds to reequip the Capitol Theater without 1 cent of cost to the taxpayers. This offer is a crucial one, and should do more than anything else to save the Capitol Theater. What Isaac Stern and his colleagues did for the cause of American music at Carnegie Hall in New York City can be done for all of the performing arts in Washington by saving the Capitol Theater. I can think of no more important and significant effort in the arts in this country in recent years than saving the Capitol Theater and financially insuring the future of the National Symphony Orchestra.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have objected to the enactment of legislation to save the Capitol Theater. Their argument is that they "consider it inadvisable to divert badly-needed District funds to a use which, in comparison with the overall needs of the District, must be considered of a lower priority."

Senator J. GLENN BEALL, Republican, of Maryland, and Representative CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland, have both introduced legislation to provide funds for the National Symphony Orchestra. Like the bill by Senator DOUGLAS, the bill introduced by Senator BEALL provides for saving the Capitol Theater. At the time this bill by Senator BEALL was introduced, the Washington, D.C., Evening Star reported, March 16, 1963, that—

> Walter N. Tobriner, President of the Board of District Commissioners said he thought it was "very desirable to preserve the Capitol Theater as an outlet for events of cultural importance."
>
> Federal grants, rather than earmarked tax money would be the appropriate way to fund a District cultural program, Mr. Tobriner said.

Clearly, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia are willing to tolerate, perhaps, even, to welcome the arts, as long as somebody else pays for them.

The District of Columbia which is so hard-pressed for funds that it cannot afford adequate schools, or to save its fast-disappearing cultural facilities, is losing more than $2 million a year in taxes, according to one recent estimate which could be realized from the completion of such building projects as those proposed for the Watergate area, the Providence Hospital site, 2700 Adams Mill Road, and the old Henderson Castle site on 16th Street NW.

High-rise apartment buildings are being constructed with great and increasing rapidity in the metropolitan area of which the District of Columbia is the center, while new construction in Washington is lagging far behind.

There are a number of reasons for this, some of which were stated by Fontaine C. Bradley at the hearing by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, on July 1, 1963, requesting, on behalf of Eugene Meyer III, Katherine Graham, Frederick S. Beebe, and the American Security & Trust Co., that the Commissioners redefine the boundaries of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project so as to exclude the Meyer-owned Henderson Castle site from the project area.

The short shrift which the government of the District of Columbia gives its architects and builders—and shortchanges itself in addition—is strikingly shown by the editorial "The Style of the City" which was published in the Washington Post of October 21, 1963.

Unless the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia takes decisive steps at this time to change the present situation, building activities will be further discouraged, the population will further decline, and the District's tax base will continue to shrink.

I include the editorial "The Style of the City" to which I have referred, and a statement by Angus Duncan, executive secretary, Actors' Equity Association, regarding the need to save the Capitol Theater in the Nation's Capital.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 21, 1963]

THE STYLE OF THE CITY

The vicissitudes of the Watergate development in Foggy Bottom illustrate the reasons for the general mediocrity of commercial architecture in Washington. There is not one recent apartment or office building here that approaches the outstanding new work in cities like Baltimore and Detroit, let alone the traditional centers of good design.

The official critics, that plurality of agencies who exercise authority over the style of building, must bear much of the responsibility for this esthetic blight. The imaginative architect is confronted with public policies no more stable than the personal tastes of the constantly shifting memberships of the various boards and commissions, the most important of which like to work in the closet atmosphere of personal negotiations and private meetings. As a measure of official indecision, there have been some 15 repetitive formal hearings on the Watergate designs.

Watergate's architects originally cooperated with the Planning Commission's staff to the point of collaboration, only to find themselves vehemently attacked when the management of the Commission passed into new hands. The builders thought that they had reached an accommodation with the Fine Arts Commission, but now the membership of that Commission has also been changed and the new arrivals announce that there is no agreement.

After more than 2 years of continuous arguing, the issue at Watergate has now been narrowed to the height of the buildings along the river front, and whether they will rise 90 feet or 160. The Fine Arts Commission seems to follow the view that height adjacent to water or a parkway must necessarily be offensive. To the contrary, height alone is vastly less important than proportion. The Commission must decide whether to encourage high narrow buildings covering small areas of their sites and opening wide spaces at pedestrian level, or low broad buildings covering large areas. Foggy Bottom's leading example of a truly oppressive architectural mass will continue to be the State Department, only seven floors high but two unbroken blocks long.

As long as the city rigidly limits height everywhere, its new buildings will continue to be the squat cubes that already line its principal streets shoulder to shoulder. In this stage of the city's growth the clearly preferable choice is to let buildings at selected sites rise to considerable heights, to save space at ground level. Fortunately the Fine Arts Commission now seems inclined to experiment, in a gingerly fashion, with that idea.

Most builders, lacking the patience and the resources of Watergate's backers, will not risk good architecture until they are assured that innovation does not automatically subject them to delay and political attack. Washington requires an explicit and firm policy for good design, and that policy will be judged by its success in bringing grace and style to a densely inhabited modern city.

LEGITIMATE THEATERS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

(Statement by Angus Duncan, executive secretary, Actors' Equity Association)

Actors' Equity Association is greatly troubled by the lack of an adequate program that would encourage the availability of quality theater in Washington, D.C. As our Nation's Capital, Washington exerts great influence throughout our country and overseas. Relative to other great capitals of the world, Washington lags far behind in providing for cultural activity befitting a capital city and, indeed, appears willing to strip herself of whatever facilities now exist for the theater arts. The Shubert Theater has already disappeared from the Washington scene, the Capitol and possibly the Keith are threatened with demolition. While informed observers of life in Washington deplore the shortage of good theater facilities, the political leaders of the community seem indifferent to the relentless advances being made by the bulldozer.

Preoccupation with a cultural center on the Potomac should not be an excuse for ignoring the need for planning theater facilities in the heart of the city and for failing to protect those theaters that already exist until new ones are built, for theater is not only an educational and cultural asset to a community, it also generates commerce and promotes beneficial activity in the city during nonwork hours.

A theater patron spends money not only at the boxoffice, but in restaurants, parking lots, shops, for taxicabs and other public conveyances. These facilities see little use during nonwork hours in Washington. At night and on many weekends, Washington streets are nearly empty and in some downtown areas totally barren of activity. Parking lots and garages have only a daytime use, retail stores see very limited evening activity, restaurants lose potentially valuable evening and weekend trade, public transportation equipment stands unused during a large portion of a 24-hour time period. By

expanding the life of the city into evening hours, quality theater can produce revenue for the city and its citizens.

When Carnegie Hall in New York was threatened, the Governor, the mayor, and many more leaders of the State and city worked together to insure its retention. This was done despite the fact that all were concerned with developing New York's Lincoln Center. Many years ago, Mayor LaGuardia acted to have the city purchase the building that is now New York's City Center. The famous New York City Ballet and Light Opera Companies, housed in this structure, remain as living tributes to LaGuardia's foresight and political leadership.

The Capitol Theater must be preserved. Other fine theaters must be saved, and new theaters for our performing arts must be provided if our Nation's Capital is to provide cultural facilities that are adequate for the city's growing population and befitting its role as a world center.

Equity urges the political leaders of Washington to support Senator DOUGLAS' bill to save the Capitol Theater. Equity looks forward to the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue in the hope that the planners of tomorrow's Washington will recognize that the use made of buildings for cultural purposes is equally as important to the cultural life of a city as the beauty of the structures themselves.

FRANKED PATRON MAIL

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to read a statement attributed the honorable chairman of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, that House opinion is unanimous in favor of allowing franked patron mail.

I, for one, am bitterly opposed to allowing Congressmen to send franked third-class mail without specific addresses of individual recipients. If a constituent is not important enough to be addressed by name, then we better not be writing to him.

I would also remind the House that in April 1962, an amendment on the floor of the House to bar such "junk mail" lost by only 5 votes in a record vote of 192 to 197. If this vote indicates any unanimous opinion on the part of the House in this matter, then I do not know the meaning of unanimous. If a vote were taken on the issue in the House now, I believe a majority of the House Members would vote to bar patron mail.

The chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee is holding up action on the legislative appropriations bill because of the demand to bar the House from sending patron mail. In the meantime, we are spending money for operation of the Congress which has not even been appropriated.

DALLAS, SHOWCASE OF CAPITALISM

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include an editorial and a feature article from the Dallas Morning News of October 22, 1963. The editorial, "Quite a Town," and the feature by Walter B. Moore, "Giant Strides Built Dallas," tell once again the remarkable story of "Big D":

QUITE A TOWN

Readers of the News' business page would find it hard to escape the conclusion that things are looking up around the Dallas area.

Business editor Al Altwegg reported the other day that employment in the Dallas metropolitan area rose to a record 507,500 for September and unemployment dropped below 3.4 percent, the lowest level of the year. This compares favorably with the August unemployment rates of the Nation, 5.2 percent, and the State, 4.6 percent.

There were good tidings on the same day for shareholders in area corporations, too. Texas Instruments reported that its net sales for the third quarter of 1963 were the highest for any quarter in TI history. The $2,923,000 in profits made the quarter the most profitable of the year.

Shareholders of Texas Industries Inc. were told at the same time that the firm's net income for the last quarter was a record $1,301,482 and heard a prediction that this fiscal year should be the best the company has ever had.

Benjamin Parrill, president of Miller Bros. Hat Co. Inc., reported that his firm registered a 7 percent increase in profits and a 9 percent boost in sales during the past fiscal year and foresaw an even better record for this year.

What keeps Dallas ticking so consistently in the business world?

Elsewhere on this page is an article by Walter B. Moore detailing "giant strides" in the development of this metropolitan community.

The enumeration reflects two basics:

Dallas has a broad and diverse foundation—finance, retailing, wholesaling, distribution, the arts, education, light industry properly balanced with heavy. Its economic eggs are in a lot of baskets.

Its leadership has been aggressive but sound. It is a leadership that takes risks but gets things done. Its financial institutions have been fiercely competitive, but in the final analysis unite on the essentials of progress.

GIANT STRIDES BUILT DALLAS

(By Walter B. Moore)

Dallas grew, not steadily without interruption, but by a number of giant strides through which civic leaders obtained major enterprises. This fact is generally accepted by historians of this city, although they may differ as to which stepping stones were most important.

A longtime Dallas civic worker was recently asked to name some significant milestones of growth. His list, not necessarily in exact chronological order and certainly not in order of importance, should prove interesting to others who may have different ideas as to leading events causing this city's growth:

1. Selection of this site on the Trinity as a crossing point for pioneers and stagecoach lines.
2. Coming of the railroads.
3. Birth of a distribution center, with the establishment of farm-implement branches.
4. Development of the State Fair of Texas.
5. Establishment of SMU.
6. Merger of various commercial groups into a central chamber of commerce.
7. Campaign which secured the Federal Reserve Bank.
8. Selection of Dallas as regional center for both telephone and telegraph setups, the coming of the News from Galveston and other steps that made this a center for communications and graphic arts.
9. Kessler plan and resultant developments.
10. Trinity reclamation and associated developments.
11. Insurance firms' growth that followed the Robertson law.
12. Annexation of East Dallas and Oak Cliff.
13. Building of a leading air terminal.
14. Selection of Dallas as a site by Ford Motor Co. and other pioneer manufacturing plants.
15. Establishment of the right-to-work concept favoring individuality and industrial enterprises.
16. Building of the original Cotton Bowl and associated developments, including purchase from an individual of rights to the January 1 Cotton Bowl game and presentation of this event to Southwest Conference.
17. Securing of the Texas Centennial Exposition of 1936.
18. Enterprises associated with the east Texas oil field which made Dallas a petroleum financing, management and distribution center.
19. Adoption of council-manager form of city government.
20. Arrival of North American Aviation as the first very large manufacturing enterprise to establish a national reputation for Dallas management and labor ability and dependability.
21. Development as a convention center, including building of Dallas Municipal Auditorium.
22. Acquisition of hospitals, research and educational institutions associated with medicine, including Southwest Medical Foundation.
23. Beginning of science-oriented industries when present management took over what now is Texas Instruments.
24. Planned, orderly integration.
25. Establishment of science research center, SMU graduate program and other current emphasis on educational excellence.

Mr. Speaker, Dallas is a showcase for capitalism. Its tremendous growth, its many civic accomplishments, its fine schools, its great industries and businesses offering both profit and employment, its contributions to art and culture, its splendid recreational facilities, its outstanding airport, its acknowledged leadership in the field of transportation and communications, its wealth, its production, its contribution to the United States of America as one of the truly great metropolitan areas, all this and more has been accomplished through the efforts of the people of Dallas. The record has been made through the full operation of the private enterprise system, capitalism.

Those with vision and courage and willingness to do and dare invested their money, their brains, and their brawn and the result, as always when these ingredients are put to work, is spelled s-u-c-c-e-s-s.

Who gains from the progress of Dallas? All the people of Dallas. Those who invested money or talent, have been able to make a profit. Profit has enabled the industries to grow and prosper and create jobs. The whole community, the workers in the factories and stores, the

industrialists and businessmen, the children share in the cultural, artistic, and recreational accomplishments.

What a contrast between the success of capitalism as seen in Dallas and the failures of communism in every country where the system operates. Dallas, and the success stories of hundreds of American communities, the standard of living of most of our people, the opportunity for all, offered in the United States is the best answer to communism.

I may be so bold as to suggest to the President and some of his advisers who seem to prefer a socialistic society, that they look around in America and compare the results of capitalism to those in Communist countries.

Instead of trying to curry favor with Khrushchev, Tito, and other Red leaders by depreciating our own accomplishments, it would be so refreshing if we heard some statements from the White House enumerating the blessings enjoyed by the people of America. Blessings, incidentally, shared with our enemies the Communists, by our free handouts to Yugoslavia, Poland through foreign aid, and now to Hungary, and Russia itself through selling them corn and wheat, every bushel of which is subsidized by American taxpayers. Just once, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear President Kennedy express his faith in the American people instead of holding their efforts and their accomplishments in contempt as he continually downgrades whatever is done and calls for more controls, more Federal planning in the pattern of a socialist nation.

We, in "Big D," do not apologize for following the capitalist system. We brag about it. We invite President Kennedy, Arthur Schlesinger, Walter Heller, Walter Reuther, George Ball, Averell Harriman, and all the other advocates of a planned economy to come to Dallas any time and share with us the pride of a real American community, built in the best American traditions, and following the finest concepts of the foundation of America's greatness, belief in the individual.

RURAL ILLINOIS 3 TO 1 AGAINST WHEAT SALE

Mr. HARSHA. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this noon I delivered to the White House 4,095 letters and postcards which refute earlier claims by the administration that rural America approves the Russian wheat sale.

All of the mail is from rural Illinois, and most of it flatly opposes the President's decision to sell. I left 2,751 communications which said no, and 1,344 which said yes. Most of those which said yes added stipulations which actually put them in opposition to the terms which the President said are acceptable.

Taking this into account, I estimate the mail shows more than 3-to-1 opposition.

Today's mail is the heaviest yet, and seems to be running about the same percentage. I will transmit this and any additional mail I receive so the White House will be kept fully informed.

The new total shows 1,767 yes, and 3,291 no, or 65 percent against.

This mail is especially significant because most of it is from my own district—an area with 46.4 percent of the population listed in nonurban categories. Most farms grow wheat.

Here are a few comments typical of those opposing the wheat sale:

Farmer from Greene County:

Just helping Russia to bury us at our expense.

Farmer from Sangamon County:

One year ago this country was alerted to the prospects of a third world war, avoided by promises to get soldiers out of Cuba, missiles, etc. No proof by inspection as pledged. Why do we reward the unfaithful?

Farmer from Calhoun County:

When you have a club, don't give it to your enemy and expect him not to use it.

Farmer from Cass County:

Let's wipe out hunger in the free countries first.

Farmer from Hancock County:

I do not have a bit of confidence in anything they do or say, and I wouldn't trust them any further than I could throw a ton bull by the tail.

Farmer from Greene County:

How does it happen that Freeman did not know of a shortage of wheat when he was in Russia? Is it possible Russia is storing food to carry through some crises?

Farmer from Morgan County:

Nor the $43 a bushel corn.

Farmer from Sangamon County:

I do not believe we should deal with a bunch of crooks and murderers of Khrushchev or any of the satellite countries. I think we will lose if we do.

Farmer from Cass County:

I do not approve, but I feel that I am in the minority because the majority will put the dollar ahead of principle.

Farmer from Jersey County:

This goes for Tito, too.

Farmer from Macoupin County:

Remember the scrap iron we sold Japan.

Farmer from Morgan County:

The New Frontier is taking us back to where Roosevelt took us and left us. If I gave you my honest opinion this paper would be scorched.

Farmer from Adams County:

Farm votes should not be for sale.

Farmer from Brown County:

This is one of the most stupid decisions the present administration has made yet. Why (many whys) should we be cooperative with our most dangerous enemy? Why should we?

Farm wife from Sangamon County:

I am a farmer's wife and to h—— with Russia. They don't care if their own people starve.

Farmer from Jersey County:

Why feed our worst enemy?

Here are comments typical of those who said yes to the wheat sale but added their own stipulations:

Farmer from Brown County:

But let's have those troops removed from Cuba in the deal.

Farmer from Schuyler County:

I do think it would have been a good time to insist that Russia withdraw from Cuba.

Farmer from Jersey County:

Provided we get a full cash payment on delivery and provided Russian troops are withdrawn from Cuba.

Farmer from Jersey County:

It is a mystery to me as to why the United States is selling wheat to Russia and Russia is not paying the United States for past debts.

Farmer from McDonough County:

They may just as well sell them wheat. They turned Cuba over to them. Broke the Monroe Doctrine without a struggle.

Farmer from Schuyler County:

If [it] would get rid of some surplus on a cash basis paid in gold at our port, and they agreed to get out of Cuba and stay out. I think we should get some settlement on Germany. And do they need wheat or are they trying to trick us? We should have market price at our port.

Farmer from Greene County:

We had just as well sell wheat to Russia, because we trade with other countries that will trade with them. But let's don't give it to them. Looks to me like a good time to use a little leverage.

Farmer from Adams County:

I approve selling wheat to Russia for what they need, but do not think we should sell them enough to dole out to their satellites. I think we should get credit for helping feed those people. If Russia objects, those satellites will know who kept them from getting our wheat.

Farmer from McDonough County:

I would approve only if Russia used it for their own use and they pay their debt due the United States first.

Farmer from McDonough County:

I feel that if we don't sell it direct some other country will buy and divert to Russia. However, I have these reservations. In exchange for the deal we should have some consideration such as: Russians out of Cuba, a relief in Berlin, or some other concession of importance.

AD HOC COMMITTEES CIRCULARIZE CONGRESS ON BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of ad hoc committees with religious sounding names who are circularizing Congress with statements and

resolutions in opposition to an extension of the bracero program.

Seldom do these committees or religious associations give their credentials or the basis of their views or valid reasons for their resolutions. A little investigation will reveal that they have made little or no objective study of the problems, many have never been near a farm—some only recently, after their commitment to oppose the bracero program—some did not and do not know the difference between a "wetback," a "green carder" or a bracero. Most have never lived near a migrant farm family or in a rural community. None has ever been a local governmental official. None has presented any alternative proposal.

The simple fact is that they do not know or understand the problem of the farmer or the bracero or the domestic.

If you want a religious answer to the bracero issue, consult your personal pastor, priest, or rabbi. The clergy in areas where the bracero works and lives do not oppose the program. They have facts, experience, and knowledge, as well as compassion, theological training, and morality.

Naturally, all of us, proponents and opponents of the bracero bill, should be concerned with the pathetic plight of the migrant farmworker's family. The bracero program is an effective adjunct to a better life for domestic workers. It is the most satisfactory, humanitarian program yet devised to solve the social-economic supplemental farm labor problem.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of this body the meeting presently being held in Washington of more than 1,000 members of the National Association for Retarded Children. I am happy to say that my district in New York, the 19th Congressional District, is well represented at this distinguished convention.

The National Association for Retarded Children is a voluntary organization of national stature. It was founded in 1950 by a group of parents who were anxious to take action to improve life for their retarded children. From this small nucleus, the organization has grown constantly, until now more than 1,000 local associations exist across the 50 United States.

We have recently seen in this Congress enlightened legislation being passed to benefit the mentally retarded, legislation outlining plans for national action far beyond the dreams these people of NARC could even imagine when they formed their organization. Our country is finally taking positive action to help the children and adults who are retarded today, and to prevent mental retardation and ameliorate its tragic effects on the lives of children of coming generations.

The members of the National Association for Retarded Children are to be commended on the role they have played in leading action at the community level to help all of America's 5½ million retarded citizens. I should like to record a welcome to them to the Nation's Capital and wish them continued success in their endeavors.

THE DENIAL OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM OF JEWS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, total annihilation threatens Soviet Judaism.

All the resources of the state are directed toward this purpose.

Alone and isolated, unprotected by law, cut off from their religious confreres abroad, victimized by a ruthless and unmitigating propaganda assault, deprived of the sacred accoutrements of religious practice, the devout Soviet Jewish believer faces the greatest danger to his religious life, his sacred beliefs and traditions.

Discrimination against Soviet Jewry in general and the practice of the Jewish religion is a matter of official Soviet policy. A virulent press campaign, designed to distort the image of the Jew by resurrecting time-worn anti-Semitic stereotypes, is a grotesque manifestation of this policy. In the metropolitan and provincial press, especially in areas where most Soviet Jews reside and where anti-Semitism is still widespread and endemic, the Jews are portrayed as worshippers of money. Rabbis and lay leaders are always depicted as extortionists of money from devout Jews ostensibly for religious purposes, but in reality for their own selfish gain. Drunkenness is cited as a frequent problem in synagogue life. In general, Judaism is ridiculed; its religious rites mocked; and its tenets portrayed as potentially or actually subversive.

In addition to the propaganda assault on Judaism, the Soviet state employs even more direct methods of circumscribe the influence and effectiveness of Judaism. No central organization is permitted to unite congregations, facilitate communications, and in general to serve the spiritual needs of the Jewish religious community as a whole.

The state prohibits printing facilities for the Jewish community. Thus, there are no Jewish religious publications. No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917. A Russian translation of the Jewish version of the Old Testament has never been permitted. Nor has a Jewish religious book of any kind been published since the early 1920's, except for the recent publication of a siddur; that is, a Sabbath prayerbook. In 1958, an edition of only 3,000 copies of a prerevolutionary siddur was made available to the many thousands of practicing religious Jews. No prayerbooks for use on special religious occasions have been published, and Jews must rely on photographed copies of their religious calendars surreptitiously circulated among themselves.

Many other forms of religious discrimination obstruct the Soviet Jew in practicing his faith. A ban still exists on Hebrew so that Jews educated in the Soviet period cannot participate fully in the liturgy of Jewish religious observances. Indispensable accoutrements for the religious service such as the tallies and tefillin are prohibited. The public baking and sale of matzoth has been forbidden. Restrictions on building synagogues has reduced the number to some 60 or 70, and those few are expected to serve 1 million believers. Prior to 1957, Jews had no institutions to train rabbis, and the yeshiva established in 1957 as an adjunct of the great synagogue in Moscow has operated under great restrictions. In general, it could not hope to meet the demands that the service of a million practicing Jews would ordinarily require.

Jewish religious leaders have suffered direct personal attacks by Soviet authorities in a campaign of attrition and pressure on the Jewish community which has systematically increased since the middle of 1961. In June and July of 1961, synagogue presidents in six major provincial cities were deposed. Six lay religious leaders in Moscow and Leningrad were secretly arrested. In October 1961, the Moscow and Leningrad leaders were secretly tried on charges of alleged espionage and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. Soviet Jews are made to feel disloyal no matter how innocent their relations may be with Israel or nations of the West. In this regard it is important to note that the religious Soviet Jew is cut off completely from his confreres beyond the U.S.S.R. No Jewish religious delegation from the Soviet Union has ever been permitted to visit religious institutions abroad, and Soviet synagogues are not permitted to have any official contacts, permanent ties, or institutional relations with Jewish religious, congregational, or rabbinic bodies outside the Soviet Union.

All these acts against religious Soviet Jews and their practices add up to a systematic policy of attrition, designed to intimidate and atomize Soviet Jewry. This policy seeks to cut the bonds that link the Jew to his historic religious past, to isolate him within Soviet society and isolate him from the world community of Jewry, and in the end to destroy his Jewish spirit; for this policy aims not only at the Jewish religion but also at the whole of Jewish consciousness.

This policy is, therefore, not another program in the real sense—it has none of its spasmodic emotionalism; nor is it Hitlerian in its mode; it is rather a policy of gradualism, attrition, and atomization calculated to seek the same end: destruction of all those essential qualities and characteristics, both interior and exterior, that make the Jew a Jew.

I trust the world will take cognizance of the foregoing and that appropriate and necessary representations will be made to the Soviet Union to the end that recognition will be given to the plaint of the Jewish people of the repressions practiced against their coreligionists in the Soviet Union. Perhaps the Soviet Government will pay heed.

RECENT ACTION BY THE UNITED NATIONS ON ADMISSION OF RED CHINA INTO THE U.N.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is worth noting the recent action by the United Nations on the admission of Red China into the U.N. This was the 14th time that the proposal has been decisively rejected by the General Assembly. Again the United States took the lead in opposing such a move and I should like to call special attention to the statement made by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. representative to the United Nations, which points out our position toward such a move in clear and concise terms:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN PLENARY, ON CHINESE REPRESENTATION, OCTOBER 16, 1963

Nothing has happened in the world in the past year to justify the General Assembly seriously redebating the item which we now have before us; indeed quite the opposite is the case. For many years this issue has been dealt with in decisive fashion by the United Nations; in 1961 proposals to seat the Communist Chinese and expel the Representatives of the Republic of China were defeated by a vote of 36 to 48; last year they were defeated by 42 to 56. In 1961 also the Assembly decided by a vote of 61 to 34 that any proposals to change the representation of China would come under the provisions of article 18(3) of the charter and this requires a two-thirds vote. Since then the leaders of Communist China have further demonstrated both in words and deed that they do not accept the most basic principles of the charter. The Albanian proposal is consequently totally inappropriate and should be decisively rejected.

Given the behavior of the Communist Chinese in the past year, it is even more unfortunate that the constructive mood of this 18th session of the General Assembly, a mood in which all, or almost all, of us have taken such satisfaction, should be interrupted in the strident and discordant rhetoric of the cold war. As President Kennedy said in his address at the outset of this session, the whole world is now looking to the United Nations to see if the current pause in the cold war can be stretched into a period of cooperation during which both sides can gain "new confidence and experience in concrete collaboration for peace." The Albanian proposal to expel one of our founding members and to replace its representatives with those of the world's most warlike regime is in essence a proposal to install the chilliest advocate of both cold and hot wars in our halls.

Two years ago on the eve of our debate on this subject Communist China had subjected Tibet to its domination. Last year it was engaged in aggressive warfare against India, and by its own admission was using its influence during the crisis over Soviet missiles in Cuba to try to prevent the solution which the rest of the world welcomed. And now this year we find Communist China not only embroiled in both old and new disputes, on all of its peripheries, but also being the unique and aggressive advocate, alone in the councils of the world, of the inevitability and desirability of war as a means of solving international disputes.

Mr. President, in the past 2 years 19 plenary meetings have been devoted to substantive debate on the representation of China. Nearly all members have expressed their views. In both 1961 and 1962, proposals to expel the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China and to admit Chinese Communist representatives were decisively rejected, not by less and less support, as claimed by the Representative of Albania in his statement of September 27, but by a no vote of 48 in 1961 and by an absolute majority of 56 in 1962. One of the preceding speakers, furthermore, has based his case in part on the erroneous assumption that a majority of member states recognize Communist China. The fact is, of course, that an absolute majority of member states—namely 59—recognize the Government of the Republic of China.

The Albanian request that this Assembly reverse itself, that we throw out a loyal charter member and make room for representatives of a regime which is not a peace-loving state will not bear scrutiny.

In contrast to the Albanian delegate's protestations about the peace-loving nature of the Peiping leaders and their dedication to peaceful coexistence, the Chinese Communists have demonstrated repeatedly that they will not meet the qualifications of article 4 of the charter. The Government in Peiping is not peace loving; it does not concur in the obligations which the Charter imposes; and it is clearly neither able nor willing to carry them out.

A recent example is Communist China's reaction to one of the most significant international developments since our last debate on Chinese representation. I refer, of course, to the test ban treaty, the first successful step in 17 years of effort to limit the nuclear arms race. What has the Chinese Communist regime said about this agreement? Unlike the virtually unanimous majority of United Nations member states represented here, which have adhered to the treaty, the Peiping regime rejected it out of hand as a fraud, a trap, a deceit. "It is rotten to the core" is their specific reaction to this first momentous step on the path to peace and security by arms control.

The Chinese Communists' rejection of the test ban treaty, while disappointing, cannot be said to come as a surprise in view of their known attitude toward other efforts to diminish international tension and the danger of war.

Their objection to the strenuous efforts of the United Nations to bring about disarmament has also been repeated within the last 60 days. "Universal and complete disarmament can be realized only after imperialism, capitalism, and all systems of exploitation have been eliminated," they say. "To make propaganda about the possibility of realizing 'a world without weapons, without armed forces, and without wars' through universal and complete disarmament while imperialism still exists is to deceive the people of the world and is detrimental to the struggle for world peace."

Just ponder this for a moment. As we know, imperialism has long been a Communist synonym for the democracies of the West. Peiping is saying that only when these free, peaceful, economic and political systems have been eliminated, can we talk of general disarmament. In other words they are opposed to the work of the 18-member committee in Geneva; they are opposed to actions such as the resolution we have just adopted in committee I forbidding the placing of weapons of mass destruction in orbit; and they are prepared to talk about disarmament only when those who don't accept their ideology have been erased.

Such an attitude hardly is a recommendation for admission to the United Nations. But it is also hardly new. Long ago Mao Tse-tung expressed the iron maxim of Chinese communism in the words: "All political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." Only recently he was confirmed by one of his spokesmen as having said in 1957: "If the worst came to the worst and half of mankind died, the other half would remain while imperialism would be razed to the ground and the whole world would become Socialist (i.e. Communist). We must conclude that they accept nuclear war, because the death of half of the human race would improve the prospects for Chinese communism in the remaining half of the world.

In spite of all this evidence of the dangerous mood of Communist China, there may be delegations here who are still essentially unmoved. People who see Communist China's attitude as only one more aspect of the "cold war"; who regard this as a remote dispute—even if important—between big powers but with little real relevance and importance to them; who may even secretly take some comfort in the attitude of Communist China on the assumption that it to some degree assists them in the struggle against colonialism.

To those who are so inclined I urge that the real objective and aims of the Chinese Communists be studied more carefully. For their true objective is not the objective of African or Asian democratic nationalism; their true objective is to use this nationalism as a way station to world domination.

The efforts of peoples still under colonial rule to achieve freedom are to be supported, but the Communist Party in those countries is enjoined to work "independently among the masses" and to "guide the revolution on to the road of socialism" by which, of course, they mean communism. And lest there be any misunderstanding of what this means to the social fabric and leadership of those states, the leaders of Communist China add that "all forms of struggle, including armed struggle" are to be mastered and that "the transition from capitalism to socialism (that is, communism) in any country can only be brought about through the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in that country." These words speak for themselves and they should speak to all of us.

No, Mr. President, while the Communist Chinese continue by word and deed to reject the obligations of the United Nations Charter—while they treat the organization with contempt and arrogance—they block their own admission to it. They—who have been branded as an "aggressor" by the United Nations—charge that the "United Nations flag has been imprinted with the ignominious hallmark of aggression against Korea." And they persist in asserting the right to use force if necessary to eliminate the Government of the Republic of China and take the island of Taiwan.

The Chinese Communists, according to Albania, consider "the liberation of Taiwan and the other Chinese islands * * * a legitimate right of this People's Republic of China * * *," an objective made more specific in a report of a political work conference of the Chinese Communist People's Liberation Army issued on March 6, 1963, which says: "We will speed the revolutionary and modernizing buildup of our

army * * * to liberate Taiwan * * *." For many years the United States has sought without success to persuade the Chinese Communists to abandon the use of force as a method of pursuing their policies in the straits. It is no wonder, in the light of such an attitude, that we participate in a mutual assistance treaty with the Republic of China.

The standards of this organization were established after serious deliberation. Every member that has joined this organization is pledged to accept those standards. The Chinese Communists cannot amend or contradict them in the way they do and still expect the members of the organization to consider them seriously committed to obey them and undertake the responsibilities and obligations of membership.

The recurrent theme of "universality" running through the arguments of those in favor of the admission of Red China surely cannot be considered in isolation from such facts. We agree that universality represents a goal toward which the United Nations must strive. But the people of China are already properly and legitimately represented in the United Nations by the Government of the Republic of China. The United Nations must not weaken its dedication to the principles on which it was founded and which have been spelled out in its charter. It is these principles that should be universal. If we were to admit those who deny their validity, we would be creating an illusion of universality, which in time would probably turn out to be no more than a universal delusion.

Nor are the realists who maintain that the composition of the United Nations should simply reflect the world as it is realistic if they disregard these principles of international conduct. The argument that it is unrealistic to exclude the representatives of a regime that for 14 years has controlled hundreds of millions of people on the mainland of China brushes aside realities that have a direct bearing upon the issue before us. These realities include the unrepresentative and aggressive nature of the Chinese Communist regime; the fact that China is already represented in the United Nations by a government which is both able and willing to carry out its obligations under the charter; the fact that the Charter of the United Nations sets forth explicitly the requirements for membership; and finally the monstrous reality of the Albanian proposal to expel a member that has always supported the charter in order to make room for a regime whose creed and actions are diametrically opposed to the letter and spirit of the charter.

This argument of realism also overlooks still another reality, namely, that what keeps the people of mainland China from participating in the work of this organization is an unscrupulous regime that has interposed itself between the people of China and the rest of the world. The people of the United States have always been close friends of the people of China, and we are much concerned with their well-being and that they take their proper place in the modern world. But we believe we could do the Chinese people no greater disservice than to give them the impression that we are siding with their oppressors.

It has also been suggested that the Chinese Communists can best be tamed by admitting them into the United Nations. Although I still feel as I said in 1961, that "this is a most tempting thought which all of us would like to share," unfortunately weight of the evidence points the other way. In their bilateral relations they have been aggressive, expansionist and unfriendly to their neighbors. On the rare occasion when Chinese Communists have spoken in international meetings they have fostered disharmony and conflict. Even in the recently completed Centenary Congress of the International Red Cross the Chinese Communist delegate, Peng Yen, refused to support a resolution which "welcomed the efforts being made by the government to dispel the menace of armed conflict by the reduction of armaments, the banning of nuclear tests and weapons and the resort to peaceful methods of negotiation."

We have another concrete illustration of Chinese Communist behavior after they were brought into the international conference arrangement on Laos. Whenever the ICC has taken action to forestall the possibility of a resumption of full-scale hostilities on Laos, it has been subjected to attack by the Chinese Communists. Despite their protestations of peaceful intent the Chinese Communists have refused to cooperate and have, through their proxies in North Vietnam, sought to defeat the purpose of the international agreement to which they have become a signatory, thereby keeping this unhappy neighbor country in a constant state of turmoil.

Nor need we look beyond the speech of the Foreign Minister of Albania, the spokesman of Communist China in this Assembly. His two speeches to this Assembly have constituted a brutal reversion to the most extreme demagoguery of the cold war and have given the Assembly a vivid example of what would happen in our incessant struggle for mutual understanding and accommodation in the halls of the United Nations if Communist China should become a member.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that the General Assembly has ruled and ruled again on this matter.

In 1961 the General Assembly after a long, full, and a fair debate decided that it was not prepared to throw out one loyal member of this organization and to replace it by a regime which defies the charter and the organization itself, and which has the temerity to demand a license to permit armed aggression as the price of its admission to an organization dedicated to peace. That decision was reaffirmed with even greater conviction in 1962. Nothing has happened in the interim to cause us to reconsider that carefully considered decision. On the contrary, everything that has happened confirms the wisdom of that decision. The evidence mounts from month to month that Communist China does not believe in world peace and collective security nor the charter of this organization.

THE 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today is the 18th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

This hour has been reserved to provide Members with an opportunity to join in paying tribute to the United Nations, not only to its outstanding works of peace in the past, but to its future as our best hope for achieving a world of peace with freedom under law.

Above all else, Mr. Speaker, we want to talk about the United Nations in realistic words, because each day it takes on more of the hard tasks of solving our complex international problems.

We need to address ourselves to this great international organization, not just with eulogies, but with honesty, candor, and enthusiasm.

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and able colleague from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] serves as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He is a strong friend of the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement appear in the RECORD immediately following the conclusion of my remarks, to be followed by the statement of the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to add their statements to the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has written its own record over the past 18 years. We have seen its effectiveness as a forum for discussion of crucial issues from the Berlin blockade to the October missile crisis.

It has helped by direct action to resolve crises which might otherwise have lead to major war in such places as the Suez and the Congo.

We are, perhaps, less conscious of the day-to-day work whereby the U.N. through its many activities is helping to lay a solid foundation for the development of an international community which can live and work in harmony.

Only last week the U.N. General Assembly banned weapons in outer space.

Here the U.N. crystallized world consensus at a given moment of time before the march of events—a changing technology and the arms race—might have made such a proposal unacceptable.

In short, the U.N., in a multitude of ways, in crises and in daily operations, supports the primary goal of U.S. policy: to further the emergence of a world in which nations can live together peacefully and in harmony, settling their differences by legal means rather than by the sword, a world in which every nation is secure and where the United States is therefore secure.

There is little disagreement on the value of the U.N. today.

It is, according to Gallup polls, consistently supported by over 80 percent of the American people.

But over the years a continuing question or complaint is registered: Is not the United States carrying too much of the burden?

In my opinion the answer is "No"—and let me tell you why I answer thus.

The United States makes two kinds of payments to the United Nations. First, as a result of mandatory assessments. The General Assembly has the authority, which it exercises, to assess member nations for the support of U.N. activities. At the first session of the General Assembly in 1946 it was decided that, in general, the costs of the organization should be shared on the basis of capacity to pay. The United States, however, argued that it was unwise to have any one member nation pay too large a share of the costs. The result was that a ceiling on assessments was created at 39.89 percent.

Later this was reduced to 33.33 percent, and in 1957 it was determined that

ultimately the ceiling should be 30 percent.

At the same time the U.N. fixed a floor of 0.04 percent for the smallest payers.

Secondly, we make voluntary contributions to support a number of U.N. programs. Included among these programs are the United Nations expanded technical assistance program and the Special Fund, the United Nations Children's Fund, the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, and the U.N. Fund for the Congo which provides economic help to the Congo.

We also make additional contributions to the World Health Organization.

In which category do the costs of our peacekeeping missions fall?

These are now the subject of mandatory assessments although we have also made extra contributions. This question was finally resolved, however, only after the U.N. began military operations in the Congo.

The General Assembly made assessments against the member nations to pay for this and the Suez operation. France, Russia and other countries refused to pay. They claimed that peacekeeping operations had to be authorized by the Security Council. The General Assembly voted to refer this matter to the World Court for an opinion.

The World Court ruled that the assessments were valid and enforceable. The General Assembly voted to approve the Court's decision. Now, if a country fails to pay, it will lose its vote in the General Assembly when it becomes more than 2 years in default on its payments. Next year the Soviet Union will be that far in default, as will France, unless they decide to pay up.

The current financial problems of the U.N. stem from these peacekeeping operations and the difficulties in getting countries to pay their assessments. The U.N. has resorted to stop-gap answers. First, the $200 million bond issue. Then, for the last 6 months of 1963, a so-called three-bite assessment was agreed upon. The first bite, $3 million, is paid by all countries according to the regular percentages; the next bite, $30 million, on a modified formula permitting the small countries to pay 45 percent of their regular share; and for the third bite, the major powers pick up the remaining balance.

The result is that the United States contributes about 37 percent of the total—far less than the 46 to 49 percent in earlier years.

This compromise—the three bite—was agreed upon because the small nations felt that peacekeeping was primarily the concern of the larger powers, and because they did not have the financial resources to stay in step with these extraordinary expenses. The U.N. has extended this formula for the first 6 months of 1964 and is still working on a longer term solution.

The proportion which our voluntary contributions bear to total contributions vary considerably. For example, our contribution to the World Health Organization's community water supply program is 100 percent. We are paying for all of it. This is one of those cases from which the impression is easily gained that we are shouldering far too high a burden.

In fact, however, counting the voluntary programs, the peacekeeping operations in both the Congo and the Middle East and pledges through the U.N. for economic assistance in the Congo, the total contribution is in the neighborhood of 45 percent.

Furthermore, in the area of voluntary contributions, the United States is very far from being the only participant.

In 1962, for example, our contribution to voluntary programs was less than 50 percent, whether U.S. contributions are compared against program pledges or program expenditures.

How do we measure a fair contribution?

If we take the simplest measure, the total productive wealth of a nation, we find that the United States in 1962 produced approximately 38 percent of the total productive wealth of all member nations.

This figure is larger, therefore, than our regular assessment and is larger than the "three-bite" compromise plan now in effect to pay for peacekeeping operations.

Let us fully understand, therefore, that wherever the United States is subject to mandatory assessments, the proportion is less than our share of the gross national product.

We are offsetting this, however, with our generous voluntary contributions. But even as we acknowledge this fact, we should understand that if the support for the United Nations were generated by applying the U.S. Federal income tax rates to all taxpayers in all member nations of the U.N., the American taxpayers would be paying considerably more than they are today in support of the United Nations, and as so many of my conservative friends like to point out, money in national treasuries does not get there by magic, it is withdrawn from the pockets of the individual taxpayer. Today the average contribution made by an American wage earner to the U.N. is approximately $3 a year. This includes the mandatory assessments and peacekeeping, as well as the additional voluntary contributions.

I use these figures only illustratively. My point is that the capacity of the United States to support the United Nations is enormous compared with the rest of the world, and the limitations we have been striving for on U.S. contributions are supportable primarily on the public policy ground that no nation should be contributing too large a share.

I firmly support that view. But do not let us get the notion that other nations are getting a free ride because, for the most part, they are not. Forty-two nations—the poorest—in 1962 paid more than they would based on their share of the world's wealth.

This results from the minimum contribution level set by the General Assembly. This point is important for one other reason. The U.N. does have a variety of programs, from malaria control to peacekeeping, some of which may not get off the ground unless we do contribute more than our 33 percent. We should not be reluctant to give these programs generous support.

Some of these programs, such as the Special Fund and the expanded technical assistance program, seek to do what we, through our aid program, are otherwise trying to do unilaterally. Even where we put in 50 percent or more, we are still ahead of the game.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to pay tribute to our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Stevenson. The eloquent tribute paid him by the President in the preface to a collection of Mr. Stevenson's speeches soon to be published conveys my sentiments. The President's statement follows:

> Many crises have threatened the peace of the world since Adlai Stevenson became the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. The force, eloquence, and courage with which he has advanced the American viewpoint have played no small part in helping to confine those crises to the council chambers where they belong.

At the end of the preface, he adds:

> During his presidential campaigns Governor Stevenson raised the level of our national political dialog. As our representative in the United Nations, he has similarly raised the level of the international political dialog. The proof lies in the pages which follow.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for taking this time for this purpose and to congratulate him on the interest he is showing as a new Member of the Congress in the vital questions that have come before us. There is no more important subject than the one that the gentleman is discussing.

Mr. Speaker, when we concluded World War II by using the atom bomb, there was in the name of humanity only one tenable position open to the civilized nations and that a position of united, formalized opposition to military aggression anywhere on the globe. We could only speculate what new changes and dangers lay down the road of the 20th century and prepare to meet them.

Thus the United Nations was conceived and has operated as the single international organization empowered to handle critical areas of international interest and international dispute. It has been peacekeeper, economic adviser, banker, friend to the needy, sick, uneducated, and jobless of many nations of the world.

But it functions in a vastly different world than that of post World War II. When war ended, revolution began; revolution on many fronts—political—as the colonial order of things was replaced by nonwhite, non-Christian, but free and independent governments—almost three dozen of them.

Economic revolution, too, has broken out like a rash. Billions of people on other continents by voice and force demand to share in the standards we regard as ordinary. And in those nations experiencing a runaway birthrate, the economic revolution is fought side by side with the biological revolution, the

one almost canceling out the success of the other.

Among the great powers of the world, the revolution in science has almost preempted all other events. Supersonic flight, intercontinental ballistic missiles, atomic energy, have captured their full attention and competition.

The global tide is running toward change—toward a new order of things in which no single country or area will be protected by time or distance—where human aspirations cannot be sealed off from those of the rest of the world by lack of knowledge, materials, or opportunity. Submission to force, to climate, to poverty, to ignorance, is becoming passé.

The new revolutions demand new rules to guide the international revolutionaries. Humankind shares no common color, no common faith, no common race—it shares only a common yearning for a decent life and individual freedom. It is essential, therefore, that we unite behind our common denominator—man's desire to be free.

Nations must share in a common dedication to freedom and also share in the responsibility to protect it. The vehicle of their common purpose is the United Nations. Within the short span of 18 years, experience and events have confirmed our need of such an organization. It has been our most important force to extend peace and order and the boundaries of the free world. It has guarded the rights of self-determination for the new nations just learning to walk and has frustrated the exploitive purposes of the Soviet; it has been the voice and the hand of freedom in the trouble spots of many nations. It is our best experienced and only working world referee to date. I hope it can grow and develop its full potentialities as the guardian of peace and freedom.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today is United Nations Day. Eighteen years ago the U.N. came into being. It was conceived in the mind of the greatest American of the 20th century—Franklin D. Roosevelt—standing today as a monument to him and to world peace imposed at the conference table rather than on the battlefield.

It is useful to compare the U.N. on its 18th anniversary to the status of the League of Nations at a similar time.

Deprived of U.S. participation, scorned by the militarists who were shortly to bring about World War II, the League helplessly stood aside while Japan marched on Manchuria and China, ignored the resurgence of German militarism, bowed to the Italian rape of Ethiopia, and watched but did not understand the subversion of the Comintern.

The United Nations in a same period has forced the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran, stood up and fought the Communist invasion of Korea, restored and kept the peace in the Middle East and prevented Communist penetration in the Congo.

There are those in the United States who say the U.N. is un-American. I say it is a valuable instrument of American foreign policy.

There are those who say it is costly. I say that American lives are more valuable than American dollars and the U.N. has preserved American lives.

Some claim the U.N. is part of the Communist conspiracy. I say nonsense.

Some friends of the United Nations are disappointed that it has not become a superstate with an army capable of forcibly imposing peace on the world, superceding national sovereignties.

The purpose of the U.N. is not that—those great men who brought the United States into the U.N. did not intend such a result—they intended a world forum where the moral force of all nations threatened by disputes could be brought to bear on disputants—and that is what we have.

I am proud to be chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that has oversight over U.S. involvement in the United Nations.

I am confident it will continue to serve the desire of the people of the United States and of the world for a peaceful world in which to bring up their children.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a very real pleasure and privilege for me to say a word on this United Nations Day.

Much water has flowed over the dam since those meeting in San Francisco gave birth to the United Nations.

Some of it has found its way quietly through calm valleys, some of it has been tossed rather violently against rocks of disagreement. None of it has reached the great sea of understanding and constructive togetherness that we dreamed of.

When I had the privilege of being the first woman to represent this great body at the 1953 Assembly, there were less than 60 members. Today there are 111. These 10 years have brought even increasing international problems with no lessening of misunderstanding, but the United Nations is still a sounding board for all the free nations—a meeting place—a forum. Newly emerging nations look to it for principles of self-government, for help in technical training for their people.

But with the rapid pace of new membership accepted without any preliminaries, there has come what may be a dangerous and profound change in the principles that led to its founding.

It was to have been a uniting of those nations whose goals were peace. But even at the outset one of the strong powers had little desire for a peace in which it did not have complete control. The battle for power began at the very beginning and continues on, even as here in our United States there have always been two great factions, one believing that strength lay in the union of autonomous states, and the other insisting that the Federal Government in Washington control. At the moment the latter element is using all its strength to build a powerful Central Government. Opposition to this is gathering strength, as the people begin to realize what it is that is being done to them.

So, in the United Nations these many new nations are beginning to see that being on their own has not necessarily brought them the independence and freedom for which they hoped. They will see more clearly when they have accepted the responsibilities of such freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope and humble prayer that all people here in the United States and out across the world will draw together during the years to come in a clear knowledge and certainty that the peace for which we set up the United Nations can be had only when each individual and each nation examines the depth of its desires and seeks first the kingdom of God, after which all things will be added unto them.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

U.N. AND THE ATOM

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the United States and the Soviet Union—which are capable of inflicting unacceptable destruction on each other within the space of an hour—agreed that it was in their common interest to put a brake on the further extension of thermonuclear power, they conducted their negotiations directly and privately. This was the only safe and sensible thing to do.

And it may well be that next steps toward control of the arms race—if such steps can be agreed upon—will be worked out in direct negotiation among the major nuclear powers before such agreements are submitted to an international body. I would expect this to be the case. But this does not deny the role and relationship of the United Nations to the search for some secure formula for arms control and disarmament.

One of the first subjects of business for the General Asembly was the bold proposal by the United States to prevent a nuclear arms race before it began by placing the management of atomic power under international control. If the Soviet Union had accepted that dramatic initiative by the United States, the world would be a far different and better and healthier place for all of us today. Since then the United Nations has been discussing and debating the subject of disarmament in general and nucler disarmament in particular year after year in forum after forum. Has all this been futile? I do not think so.

This protracted preoccupation of the United Nations with the subject of disarmament has served as a constant reminded that the people of the world are weary of war and tired by the burden of armament. These debates—with their proposals and counterproposals—also have served to reveal the real policies, as

distinguished from the propaganda, of the two sides. For example, when the Soviet Union first delayed substantive disarmament discussions because they insisted that discussions should take place within a 10-nation forum instead of a 5-nation forum, and then won agreement for a 10-nation forum, and then walked out of that forum because they did not like the way things were going, it was clear to all which side was serious about negotiating and which side was not. Repeated incidents of this kind have had an educational effect upon the leaders of other nations.

Furthermore, the United Nations has served as a useful center for direct negotiations and as a promoter of new negotiating efforts—as with the establishment of the present 18-Nation Disarmament Conference which has been working for the past 2 years in Geneva.

But the essential relationship between the United Nations and disarmament is that the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations is the only substitute for the warmaking capacity of nations. Disarmament and peacekeeping are two sides of the same coin.

This linkage has been seen clearly by the United States and made a condition of progress toward general disarmament. When U.S. Delegate Adlai Stevenson described the U.S. plan for general and complete disarmament in 1961, I believe we made a breakthrough in the dialog of war and peace. His description of the relationship between peacekeeping and disarmament are, I believe, well worth recalling:

> In a world without arms, military power would be taken out of the hands of nations; but other forms of power would remain—and mostly in the hands of the same states which are the most powerful military states today.
>
> Conflicting ideologies would still be with us.
>
> Political struggles would still take place.
>
> Social systems would still be subject to disruptive pressures from within and without.
>
> Economic strength would still be a factor in—and an instrument of—national foreign policies.
>
> And the world would still be the scene of peaceful transformations—for it cannot and should not remain static.
>
> Let us be clear about all this:
>
> Disarmament alone will not purify the human race of the last vestiges of greed, ambition and brutality—of false pride and the love of power. Nor will it cleanse every last national leader of the least impulse to international lawlessness. No sane and honest man can pretend to foresee such a paradise on earth—even an earth without arms. * * *
>
> It therefore seems clear * * * that the only way to general and complete disarmament lies along two parallel paths which must be traveled together. One leads to the absence of arms; the other to the presence of adequate machinery for keeping the peace. As we destroy an obsolete institution for the settlement of disputes we must create new institutions for the settlement of disputes—and simultaneously.
>
> Let me repeat for emphasis. We do not hold the vision of a world without conflict. We do hold the vision of a world without war—and this inevitably requires an alternative system for coping with conflict. We cannot have one without the other.

This is the U.S. position today: We can safely dispose of the machinery of war only as we build, simultaneously, effective machinery to keep the peace and resolve the conflicts that would remain in a world without arms. This is the essential relationship between the United Nations and disarmament.

But it has been clear since that first fateful atomic explosion in 1945 that inherent in the atom was the potential not only for the destruction of mankind, but for its lasting betterment. I have mentioned a few of the efforts through the U.N. for disarmament. I would be remiss if I did not point out the progress that has been made through the U.N.—or more properly through its affiliated specialized agent, the International Atomic Energy Agency—toward constructive uses of the atom.

Since that explosion in Hiroshima the world has lived with a threat and a promise. Both stem, oddly enough, from the inevitable proliferation of atomic power. The threat, of course, lies in a proliferation of the atomic weapons; the promise in a proliferation of the manifold peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The U.N. in its efforts toward disarmament has served to keep an uneasy lid on the threat. And the IAEA has sought to maximize the promise by spreading the growing body of scientific knowledge on ways the atom can serve mankind.

The U.S. Government took the lead after World War II in an attempt to internationalize atomic energy. However, due to Soviet intransigence, the International Atomic Energy Agency did not come into being until 1956.

Not widely known is the fact that the IAEA was created for a purpose which it never had to fulfill. At the time of its birth it was believed that nuclear materials would be in extremely short supply and that some agency should be set up to parcel out the limited quantities available. As things worked out, there proved to be a relative abundance of nuclear materials and the problem became one of insuring that the materials were used for peaceful purposes. It was not until last year that the IAEA began to focus clearly on the many other tasks it could accomplish in this field of infinite promise. An advisory committee, headed by Dr. Henry Smyth, U.S. Ambassador to the IAEA, filed a report which highlighted three basic considerations which the IAEA should reflect in its future activity.

First, the committee stressed the growing future applications of nuclear energy through wide areas of the world.

Second, it underlined the necessity of helping nations to build the skills and institutions required to utilize the new atomic technology.

Third, it cautioned against the uncontrolled spread of atomic reactors without international safeguards to assure the utilization of fuels and fission products for peaceful ends.

In connection with the final assumption, it was clear that an international agency would be more effective in assuring adequate inspection for a number of reasons. An international body would apply a more uniform set of inspection standards than would a number of countries conducting their own inspections.

An inspection conducted by a group of technicians of different nationalities would insure against fraud and be more credible to the international community. Moreover, experience in international inspection is the only kind really relevant to the associated arms control and disarmament problem. And finally, an international organization is cheaper and more efficient than a series of national bodies.

Let us examine for a minute what the IAEA has been able to accomplish in the few years of its existence. There are now well in excess of 200 research reactors around the world, of which more than 25 are in developing countries. In about a dozen nations, in addition to our own, nuclear power programs are underway. The Agency has conducted power studies in a number of countries, pointing out areas where atomic power could be competitive and practical. It has provided information and cost estimates to these countries and has assisted them in reactor development and in the training of specialized personnel to operate and maintain these facilities.

In the field of inspection, it has maintained regular inspections of facilities below a certain power level. These inspections are now being extended to larger reactors. Although this program has been hampered by the refusal of some larger atomic powers, notably the Soviet Union, to submit to inspection, the experience gained in other countries will be invaluable when these safeguards can be applied on a truly international basis. And it is important to remember that today's limited inspection has prevented the diversion of nuclear materials to military uses in those areas where it has been carried out.

Concurrently with growing utilization of the atom for power has been a vast increase in man's knowledge and peaceful application of radioisotopes. The IAEA has assured that these advances in the fields of medicine, agriculture, and industry have been speeded to other countries of the world where they may be put to effective use. Through the Agency supplies of essential radioisotopes have been made available to those countries not yet able to produce them.

A further vital service rendered by the Agency is that of training scientists and technicians from other countries. Without this training these nations would be unable to join their world neighbors in realizing the atom's limitless potential for good. Already these technicians are returning to their home countries and applying their new skills to further their national development.

In the atom man has discovered the potential for molding his environment and ending the ancient scourges of hunger, pestilence, and disease. But the same power poses a challenge to his capacity to maintain a civilization of law and order. The IAEA is an institutional response to this challenge, and the extent to which it succeeds in its vital tasks and responds to new scientific breakthroughs will affect the course of history. For the sake of man's self-improvement, as well as his survival, it must not fail.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of Lincoln's adage that you can fool some of the people all of the time when I get the usual run of Carl McIntyre, Smoot, and Birch literature in my office constantly from the same misled, misinformed group, who, out of desperation, question the loyalty and religious faith of all representatives when they are confronted with the necessity of choosing between realistic alternatives. These folks are the authors of more "cleverisms" than the free mind can comprehend, one of which is the voice calling from high on the U.N. building, "Let me out." A clever ditty to these people appears to be the sole answer to all of our fundamental problems and they always promise massive retaliation for the nonconformer. I have a dozen of these honest but misled folks in my district who purport to speak the voice of 400,000.

The theory of many government critics is that you can state anything, get someone to agree with you, ignore the real facts, and all of a sudden you have created a cause.

This week, all over the United States, we are celebrating United Nations Week, and today, October 24, 1963, United Nations Day. Plain people all over my congressional district are congregating in groups to pay honor to the organization created in San Francisco in 1945. There will undoubtedly be some who will laud this organization more than is deserving. For many, a free organization between the nations of the world—the pros and the cons thereof—generate very real emotional feelings.

I commend Democrat Senator ALBERT GORE and Republican Senator GORDON ALLOTT for their realistic reported appraisal of their impressions of the 1962 General Assembly to which they were official American delegates. They jointly pointed out that the United Nations, to be sure, was no universal panacea for all world ills; it was a cumbersome debating society. They cited, however, that the U.N. was perhaps better than we knew, first, in providing a forum where an untrammeled flow of words might be exchanged between nations; and, second, that potentially the U.N. was the only group of its kind, based on multilateral agreement to keep the peace between large and small powers; and third, the U.N. is a tremendous educational facility in the exchange of vital information and the grounding of all nations in fundamental concepts of international law and procedure.

Where else could the United States have formally indicted Cuba and the Soviet Union but in this forum? With propaganda machines finely developed by all nations, it is essential in international relations, not only to have right on your side, but there must be a method of communicating a position.

The Monday-morning quarterbacks are now pointing up that Vietnam, Korea, Cuba, and Latin American coups are all the result of a Communist dominated U.N. Representative ROBERT N. C. NIX, of Pennsylvania, writing in a local magazine, has eloquently set forth that anything can be proven out of context relative to our foreign policy. Coups, revolts, and reverses disturb the conservative mind which basically wants things to stay just about like they were yesterday. Anybody thinking of tomorrow is obviously communistic—how the liberals and conservatives have changed places in 25 years.

The U.N. has provided the forum where nuclear testing limitation debates were first held and the world powers were there taught the benefits of mutual restraint in this area.

The real fear of a few Americans of the United Nations is their fear of communism. They have no answer for Communist mimicked demands for equality of people and this makes them uneasy and frustrated. It is unrealistic that we can fight a war with Japan, Germany, and Italy, killing thousands on each side during a 4-year period, and today enjoy nearly $5 billion worth of yearly trade with these nations and yet, our World War II ally, with whom we have not clashed ever in battle, we are prepared never to recognize a de-Stalinization and continue a cold war of nerves during our lifetimes.

Many persons are panicked to change the status quo. Our President is not, and neither is the majority of his political party. The President may rely on the fact that he will have sustained support from people who are not concerned with appeasement, but are concerned with people peacefully living with people who understand each other.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to join my colleagues in paying tribute to an organization which has demonstrated its effectiveness and holds promise of creating a world of peace. Tensions have been and will continue to be great. Our days are full of crises.

Some are crises of danger: Threats to survival—to life and liberty and all the work of all the centuries. Other threats are less extreme, but nonetheless dangerous: Subversion of those ideas and ideals which we hold dear; threats to those ways of conducting affairs which we call civilized and which have been brought into being through agonies of thought and trial and error—threats to our institutions of freedom, of business, of government.

Other crises are those of opportunity: Opportunity to work for the kind of world we would like to live in; opportunity to promote our varied interests in many different ways; opportunity to work with other likeminded nations so that strengths may be teamed up and results may be greater than could be obtained from anyone's trying to go it alone.

Some of the threats can be countered—and some of the opportunities grasped—by the United States acting alone. Other threats and other opportunities are best handled in concert with other nations. In either case we work to prevent what we know to be bad and to promote what we believe to be good.

Now, two of the paramount duties of any civilized government are, first, to protect the lives and rights and property of citizens, and second, to promote the general welfare, of the citizens end of the state. It is for these two reasons that the other 110 members of the United Nations belong to the organization. We belong to the U.N. because we think it is useful for us to do so. The U.N. represents a few of the many different ways in which the U.S. Government works to protect and promote the interests of our country and its citizens.

Let there be no mistake: Neither the U.S. Government nor the U.N. is a charitable institution, engaged in dispensing alms to worthy indigents. Both are institutions which exist to serve self-interests—the U.S. Government to serve the self-interest of its people, the U.N. to serve the self-interests of its 111 members. I am not talking about selfish interest, but self-interest. The terms are not synonymous, nor are they interchangeable.

We work through the U.N. because it is helping to build the kind of world we would like to live in and do business in. The U.N. is helping to build our kind of world.

What kind of world do we want? One that is safe, at peace, secure for little nations as well as big ones? Yes. One in which there are decent and honorable rules to govern the relations between men and among nations? Yes. One in which there is a reasonable degree of tranquility in the domestic affairs of the various nations? One in which there is ever-broader opportunity for economic and social progress? One in which justice can flourish and the blessings of liberty be counted secure? The answers, of course, are all affirmative. These are the positive attributes of the kind of world we want to see.

In all of these affairs the U.N. is active: The U.N. is working for peace and security; the U.N. is working for law and order; the U.N. is helping to counter threats to domestic tranquillity in many countries; the U.N. is helping provide more economic and social opportunities for millions of people in scores of countries; the U.N. is working for justice; the U.N. is helping many nations to promote the general welfare; the U.N. helps to secure the blessings of liberty. It is no accident that the words and concepts found in our U.S. Constitution are echoed in the language and ideals of the U.N. Charter. We helped write that charter and most of the other authors had knowledge of the ideas and the phrases of freedom found in our basic documents.

Nor is it an accident that the American people, by an overwhelming majority in all the nationwide polls, support the U.N. But, I suspect that some of the most ardent supporters of the U.N. root for the organization for the wrong reasons—just as some of the most vocal critics are against the U.N. for the wrong reasons.

Supporters often talk about the U.N. as if it were the one and only organization in the field of international relations; the only means available to the United States in the search for peace and progress. Critics denounce the U.N. for being a "world government." In point

of fact the U.N. approaches neither extreme: It is neither the one and only tool used by the U.S. Government in the field of international affairs, nor is it a supergovernment which can tell every nation how to conduct its internal affairs, commit the armed forces of any nation, or raise money through taxation.

The U.S. Government uses all kinds of means to protect and promote its interest. Some actions we take all by ourselves: Deciding on the size of our Armed Forces, the production of weapons and the level of defense expenditures; undertaking research and development in the fields of atomic energy and outer space; deciding on tariff and trade policies, the level of foreign aid, or how much to spend for our embassies overseas or for the work of the U.S. Information Agency. It is we alone who decide whether to recognize another government, whether to allow our citizens to trade with other nations, or whether to ratify treaties. These and similar matters—both policies and programs—are made in the United States of America, period. They always have been, and are today, the kind of decisions which no one else can—or should—make for us. The U.N. does not, and should not, make these decisions. The U.S. Government should make them, and does make them, in the light of our own interests and our assessment of the best ways to advance them.

Next there are a whole series of bilateral decisions made by the United States and other individual nations after negotiation and agreement. These usually take form as treaties and cover a kaleidoscope of subjects ranging from the traditional ones of friendship, commerce, and navigation on to base rights and status of forces and deployment of nuclear weapons; tracking stations for space and missile research; economic and technical cooperation; and other matters which are best handled by the United States directly with other individual nations. For example, development of the St. Lawrence Seaway is of little concern to anyone except the United States and Canada; flood control on the Rio Grande is of immediate interest only to the United States and Mexico. These, and similar matters, are best handled bilaterally. There will continue to be plenty of room—and need—for bilateral negotiations and bilateral arrangements.

We have regional arrangements; NATO, SEATO, CENTO, and the oldest of all, the Organization of American States. We belong to these organizations for purposes of mutual defense, or for purposes of economic cooperation, or the furthering of agreed goals in political matters. We belong to regional organizations because it is easier, better, or less costly for us to work through such organizations than to work by ourselves.

Those are formal arrangements on a regional basis. There are also informal arrangements. The best known of these is called the Atlantic Community. Depending on who is doing the talking, the phrase "Atlantic Community" means North America plus Western Europe; or North America plus Central and South America plus Western Europe; or all the nations which own any of the rocks and beaches washed by the Atlantic Ocean; or all of the NATO nations plus all the Rio Pact nations. So you can see the definition is elastic.

Assuming that we are talking about the second one—all the Americas plus Western Europe—here we have a tremendous building job to do. The Common Market in Western Europe is part of the job. Alliance for Progress is another part. The economic progress and solidarity of North America—the United States and its immediate neighbors to the north and south—is still another part. All together these separate elements and other synchronized actions make up the grand design of the Atlantic Community, the center of the strength for peace, the backbone of the financial forces and technical tools needed for progress, the center of the strongest forces for building our kind of world.

In addition to all of these cooperative endeavors we have need for still another organization, an international one with almost global coverage; the United Nations. We have it because we need it, because there are jobs that we want done which cannot be well done, nor done so easily, through any other grouping of forces.

Our problem is not, as some would have us believe, to choose one or another of these interlocking concerts of nations—neither the regional alone, nor the Atlantic community alone, nor the U.N. alone. Our job is to work through each—or all—at such times, and for such purposes, as will best serve the national interests of the United States.

I keep coming back to the national interests of this country as a standard of measurement for our actions. How else are we to judge? By someone else's interest? By consulting tea leaves or a deck of cards? Or a reasonable analysis of all the favorable facts and a hard-headed decision as to what is best for us?

It is this last standard which, when applied against the facts of life in today's dangerous and exciting world, leads us to belong to, to work in, and to benefit from the United Nations. And as in any discussion of U.S. policy, we must always ask the question: "What are the alternatives?"

Can the search for peace be prosecuted better than through the U.N.? Is it possible to put together meaningful arrangements for nuclear control and practical disarmament measures on other than a global basis? Have we the time and the talent and the energy to send out negotiating teams to the other 110 U.N. member countries every time an issue of worldwide interest comes along? Or is it easier, cheaper, and more convenient to do business at a single place and at agreed times?

Are we so self-sufficient that we need no partners in the job of building for peace and progress? Shall we go it alone in trying to map the winds and waves and weather? Shall we turn the clock back before 1853 when Lieutenant Maury represented the U.S. Government at the first international meteorological conference?

Are our hopes so low, our ideals so tarnished, our confidence so shaken, our will so weak that we can forget about the United Nations and its work of peacekeeping and nationbuilding?

Merely to ask the questions in this way obviates the need for answers.

Yet many people are worried about our relations with the U.N. They read criticism not only from foes of the organization, but also from long-time friends. They hear that the U.N. is going bankrupt, and learn that many nations are refusing to pay for certain U.N. operations, particularly peacekeeping operations. They are told that the U.N. is trying to murder the idea of self-determination in the Congo. They read that the United States is losing its shirt in the U.N. General Assembly votes, that the new nations of Africa and Asia are taking the U.N. over, making an unholy alliance with the Communist bloc, and destroying the U.S. influence. And they read that the U.N. does not do anything about repression in Hungary or about Indian aggression in Goa, but sticks its nose into the affairs of U.S. allies in Africa.

Were all the charges true we would have good cause for worry. Fortunately, most of them are not.

The U.N. is not bankrupt, although it is in temporary financial difficulties because it has been carrying on two peacekeeping operations we, the United States, are tremendously interested in, but which a few large nations have refused to pay for and many small nations have claimed they cannot afford to pay for. One of the peacekeeping jobs is in the Middle East where a U.N. Emergency Force—UNEF—is patrolling the borders of Egypt and Israel, maintaining peace in the Gaza area.

The largest and most expensive peacekeeping operation, however, is the one in the Congo. This is also the least understood.

In 1960 the Congo became independent of Belgium. The Belgian armed forces left. Shortly thereafter the Congo started to fall apart, and violence and bloodshed followed. Various factions in the Congo took after each other. The Government of Belgium sent troops back to protect the lives of its nationals in the Congo. The Congo Government did not want the Belgian troops and appealed to the U.S. Government to send U.S. troops to help restore order.

We could have done this—just as we sent 14,000 troops to Lebanon in the summer of 1958. But the Congo situation was different. Had we responded to the invitation from the Central Government of the Congo, what was to prevent the Russians from responding to a similar request from factions which were unhappy with the Central Government? And if the United States were on one side and the Russians on another, would not this be a situation which might result in active hostilities between Russian troops and U.S. troops? Might not this increase the risk of war, even nuclear war?

What was the alternative? It was to avoid direct confrontation between

the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the Congo by asking the U.N. to take over the job of peacekeeping and restoring order. The U.S. Government told the Government of the Congo we were turning down its request for troops but would support any request for help from the United Nations. The Government of the Congo did ask the U.N. for help and the U.N. responded.

The record of the U.N.'s success in keeping the peace, countering repeated attempts at secession, and in strengthening the new Congolese Government and economy is a matter of record. The Congo is now well on its way to assuming a responsible, viable, and independent role in the growing community of African states.

One particular worry about the new African and Asian nations has not found a base to stand on. That is the fear that as the U.N. membership went from 51 to 111, a great many of the new members might—because of reaction against the evils of colonialism—team up with that self-professed anticolonial, the U.S.S.R., and turn the U.N. into an anti-U.S., anti-Western club. This has not happened. The new nations do not vote as a solid bloc. Nor do they consistently vote with the U.S.S.R. and against the United States.

The Afro-Asian members are making their own choices, each country judging what its own best interests are and how they will be served by any particular vote, or abstention. It is worth noting that the U.S.S.R. has never been successful in getting one of its resolutions adopted if the United States was in active opposition to it. The U.S.S.R. can count on only the votes of the Communist bloc and Cuba. The free ones vote as they see fit. And it is good to know that most of them most of the time see things the way we do.

The U.N. is very much alive. The Security Council meets. The General Assembly debates and votes action. The Secretary General remains an effective executive agent. He was not turned into a three-headed monster by the Soviet-sponsored troika proposal. And, through the specialized agencies, the U.N. is working for the peace and prosperity, the health and safety, of the big as well as the little nations.

In the U.N. General Assembly, all nations, and their delegates are required to practice what we preach: Law and order, representative democracy, free and open debate under regular rules of order, voting in accordance with agreed procedures, and responsibility for decisions. No single political bloc or geographic grouping can dictate to the General Assembly. There is no veto power in the Assembly, so no nation can block a resolution wanted by most members. Since no nation can exercise the power of dictation every nation must exercise the power of attraction for its ideas and policies, for the resolutions it introduces, for the arguments it develops.

Through the U.N. and its specialized agencies and other related bodies there are being encouraged those relations of government and business and labor which emphasize our ideas about the best ways to achieve economic and social and political development: private ownership; individual initiative and responsibility; increased production and productivity with benefits shared among owners, workers, and customers; fair dealings under equitable laws.

Through the World Bank and other U.N. financing institutions the U.N. is providing capital for economic development on terms and conditions which are in line with our ideas of doing business in a responsible way. The Bank has courses in economic development and the formation of capital which are given to persons from the lesser developed areas who are now, or will be shortly, in charge of developing policies and practices to be followed in their nations. These courses emphasize our ideas about capital institutions, our ideas about credit and interest rates, our ideas about how investment and economic development are best encouraged. The Soviet Union is not a member of the World Bank and has no influence whatsoever in its decisions.

Anyone who will look at the facts cannot fail to conclude that the U.N. is helping to build the kind of nations and kind of institutions we can live with.

We do not think of the U.N. as a substitute for U.S. direct action. It is not a substitute for cooperation with other nations on affairs of local regional concern. It is not a block nor a bar to effective informal consultation and joint effort, as in the Atlantic community. It is not a substitute for needed defense alliances. We do not try to pretend that the U.N. is something it is not, or that it can do things it was not set up to do. However, we should not ignore its obvious uses, its established place in the conduct of diplomacy, its work in the quest for peace, its help in building the kind of world that is fit for free men to live in, to work and play and do business in.

In any serious discussion of U.S. interests, and ways in which those interests—strategic, defense, political, diplomatic, economic, and cultural—can be protected and promoted; in any discussion of the alternatives available; in any examination of the record; the consensus is: We need the U.N. because it is helping to create our kind of world.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Let me say first, while I very frequently find fault with the United Nations, as we all have, and sometimes we have been disappointed, I was one who did vote for the measure authorizing the purchase of the bonds. So I speak in a general category anyway as one who is friendly to the United Nations. I would hope the gentleman from Minnesota would agree with the statement I am about to make. I have been here for some years now, and I am sure those who have been here for a similar period of time will concur that this House never had a stancher and more effective supporter of the United Nations than your predecessor, Dr. Walter Judd. I think it is most appropriate that the RECORD here make note of that fact.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his remarks. May I add that while my predecessor and I were before the people of our district, I found considerable satisfaction in the fact that both he and I shared the same views on many important international issues not only as to the need to support the United Nations but the need to maintain a strong program of helping the underdeveloped and newly emerging nations. I welcome these sentiments and I think they deserve tribute.

THE U.N. MEETS ITS CHALLENGES

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, today the United Nations is 18 years old. It was also 18 years ago that a well-known financier and a very wise man—Beardsley Ruml—made a prophetic statement about the United Nations. In 1945 Mr. Ruml said this:

> At the end of 5 years you will think the United Nations is the greatest vision ever realized by man.
>
> At the end of 10 years you will find doubts—within yourselves and all throughout the world.
>
> At the end of 15 years you will believe the U.N. cannot succeed. You will be certain that all the odds are against its ultimate life and success.
>
> It will only be when the U.N. is 20 years old that you will revere and laud the dedication of those who devoted their energies to it through its turbulent course. For by then we will know that the U.N. is the only alternative to the demolition of the world.

The first stages of this prediction have turned out to be remarkably accurate. I would remind you that 2 years ago, as the 16th General Assembly met in New York, the United Nations was without an executive head, and without a plan to avert bankruptcy.

At that moment a desperate question-mark seemed to hang over the fate of the world organization. Tiny but noisy minorities who still cling to isolationism, or who are prepared to risk war by go-it-alone intervention, jumped up and down in shrill glee. There were convinced that the U.N. was finished. They were, of course, abetted by the Russians who did their best to paralyze the executive arm of the U.N. with their infamous troika proposal.

At the same time gloomy prophets and the hip-shooting analysts who dominate small parts of the press administered the last rites and prepared to bury the U.N. in public print. Even the responsible press and news magazines wondered out loud in unison: "Can the U.N. survive?" The implications seemed to be that if it did survive, it would be but a shadow of its former self.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the U.N. survived. It not only survived, but emerged a better, stronger instrument for keeping the peace—subject to only one qualification. That qualification is the question of finances.

At this very moment, the United Nations—supported by the United States—maintains the peace in the Middle East and the Congo.

At this very moment—at U.S. initiative and under the auspices of the U.N.—the nations of the world are still seeking some safe formula to halt the deadly arms race and put the world on the path toward true peace.

At this very moment—at U.S. initiative and under U.N. auspices—the nations are meeting in an effort to find other formulas for cooperation in outer space.

At this very moment—at U.S. initiative and under U.N. auspices—the nations are working on concrete plans for a great decade of economic and social progress.

This, then is the major business today of the United Nations: Peace; cooperation in space; and improvement in the standards of living for the world's impoverished people. All of these activities are carried on through the U.N. Each of them, if successful, will bring enormous benefits to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. has not expired from anemia, as its early critics were wont to predict, or from overindulgence, as the latter-day doomsayers would have it. Instead, it has grown in its capacity to act with each successive challenge to its survival.

The role of the United Nations in today's troubled world is no longer in doubt. The U.N. is a vital force for peace, growing progressively in its usefulness to us and to the other nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the United States stands to benefit from the United Nations in direct proportion to our enlightened support and participation. Today, on the U.N.'s 18th anniversary, this House should reaffirm that support and express its gratification at the high quality of our participation to date.

I, for one, take this opportunity to do so.

In closing, let me take this occasion, as the Representative from Vermont, to pay special homage to one from my own State who played such an important role in the early growth of the United Nations. I refer, of course, to Ambassador Warren R. Austin.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Vermont for his very fine statement.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and apologize to him for breaking in at this time on this very important discussion we are having in the House of Representatives. I want him to know that I had a special order myself this afternoon, but I have to leave for Pittsburgh immediately and thus will not be able to take it.

I just want to make a comment here about an incident that happened in the last 24 hours that has been called to my attention, which I believe is worthy of note at this point, because it has a great deal to do with the total matter that we are discussing, which is the cause of the United States and the United Nations and its foreign relations and prestige in world and domestic affairs.

It appears that a group called newspapermen are on a tour, as they call it. If Congress were to take a tour, they would call it a junket, but these newspapermen call it a tour. One of the newspapermen is an editor from my home district. He is sending back a daily communique, and it appears that on the day he was in Paris he states in his communique they had arranged for a meeting with President de Gaulle. However, in his communique he states that in talking to the State Department through the Embassy that they were advised at the Embassy not to meet President de Gaulle since he no longer has any influence in French politics. I was going to suggest to the House that perhaps with all of the money that we are spending we could perhaps have a small appropriation made to buy Dale Carnegie courses for the members of the Embassy who think along the same lines.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. FRASER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be associated with the gentleman from Minnesota in saluting the 18th birthday of the United Nations today, and with the other gentlemen on both sides who have joined with him. I am persuaded that it is the idealism and vision of the United Nations Charter which has made the American people stick with the United Nations through thick and thin for the last 18 years.

I doubt that there are many people in my constituency in Wisconsin, or for that matter in any other constituency, who can quote verbatim from even a single article of the Charter of the United Nations. But almost everybody knows somehow that the United Nations stands for cooperation among nations and that it stands against coercion.

Almost everyone knows that the U.N. stands for justice and economic and social progress and for human rights. And we Americans know that these are the things that we stand for, that the authors of the Declaration of Independence and the framers of the Bill of Rights stood for. We know that the U.N. stands for the kind of world we would like to live in and the kind of world we are determined to have our children live in.

And because of this devotion to the U.N. through thick and thin, it is becoming for us to seek continually new ways in which our country may usefully make the United Nations an even more constructive and creative organization.

I would like very briefly, Mr. Speaker, to suggest a couple of such ways. We have seen in recent months the terrible dilemma that our country has gotten into in far-off Vietnam, where on the one hand we are determined to protect that unhappy country against Communist invasion and infiltration, and on the other hand we have been increasingly worried because the Government of that country, headed by President Diem, seems unresponsive to the needs of its people and the desires of its people; has allowed persecution of one or another religious sect to go on; and in many other aspects presents itself as a very embarrassing client of the United States.

I have suggested, and I suggest again today, because I think it is something that we might usefully consider, that either the United States or another friendly nation table before the United Nations a proposal to invoke the mediating and observing processes of the U.N. in Vietnam. There are at least three important things that such an invocation of the United Nations could accomplish. A U.N. mission in Vietnam, in the first place, could identify and contain outside aggression. In the second place, the mere presence of such a United Nations mission in Vietnam—and there is not now such a mission—could constitute a guardian for human rights and provide help to end some of President Diem's current repressions.

Thirdly, and perhaps most important of all, it would tend to clarify the proper interest of the United States in South Vietnam. That interest is to protect South Vietnam against Communist aggression, not to hinder it by presenting the United States clothed in the robes of the protector of a backward-looking and unrepresentative client government.

I know it is said that if we do this we are going to lose South Vietnam, but to this I would say: Not at all. We can and should continue our military protection of South Vietnam under the United Nations auspices. If this produces difficulties with the Diem government, I would say that we have those difficulties already, and I would point out for the historical record that from June until December 1944, the greatest land battle in the world's history was fought within the borders of France at a time when we did not recognize the Government of France and when we dealt solely with French military commanders.

I have been a rather regular reader of the statements made by Madam Nhu, President Diem's sister-in-law, since her arrival in this country. I frequently find myself in disagreement with what she says, but in this morning's paper she is quoted as saying:

> I telephoned my husband last night and told him, "Let us break off diplomatic relations with America and just take their military aid."

Well, I think this is a suggestion of Madam Nhu's that we might well seriously consider, particularly since it is she who made it. I think it would be entirely useful to get a United Nations presence into Vietnam. If the Diem Government wishes to break off relations with us, we can very well continue our military aid to tactical echelons of the Vietnam forces. Thus, we would be doing what we can to protect the country against communism, but at the same time we would be doing it under the banner of human rights which the U.N. can epitomize.

Mr. Speaker, to turn to another possible way in which the U.N. can be more meaningful in our life—and this is a field about which we do not ordinarily think in connection with the U.N.—we in this country are acutely concerned with the conservation of our natural resources, our woods, our wildlife, our waters, our

soil and all the other things for which we act as trustee for generations yet to come.

What we are beginning to realize, however, is that the problem of conservation is not just a U.S. problem, but has to do with Africa, Asia, Latin America, and indeed with countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Thus, I am very pleased to find recently support in both the Department of State and the Department of the Interior for a suggestion which I made in this body, and which the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has made in the other body, that the issue of worldwide conservation be tabled before the United Nations. Out of such a conference might come, for example, an agreement by the wealthy countries to limit the import into those countries of the leopard skins, the rhinoceros horns, the feathers and other animal products which are slowly depleting the world resource of wildlife. Out of this conference might come some U.N.-sponsored conservation aids for the developing countries, enabling them to conserve their own resources.

Mr. Speaker, out of such a conference might come a recognition that whereas the countries on the other side of the Iron Curtain like Hungary have given to this country the Hungarian partridge, which is an important game bird, we now read that in Hungary practices are being pursued which go against the interest of worldwide conservation. We read that because Hungary is moving toward collective farms, the hedgerows between fields are being ripped up. We in Wisconsin who have provided over the years a hospitable home for the Hungarian partridge have long since found, to our sorrow, how the practice of so-called clean farming, getting rid of the cover between the fields, can hurt the cause of conservation and hurt the possibility of wildlife survival. Americans may not talk to Hungarians about the dove of peace, but perhaps we can talk about the partridge.

So, Mr. Speaker, not only between the developed world and the developing world, but between the two poles of the world, between the free world and the world dominated by communism, there is an opportunity here, I suggest, for a mutual effort that transcends the hatreds of the cold war struggle and that recognizes the conservation of our soil, our waters, our wildlife, as a problem of all the countries of the world. Our natural heritage belongs not to just one country or region alone, but to all mankind. All nations have a stake in preserving the stock of wildlife on this globe.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest here that in the field of conservation, and in the tormenting problem of Vietnam, there are ways in which we can do even more with the United Nations.

It is, therefore, appropriate on this 18th birthday of the U.N., that we give some consideration not only to how we can memoralize and do homage to what has been done by the United Nations in the years behind us, but to how it can be an even more effective agency in working toward world peace in the days to come.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. It is my opinion that the imagination reflected in the gentleman's statement about the possible uses to which the United Nations should be put and the important function which they could play in such areas as Vietnam and in the conservation of our world resources, that these suggestions are very welcome and are the kind that will help make the United Nations grow and become an even more vital organization.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to add my voice to those participating today in commemorating the 18th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. In the spring of 1945, at town meetings throughout New Hampshire, the then proposed United Nations organization received a strong vote of confidence. I believe that the Granite State was the only one in the country that permitted its citizens to thus express their opinion at the polls.

New Hampshire granite was used as the cornerstone for the United Nations Building in New York. With an opening vote of confidence by the people of New Hampshire and with New Hampshire granite as a cornerstone of its building, the United Nations is thus of particular concern and affinity to residents of New Hampshire. We have supported the United Nations in the past and we shall support the United Nations in the future.

Our support is not blind support, however, and we reserve the right to criticize the actions of this body just as at our town meetings and, indeed, throughout the year, we reserve the right to criticize our elected officials and our own deliberative bodies. And, Mr. Speaker, I might add that this is a right that is frequently exercised, for in New Hampshire, we take the matter of government seriously. Our State motto is "Live Free or Die" and the freedom to criticize is important to freedom.

Support for the United Nations or any other institution of man should not be blind and unquestioning. There is a tendency among some friends of the United Nations to confuse valid criticism of this institution with hostility. Some criticism of the United Nations is unfair and unfounded in fact, but this is not true of all criticism of the United Nations. Just as some criticism of Congress is unfair, there are criticisms of this body that are constructive and well-founded. In my opinion, much unfair criticism of the United Nations comes from people who expect too much of it and thus, of course, are disappointed.

Let us recognize the United Nations for what it is. As such, we can surely applaud its progress on the long and tortured road toward a better world, a step, at least, toward man's aspiration for peace, a ray of hope. It is a deliberative body of imperfect men and nations. It is a forum where people can shout instead of shoot. It is a mechanism for adjusting world tensions and for all of its imperfections, it is a proven step, toward the sensible solution of the great problems of war and peace, of poverty and ignorance in the world today.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join in expressing support of America's participation in the United Nations.

Despite its many critics—and the fully justified criticism on some counts—the United Nations organization remains the most effective single international force for peace and order in a troubled world.

Nothing would do more to advance the Communist conspiracy in the world today than American withdrawal from the United Nations.

Nothing would do more to strengthen the arm of Premier Khrushchev than for the United States to yield the field to Soviet leadership in the U.N.

Recent events in the U.N. on the issue of Red China's admission indicate we are gaining support for our position, and America's stock is high among other U.N. members.

Among American citizens, I believe the United Nations' stock is also high and will continue to rise as the effectiveness of the U.N. grows.

In closing, it seems appropriate to recall the observations of a great British statesman many years ago:

> The United Nations was not created to take the world to Heaven, but rather to keep us from going to the other place.

The United Nations organization has not taken the world to the comparative heaven of international peace and justice as yet, but it has certainly helped substantially to prevent our going to the holocaust of thermonuclear war and has provided a useful forum for the peaceable discussion and negotiation of disputes among the nations.

With full awareness of the U.N.'s structural weaknesses, with equal awareness of the great importance of U.S. armed strength and readiness, let us continue to give our strong support to the United Nations in the years ahead.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his statement. I think he has properly construed the role the United Nations has played during its 18 years.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in this discussion today of the United Nations, we should not forget that the urge for international cooperation and organization is deepseated in the history of the human race. We can better understand the desire of mankind to see the United Nations become a success when we consider the number of attempts that have been made through the years to create lasting international organizations.

ANCIENT GREECE

The first antecedents of contemporary international organizations were organized in Greece before the birth of Christ. The amphictyonic councils, of which the Delphic council was the most

illustrious, were composed of representatives of those tribes devoted to the same religious temple. Bound by the same religion, some city-states would agree upon the joint maintenance and security of holy places and provide for a council to discuss or manage such matters. The council members swore to observe the inviolability of shrines and the safety of pilgrims, and they pledged themselves to moderate rules of warfare: for example, the interruption of water supplies and the razing of cities were forbidden. The Delphic Amphictyony, however, touched political regulation only as an incident to its functions as a religious cooperative invaluable as an assembly of Greek opinion on matters of common concern, such as setting a price on the heads of citizens who had assisted the Persians or launching a crusade against some sacrilegious city, nevertheless the amphictyony had no force beyond the willingness of each member tribe to follow its resolutions. The most glaring weakness of the council lay in its voting arrangements, for as an ancient tribal institution it did not reflect the locus of power in cities like Athens, Corinth, and Thebes but rather granted two equal votes to each of its twelve tribes. Only in the last centuries before Christ were the voting arrangements reformed, but by that time the shadow of Macedon and Rome had passed over the Greek peninsula.

Out of amphictyonic councils it may be presumed that such Greek political confederation as the Phocian League, the Akarnian League, and the Boeotian League emerged. The Lycian confederation presents the first historical evidence of weighted voting in an intersovereign assembly, for middle-sized cities and one vote for each of the tiny settlements in Lycia. In the Achaean League there were genuine foundations for a Greek federal state: an assembly of the cities met twice annually to vote on "national" affairs; a senate, equivalent to a standing committee, an executive council, a secretary, and a general were elected. Continuous joint action in foreign affairs and federal tax levies on each of the member cities were distinctive attributes of the confederation. All these leagues, however, had the advantage of linking peoples with the same racial-cultural background in a political union, and in this respect they were very different from modern international organizations.

MIDDLE AGES

During the Middle Ages, several examples of collective organization for specific purposes existed. Perhaps the most famous confederation of medieval times was the treaty among the Swiss cantons of Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden in 1315. It was followed by pacts with Lucerne, Zurich, Glarus and Zug, and Berne primarily for cooperation in repelling attacks. This league became the nucleus of the modern state of Switzerland.

A singular illustration of a combination of city-states for the promotion of trade was the Hanseatic League. The League originated as a society of commercial towns on or near the Danish isthmus for the protection of trade through the equalization of tools and the suppression of piracy. Gradually obtaining mastery of the North and Baltic Seas, the Hanse, including upwards of 50 cities, defeated both Denmark and Norway in 1370, thereby securing a virtual monopoly of sea trade and many other strategic economic concessions. As a political organization, the Hanse prescribed rules for the admission of new members, forbade any member city to make war without approval of its four closest neighbors, and permitted only the Diet to commit the whole League to war. Between 1363 and 1550 the Hanse convoked 53 general assemblies. Administrative expenses were shared by the members, an agenda was circulated prior to the Diet's meeting, and resolutions were passed by a majority vote of cities represented. Such resolutions were binding upon the entire League; failure to comply on the part of one town might lead to expulsion from the Hanse, the loss of all trading privileges, the arrest of visiting merchants, and the confiscation of the town's property in all the cities of the League. Because the Hanseatic League was an international "corporation" with an administrative center in Lubeck and self-governing "factories" in foreign ports from London to Novgorod, it ran counter to the rising tide of nationalism and the dynastic state of the 15th and 16th centuries. Consequently, it slowly withered away.

EMERGENCE OF MODERN NATION-STATE

The most important arrangement of the new state system was the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, terminating the Thirty Years War on the Continent. No international organization was established by the peace treaty. But the joining of practically every European state in a diplomatic conference signaled the opening of a new era in international relations. Of all the many European sovereigns only the Sultan of Turkey was not mentioned in the Articles of Peace, and delegates from every state except Muscovy, Turkey, Poland, and England attended the conferences, which extended over 3 years.

In addition to sanctioning the independence of new states and redrawing the map of Europe rudimentary acts of international regulation which were to serve as important precedents were included in the treaty provisions for the abolition of many tolls upon commerce among the states of the Holy Roman Empire and the declaration that the navigation of the Rhine was to be free. Each principality of the Empire pledged that, if injured, it would first seek to bring its cause to a "friendly composition of the ordinary procedures of justice." Should the dispute not be terminated in 3 years, the other parties, being notified that "gentle means" had not succeeded, were obliged to aid the injured party by counsel or force.

As an international assembly, the Congress of Westphalia bore little resemblance to the intricate organization of 20th century peace conferences. No officer presided, no committees were formed, no votes were taken. But the cities of negotiation, including the route between Munster and Osnabrück, were neutralized from the war while both Papal Nuncio Chigi and Ambassador Contarini of Venice acted as mediators for the plenipotentiaries in Munster. Of the greatest importance to international organization, however, were the gathering of hundreds of envoys in a diplomatic conference which represented practically every political interest in Europe and the achievement by negotiation, rather than by dictation, of treaties which legalized the new order of European international relations.

Sixty-five years later in 1713, another great conference was held at Utrecht to end the war of the Spanish succession. Hostilities were still in progress when the plenipotentiaries assembled to confer on a general peace. Once again, practically every interest in Europe participated in the conference to negotiate a treaty of peace instead of imposing one by force.

During the 17th and 18th centuries, modern plans for international organization appeared. The Duke of Sully, minister of Henry IV of France, suggested in his memoirs a European confederation of 15 states; William Penn in 1693 proposed a diet of states, including Moscovy and Turkey, wherein voting would be weighted according to the foreign trade of the states. At Utrecht itself, the project of the Abbe de Saint-Pierre for perpetual peace called upon the sovereigns to submit their differences to judicial decision. In the event that any sovereign should refuse to cooperate in the judgment, the other states would unite their military forces against him.

Such schemes, humanitarian in outlook and containing the germs of future international organization, gained no acceptance within the 17th and 18th centuries state system—not quite free from its feudal origins nor yet pressed by rapid interstate communications. Clinging to personal sovereignty as a norm of political life, the princes established no practical international agencies.

Nevertheless, "congresses," emulating the meetings at Westphalia and Utrecht, became an accepted mode of international diplomacy to adjust the quarrels among states, quarrels which now affected every other member of the European state system. Thus, at Cambrai in 1722 representatives from Britain, Austria, Spain, France, the united Netherlands and several German states met for a period of 3 years to discuss, though not settle, a dispute between Spain and Austria; at Soissons in 1728 another gathering was called on the British-Spanish controversy over Gibraltar. In the war of the Austrian succession, every European state except Denmark, Switzerland, and Turkey was involved, and the congress at Aix-la-Chapelle worked out the final peace treaties among six European states. These are only a few of the "congresses" held during the 18th century.

Modern international organization differs from the conferences and congresses of this period in three major respects. Its foundation is still the treaty or interstate contract, but, first, the stress is on a multilateral agreement rather than

a bilateral accord. Although the treaties resulting from the Conference of Westphalia and the periodic congresses of the period were multilateral in concept, the treaties themselves were concluded between only two states. Thus, a series of treaties were signed at each conference to register the new status of affairs. Secondly, treaties under modern international organization attempt to harmonize continuity and self-perpetuation of the basic document with modification of the terms. In other words, they are not made to be broken. And thirdly and most characteristically, modern international organization is institutionalized by periodic councils and permanent secretariats. Each of these aspects become explicit in the development of international organization in the 19th and 20th centuries.

MODERN NATION-STATE SYSTEM

Toward the end of the Napoleonic wars, some 216 different delegations met in Vienna in 1814 to liquidate the unsettled political problems which the years of warfare had raised for Europe. By comparison with the pre-Napoleonic international gatherings, the Congress of Vienna made some remarkable advances toward international organization in the extent of first, its political settlement; second, the diversity of economic-social problems treated; and third, the procedure of the Congress itself. Not only were there 121 articles in the body of the Treaty of Vienna, but the final act of the Congress also legalized by unanimous international consent 17 other acts, declarations, regulations, and protocols to which different states had previously adhered during 1815.

The most notable contributions to the development of international organization resulting from the Congress are the following:

First. For the first time at an international conference, special committees were established to deal with selected problems. Of special importance to the Congress was the Statistical Commission which made a complete census of territories in dispute among the powers, thereby providing a reasonable basis for negotiation and heralding the modern practice of international organization with its factfinding commissions.

Second. By a new quadruple alliance, Russia, Prussia, Austria, and Great Britain displayed their determination to guarantee the peace terms of the Treaty of Paris and to thwart any revival of French aggression. They accordingly agreed to renew their meetings at fixed periods for the purpose of consulting upon their common interests, and for the consideration of the measures which at each of these periods shall be considered the most salutary for the repose and prosperity of nations and for the maintenance of the peace of Europe. The intention of the four European powers was implemented at the conference of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1818, at the conferences of Troppau and Laibach, 1820 to 1821, and the conference of Verona, 1822.

In this manner, several European states took it upon themselves the responsibility to maintain the peace of Europe, and for this purpose, they institutionalized their agreement by calling periodic meetings.

The legal mechanism for consultation among the great powers failed in 1825, but the practice of international conferences, in time of peace, among the states of Europe to regulate their political views and interests had been firmly established. No permanent machinery existed, but a series of conferences from 1826 to 1913 served to inculcate the habit of multilateral consultation and testified to the genesis of international organization.

It is virtually impossible to trace the rapid multiplication of international conferences during the latter half of the 19th century. Some grew out of common effort to stop a war in progress; others met to find agreements which would prevent the outbreak of hostilities. The conference in London, 1867, over the status of Luxembourg, for example, brought together all the great states of Europe, including the new Kingdom of Italy, and pledged them to respect the perpetual neutrality of Luxembourg, thereby easing for a few years a point of tension between France and Prussia.

The significance of this multiplication of conference lies in the adaptability of the device of consultation to the late 19th century diplomacy in both peace and war and the willingness of states to submit their propositions, pleas, and arguments to the hearings of other states. The new system of consultation among states, however, did not and could not fashion instantaneously an international community. Respect for the law and the swift punishment of criminals as typified by the national community loomed upon a horizon very distant from the first simple steps toward international organization.

International economic and social problems always require political activity for their ultimate solution, but some economic and social needs affect power relationships less than others. Consultations by the great powers during the 19th century proceeded with a nervous and hesitant pace toward a comprehensive international organization because they instantly challenged the European balance of power itself. During the century, however, a spate of international problems offered to statesmen and specialists alike the opportunity to confer without rousing too roughly the delicate sentiments of national pride; indeed, without loss of treasure or prestige the states of Europe fell upon their twin enemies—poverty and disease. To utilize the steamboat, the railroad, and the telegraph efficiently required international cooperation, while these communications, in turn, opened the dark door of envy and ignorance to let the hope of organized international work.

Of primary importance in the development of international organization is the proliferation of river commissions during the 19th century. The first of these was the Octrai of the Rhine, established in 1804. The Rhine River, flowing from western Switzerland and either bordering or traversing Austria, Germany, France, and the the Netherlands, drains fertile valleys, great forests, and both coal and iron territories. But the arbitrary tolls imposed by local princes and the right of cities to compel the transfer of cargo to local ships clogged the avenues of trade and impeded commerce. Furthermore, problems of navigation and security on the river were manifold.

The Octrai of the Rhine provided that there shall be a director general empowered to direct and supervise the establishment and the collection of navigation tolls; to administer everything in respect to the tolls and to watch over the execution of the agreement. The director general was appointed by the parties to the agreement which included all riparian states. By this means, the riparian states collaborated to improve and maintain the river, to collect common tolls for the costs of upkeep, and to secure the safety of navigation. The benefits of such an arrangement for commerce need not be dwelt upon.

The director general of the Rhine became a prototype of the international civil servant, responsible not to his government but the governments as a collective organization signatory to the treaty. The Octoi of the Rhine furthermore provided for assistant inspectors and collectors at the toll stations, to be appointed by individual governments, and an international commission to determine finally all appeals on questions of tolls and police regulations on the Rhine. The basic structure of modern international administrative agencies—an international conference or commission whose members are appointed by their governments and a director appointed jointly—was clearly foreshadowed.

The same type arrangements were made for other rivers in Europe, and notable the Danube River where both riparian and nonriparian states were included in the regulation of commerce on the river.

Several other problems of a "nonpolitical" nature were tackled by international organizations in the 19th century. Most prominent among these were the International Telegraphic Union and the Universal Postal Union, both of which are still with us today. In addition, smaller agencies concerned with health, science, copyright and patents, and railroads were established. Common to all of these agencies was the provision for a permanent secretariat responsible to all signatory governments and a general conference of delegates representing all signatories which met once a year or every 2 years. Even though these agencies dealt with technical problems on an international level, they provided invaluable experience for the architects of the League of Nations and the United Nations.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The 19th century was an age of international consultation on political affairs; the 20th century begins a period of collaboration. A salient difference between international organization before and after the League of Nation lies in the achievement of a permanent agency through which states can collaborate continuously on the grave problems which affect the peace of the world.

The League of Nations did not spring full grown from the minds of wise statesmen. Indeed, its origins can be traced back to the various congresses of the 19th century culminating in the two international peace conferences at The Hague. Just as the Napoleonic Wars had interrupted the rudimentary peace parleys of the 18th century only to be revived in the Congress of Vienna, so did the First World War suspend the universal conferences at The Hague only to realize a more articulate association of nations in the League.

The League of Nations operated through three major organs: first, a Council, originally comprising Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and four smaller states designed by the assembly; second, an assembly, consisting of all the member states, originally 42 in number; and third, a permanent Secretariat whose chief officer, the secretary-general, was nominated by the Council and approved by a majority of the assembly. Even in these rough divisions the structure utilized the experience of the 19th century with its concert of major powers, its general assemblies such as the Congress of Vienna, and the institutions of dispassionate international secretariats most notably in the form of the telegraph and postal unions. On any matter extending beyond administrative regulations, equality of votes and unanimity of voice had ruled international procedure. The League of Nations circumspectly hewed to this line. Learning from the past, however, the covenant required the Council to meet at least once a year and the assembly to convene at stated intervals. For the first time in history, therefore, the world was provided with humming machinery to study and solve the causes of international war.

Whatever the reality of aggression proved, the fledgling international organization in 1931 and 1936 could not soar beyond its own limitations: the provincialism of the United States, the pessimism of France, the opportunism of the Soviet Union, the conservatism of Great Britain, all shuddered under the ruthless arrogance of Japan, Italy, and Germany while the small states, too frequently played with callous ambition or petty covetousness.

Yet for all these adolescent disorders the organization carried on its work. Throughout the 20 years of its brief life the League of Nations steadfastly promoted international administration. Cautious world cooperation was filled with new energy and, culling the weeds of the past from old bureaus, the League's international economic and social programs flowered in the fields of commerce, health, communications, and protection of helpless peoples. The Permanent Court sponsored by the League gained the respect of the world, and no reticulation of international law had ever spread so rapidly. Both at Geneva and in the cities of different continents the League encouraged conferences and consultations among statesmen, some of whom became close friends and sympathetic with other national views. In its best years, from 1924 to 1931, the foreign ministers of Great Britain, France, Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries frequently represented their states in the Council, giving to the international organization a political weight and center unparalleled in modern times. Not only were responsible ministers represented in the Council but distant states, notably Brazil and Argentina, appointed special representatives to Geneva with ambassadorial status to sit with the Council instead of utilizing on a part-time basis one of their envoys to a European state. Even the blasts of derision leveled at the military impotency of Geneva in later years could not alter the fact that no other international organization had ever united to condemn and punish a major state for violating its covenants to keep the peace.

The days of the League were unhappily numbered in the docket of security from international aggression. After helplessly expelling the Soviet Union on December 14, 1939 for its attack upon Finland, the League faded into the twilight of a shattered world at war. Japan and Italy had been revealed as blustering criminals in a community of nation-states, but their success in getting away with their loot forecast the doom of the first period of international collaboration. The weakness of the League of Nations to enforce its judgments, however, did not mean the end of international organization for the maintenance of peace; it indicated rather the urgency of shoring up its hollow structure. Scarcely had the Second World War blazed across Europe than men of vision set themselves to the task of creating a new charter for international collaboration.

UNITED NATIONS

The history of the U.N., the second trial of international collaboration by a world organization for peace, has too many new pages for a seasoned analysis. The many facets of its international activities—in security matters, in economic, social, and cultural affairs—beggar an adequate description, and the mere account of its ever-proliferating conferences, commissions, and committees would make a dizzy array of details. But the continuity of the U.N. in many respects with the League of Nations gives the 8 postwar years some perspective. For dependent and colonial peoples the U.N. has carried a beacon of hope and a plea for equality unknown to the past degradations of slavery and exploitation. For the improvement of mankind through international economic and social cooperation it has afforded new insights and bold projects captivating the imagination on the limitless possibilities of improving health, nutrition, employment, education, science, and morals through international organization. All these things enrich the soil and the climate of international peace and security. For the deadly quarrels of nation-states the U.N. has provided a means of accommodation, a permanent forum, and a permanent tribunal; it has offered to all disputants its good offices and has successfully driven every state, large or small, to the bar of world opinion. The U.N. is an international organization, not a world government: as such, it bumps along the twisting, rocky, perilous trail first opened in the 19th century. Given a pliable, multilateral treaty for a constitution, an expert international secretariat, and the honest will of nation-states to work together for peace, the U.N. can make the 20th century a golden era of civilization.

Mr. RYAN of New York. October 24 marks the 18th birthday of the United Nations, for it was on that day in 1945 that the Charter of the organization entered into force. In the lives of young men and women, the age of 18 is a landmark, since it marks the end of one era in their lives and opens up to them many new privileges and responsibilities. Similarly, the 18th anniversary of the United Nations can serve as a landmark from which we can review the accomplishments of these formative years and assess the challenges for the future.

By physical measurement the growth of the world organization has been tremendous. From the 50 nations which signed the Charter at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, the membership of the United Nations has more than doubled and there are now 111 nations represented. The very existence of many of these countries is due in large part to the encouragement and assistance of the United Nations, and we may count the presiding of the United Nations at the death of colonialism and the birth of dozens of independent nations as one of the organization's major accomplishments.

More important than the growth in the size of the United Nations, however, has been its invaluable contribution in maintaining peace during an epoch in which peace has been in constant jeopardy. Today I would like to discuss several different ways in which the United Nations has contributed to maintaining the peace.

The first is as a policeman, when there has been a breach of the peace. On many occasions the United Nations has proved its capability to mobilize collective action for the maintenance or restoration of peace. In one way it may be surprising that the United Nations has succeeded in this peacekeeping function at all, for its Charter had been drafted with the concept that the great powers would continue to cooperate in peace as they had in war. Experience quickly proved that the requirement for unanimity among the big powers for Security Council action, in other words the veto, would prevent the United Nations from enforcing the peace in the manner which had been originally contemplated. For example, the military agreements by which members were to make armed forces available to the Security Council were never concluded.

In spite of the veto, however, the United Nations proved able to take decisive action to maintain or restore peace in numerous crisis situations. Attempts at overt armed aggression by the Communists were sharply reduced after United Nations forces repelled the aggression of North Korea in 1950 across the 38th parallel. The hostilities following the nationalization of the Suez Canal in 1956 were brought to an end after the General Assembly urged a cease

fire and established an emergency force to secure and supervise the ending of the conflict.

The United Nations has also served an invaluable police role in areas where the transition to independence and the withdrawal of colonial power would otherwise have left a dangerous vacuum, a vacuum which would have been exploited by the Communists or other individuals seeking to promote their own purposes. The outstanding example is the Congo, where for more than 3 years the United Nations Force has worked tirelessly and often thanklessly to restore and maintain order and to train the Congolese to assume the responsibilities of self-government. A great Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold, gave his life in this effort. The new Secretary General, U Thant, has reported that the time has now come in which we can envisage the early ending of the military activities and the withdrawal of the United Nations Force.

Similarly, the United Nations assisted in the transfer of West New Guinea from Dutch administration to the Republic of Indonesia. First bringing about a cease-fire, the United Nations then formed a Temporary Executive Authority to insure that needed public services, which had been previously carried out by the Netherlands, were not interrupted. The Temporary Executive Authority also helped prepare the people for the change taking place. The success of the United Nations efforts was culminated when the Dutch and Indonesian Governments resumed normal diplomatic relationships and exchanged representatives.

Korea, Suez, the Congo, and West New Guinea illustrate the policing functions of the United Nations, in which the organization steps into crisis situations where hostilities have begun and restores order. The United Nations has proved capable of fulfilling this function far more effectively than any single nation because the international organization has the sanction of the world community.

There is another way in which the United Nations has proved invaluable in contributing to peace in the postwar period. I refer to its role as a center for the pacific settlement of disputes. Throughout its 18 years of existence, the United Nations has exerted a constant effort to work out solutions to the basic international problems which give rise to tension. The political controversies which have been brought before the United Nations are too many to enumerate at this time, but they have included problems in every region of the world, such as the treatment of Indians and the racial policy in South Africa, the violation of human rights in Eastern Europe, and the Palestine problem.

Some of these problems have been successfully settled and have passed into history. Others are still with us and will undoubtedly remain with us for many more years. In any event, through the open discussion of disputes in the General Assembly and the Security Council, the issues have been clarified and public opinion has been focused upon the parties to the dispute, acting as a restraint and a sobering influence upon them.

The Cuban situation of 1 year ago provides an excellent example of the important assistance which can be provided by the United Nations. On United Nations Day last year the people of the world watched tensely as they witnessed the confrontation of the two great nuclear powers. On the surface the United Nations appeared powerless. It was the two great nuclear powers who held the world's future in their hands. Nevertheless, the world organization did not stand idly by and wait while the two giants decided which way they would move, but instantly exerted every influence it could in favor of peace.

First of all, the organization served to keep communications open between all the involved parties. Each side had a place it could present its case and make clear its understanding of the facts. The United Nations provided a site where representatives of each side could negotiate without a long controversy over whether and where such negotiations should take place. Second, it allowed parties not directly involved to make constructive proposals and take the dispassionate, impartial action of a third party. For example, at a critical moment it was Secretary General U Thant's intervention which led to the diversion of the Soviet ships headed for the island of Cuba and their interception by the U.S. Navy. Finally, it provided a funnel through which all the peoples of the world could channel their anxiety and make it weigh upon the great powers as they made their fateful decisions. We cannot pretend that the United Nations could have prevented a world holocaust if either the United States or the Soviet Union had acted rashly or irresponsibly or with reckless determination to fight it out once and for all. On the other hand, we should not overlook the fact that without the United Nations the chances of a peaceful outcome of the Cuban crisis would have been greatly diminished.

The United Nations also deserves more credit than it generally receives for bringing about the treaty to end nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere. As in the Cuban situation, the decisive power lay with the United States and the Soviet Union. If those two countries had insisted upon the continuation of atmospheric tests, there would have been little the United Nations could have done to prevent it even if the radioactive strontium and iodine in children's bones doubled or tripled. On the other hand, however, who will ever be able to measure the influence of the United Nations in bringing about the Soviet and American decision to conclude the test ban treaty? The constant outrage of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and other parts of the world against the contamination of the atmosphere found expression in United Nations debates. The annual resolutions urging agreement on a test ban and requesting the nuclear powers to refrain from tests were impossible to ignore, and helped keep the negotiations alive even when their prospects seemed bleak. The study and conclusion of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, that "all steps designed to minimize irradiation of human populations will act to the benefit of human health," was an additional impetus. As in the case of Cuba, so in the matter of a test ban the role of the United Nations was not decisive. Yet without the United Nations the successful conclusion might not have been achieved. If further progress toward mankind's control of armaments is made, we can be sure it will be in part because of the United Nations unceasing efforts in that direction.

Finally, the United Nations has contributed to the peace through its economic and social work to improve the welfare of all the people of the world. Perhaps in the long run this will be its greatest contribution, for poverty, hunger, illness, and ignorance are the greatest enemies of peace. During its 18 years of operation the United Nations has built a solid record of achievement in improving the welfare of the underprivileged.

First, it has worked in the technical sphere through 13 specialized agencies such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund—UNICEF—and the World Health Organization. Through the Food and Agriculture Organization technical and scientific skills have been supplied to underdeveloped countries to assist them in improving their own farming methods. Through UNICEF programs of long-term benefit for children have been developed to replace the initial program of providing emergency food and clothing. Through the World Health Organization numerous communicable diseases have been attacked with the international cooperation which is essential if the diseases are to be eradicated and high priority has been placed on the training of health personnel for the strengthening of public health services. These are just a few examples of the ways in which the specialized agencies have contributed to the world's welfare.

Another way in which the United Nations has contributed to economic and social welfare is through its program of assisting in the economic development of underdeveloped countries. Through the expanded program of technical assistance and the development decade program, the United Nations has sought the same kind of objectives which the United States is seeking in its program of foreign aid to underdeveloped countries. The international organization has proved uniquely qualified to carry out development functions. First, it can draw on the technical resources of all its members. For example, it can employ technicians from every country or convene international meetings of technicians such as the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of Less Developed Areas. Second, it does not face certain problems in providing assistance which are faced by individual nations, such as being suspected of chauvinistic motives, or meeting resentment if strict stipulations are attached.

In addition, a Special Fund and International Development Association have been established to assist large-scale

projects and to help meet the pressing demands of the underdeveloped nations for capital assistance. In this year's annual report the Secretary General noted that the Special Fund has thus far approved 327 major projects in 120 developing countries and territories. Toward the program's cost of $672 million, the Special Fund was contributing 42 percent and the developing countries were contributing the remainder.

As still another contribution in the economic and social field, the United Nations provides important assistance to national efforts to improve welfare through the wide range of information and statistics it collects and reports on such subjects as housing, transportation, and population. Finally, as in the political field, the discussion of problems in the Economic and Social Council focuses attention on the issues involved and brings the weight of public opinion to bear in their solution.

These are just a few of the many ways in which the United Nations has assisted in promoting the economic and social welfare of the peoples of the world. They can be listed along with the organization's accomplishments in the field of collective security and pacific settlement as major contributions to peace which the United Nations has made in the past 18 years. There are many more which could be cited but a complete list would be far too long for any single speech.

Thus we may conclude that on its 18th birthday the United Nations is a vigorous organization with a bright future. It is a happy contrast with the League of Nations, whose 18th anniversary year was marked with Munich and from which several nations had already resigned. Remembering that an international organization can only be what its members make it, on United Nations Day of 1963 let us resolve to continue and strengthen our support of this organization and encourage other nations to do the same. If the United Nations can sustain the record it has achieved in its first 18 years, we can be confident that we are well on the road to lasting peace.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, every year when some consideration of the U.N. comes up we not only hear eulogies from the U.N.'s friends and intemperate attacks from its foes; we also hear the perennial complaints that the United States is being voted down the river by various blocs of nations. The standard complaint is that the new Afro-Asian nations are teaming up with the Soviet bloc to hand us a regular shellacking in the General Assembly. Of course, the facts do not reveal any such thing, but the main complainers do not really care for facts—all they want to do is to scare the very young or the gullible.

However, many people of good will and good sense are deeply concerned lest the United States—which is one of the founders of the U.N. which is one of its strongest supporters and which pays more assessments than any other single nation—should fail to exercise a degree of influence proportionate to its power. For this reason they suggest that the voting system in the U.N. be changed from the present "one nation, one vote" system to some kind of weighted voting system.

I was interested to discover that the Department of State was concerned enough about this matter to undertake a study on weighted voting. After reading as much of the unclassified material as is available I come to the following conclusions:

First. We are doing all right under the present system and have a batting average of more than 86 percent.

Second. The application of weighted voting formulas would not change the results of past votes by terribly significant amounts—about 84 percent would have come out the same under any plan which was developed.

Third. No system which would substantially change the "one nation, one vote" rule would have any chance of adoption, anyhow.

The Department of State feels, and I agree, that for any system of voting to be adopted by the U.N. the following considerations must be present:

First. The system must be easy to understand.

Second. It must be based on factors for which adequate information is available.

Third. It must be applied in a reasonably equitable manner.

Therefore, the Department chose national income, population, and U.N. scale of assessments as the three factors with which to develop weighted voting formulas. The reasons are simple: National income figures are available and acceptable, because nations report them to the U.N.; population—a factor essential to any system of weighted voting—is also a matter of record in the U.N.; and U.N. assessments are already known and are based, roughly, on ability to pay.

Even without going to the electronic computers, anybody with a list of the U.N. nations—their population, national income, and their U.N. assessments—can figure out that any voting formula based on a simple application of one or any of the three factors would not be accepted. It would give too much voting power to the big nations and take away too much voting power from the small ones. While the big nations might like this, the small ones are guaranteed not to, since the "one nation, one vote" idea is prima facie evidence of equality of sovereignty. Obtaining such a change would be about as difficult as trying to obtain proportional representation in the U.S. Senate.

If the value of a nation's vote in the U.N. were directly proportional to its assessments for the support of the U.N., the United States alone would have almost one-third of the total votes since our assessment is slightly more than 32 percent. This would mean that the United States and one European nation would be able to stop action on questions which must be decided by two-thirds vote in the General Assembly. Since the United States and one other nation would have more than one-third of the votes and since the other 109 nations could not possibly muster the necessary two-thirds, any system which results in 109 nations being thwarted by two nations would not even be considered.

You get a somewhat similar result by using national income as the weight: The voting power of the wealthy nations, particularly the United States, Canada, and our NATO allies, goes up; the voting power of the Soviet bloc goes up, too; but the voting power of most nations goes way, way down.

If votes were proportional to the size of population, the U.S. vote would increase in value, because we are one of the 10 largest nations; the value of the Soviet vote would go up, too; but, 2 nations—this time China and India—would have almost as much voting power as all the other nations combined. Therefore, it is clear that no system of weighted voting based on simple application of the three factors, either singly or in combinations, could possibly be adopted.

The State Department's study then turned to some fancy combinations, with various weights assigned to each of the factors, sometimes taking two factors together. But regardless of the juggling of the figures, when the weighted votes were substituted for the votes actually cast on 178 rollcall votes of major importance to the United States, it was discovered that the results would have been the same in 148 cases, or 84 percent of them.

This leaves the question "How are we doing under the 'one nation, one vote' system?" I referred earlier to 178 rollcall votes of major importance to the United States. These were recorded in the General Assembly, either in plenary session, or in meetings in various committees. It should be noted that only "Yes" or "No" is counted as a vote—abstentions do not count. The United States voted 158 times, and abstained or did not take part in the vote 20 times. It voted "Yes" on 103 issues and "No" on 55 issues.

When we voted "Yes," enough other nations also voted "Yes" so that 98 of the 103 issues we voted for were adopted. When we voted "No," enough other nations voted "No" so that 39 of the 55 issues we opposed were defeated. Our batting average on "Yes" votes is 0.950; our batting average on "No" votes is 0.700; and the combined average shows that we were on the winning side enough times to have a batting average of 0.867. You do not have to be a Babe Ruth, or Roger Maris, or Mickey Mantle, to know that this kind of batting average is phenomenal.

On the statistics of it I do not see how we could do much better.

But even if we could do better with some kind of weighted voting system there is absolutely no chance of getting it adopted. In the first place any system which gives too much to the big boys and takes too much away from the smaller ones is not even going to get to first base. In the second place, to put any weighted voting system into effect would require revision of the U.N. Charter. The Russians have made it abundantly clear that they are just not interested in Charter revision until the Red Chinese have been admitted to membership; and we have

made it abundantly clear that we are not interested in membership for the Chinese Communists; and so, right there is roadblock No. 1.

Even supposing this hazard could be removed there are still a lot of stepping stones to cross—and all of them are slippery. Charter revision on anything requires three distinct procedural steps. The first is approval by the U.N. Security Council, including the affirmative votes of the five permanent members; the second is approval by two-thirds vote in the General Assembly; and the third is ratification of the changes in the U.N. Charter by two-thirds of the U.N. membership, acting through their constitutional processes.

Since we are doing all right, anyhow—I might point out that the Russians have never gotten anything adopted in the General Assembly that we actively opposed, whereas we have gotten lots of stuff adopted over Soviet opposition—since weighted voting formulas give the same results in about 85 percent of the issues, and since no system which has been devised would have much chance of adoption, I suggest we stop shadowboxing with weighted voting and instead settle down to consideration of how we can make the U.N. work better under the existing charter.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to stand in the House today and pay tribute to the United Nations on its 18th anniversary. This pleasure is perhaps greater than that enjoyed by most of my colleagues who are participating in this special order. During 1961 and 1962 never was a kind word for the U.N. uttered in this Chamber by my predecessor. As a venomous spokesman and member of the militant John Birch Society, his violently anti-U.N. attitude was not a broad reflection of the will and wishes of California's 25th Congressional District. He reflected only the views of a small but highly vocal minority of reactionary crackpots who carry on a continuing fright campaign aimed at driving the United States out of the U.N., and the U.N. out of the United States.

Although an enlightened electorate caused by predecessor's forced retirement from public life, I must confess that the anti-United Nations assault in my district has not subsided. It is, however, I am happy to report, being met headon by most of my constituents, many of them members of the American Association for the United Nations. Where the Birchers bring heat, the AAUN brings light. Where the Birchers attack with lie, distortion, smear and hate, the AAUN defends with truth, fact, fairplay, and love of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, to hear the Birchers and Birchsymps tell it, the U.N. is an atheistic organization, not only because God is not named in the charter, but because the U.N. has no time for prayer.

The fact of the matter is that the U.N. General Assembly opens and closes each session with a moment of silence for prayer or meditation. And I would only point out that the U.S. Constitution does not name God. Does this then make that precious document, and the Nation upon which it was founded, ungodly? Certainly not—at least not to the logical mind.

And what of the Birch fallacy that the U.N. is too costly, that Uncle Sam is paying all the bills?

The United States share of the U.N.'s regular $82 million budget in 1962 was 32.02 percent, or about what 10 hours of World War II cost each of us.

What about the rightwing charge that the U.N. Commission on Human Rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are, in effect, eroding our rights as American citizens?

This allegation is quickly refuted by examining the U.N. charter. Article 2, states that:

> Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

Article I of the Declaration of Human Rights understandably nettles the Birchers because it enunciates a philosophy with which they are obviously not in sympathy:

> All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Another myth propagandized by the Birchers is that the U.N. is dominated by the Soviet Union. It is interesting to note that the Communists use the same line, but in reverse—the U.N. is controlled by the United States. Birds of a feather flock together, Mr. Speaker, but armed with a shotgun loaded with facts, we can declare open season on extremist species.

There are 111 member nations in the U.N., with only 10 of them actually under Soviet domination. Yugoslavia, definitely a Communist state although not under Kremlin control, frequently votes with the U.S.S.R. The remaining 100 member nations include the countries of Latin America, Western Europe and the United Kingdom, all friendly in varying degrees to the United States. The member nations of Africa and Asia, like the United States and its allies, vote according to the merits of the particular issue as it affects their own national interests—as do we.

Perhaps the most twisted tale spawned in the smoking typewriters of the paranoid patriots is the one dealing with the U.N. Military Committee. This is the one about Molotov, who, in a secret deal with Alger Hiss, fixed things so that American soldiers would always be directed by an agent of the international Communist conspiracy.

In the Hearst newspaper editions of April 7, 1963, editor in chief William Randolph Hearst, Jr., takes the lunatic wrappings off this modern-day fable concocted for the cult of nonthink. With the consent of my colleagues, I would like to insert Mr. Hearst's column at this point in my comments.

DON'T BELIEVE EVERYTHING

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

The many evidences that there are some people who will believe anything—no matter how oddball or offbeat—prove we haven't come so far from the days of the goldbrick and snake-oil spielers, after all.

I don't go into the question of real weirdies who clutter any editor's mail with suggestions for trapping enemy missiles in artificial clouds of asparagus soup. Or solving transportation problems with polyethylene flying carpets.

This piece is just about the gullible ones who accept everything they hear or read as gospel.

Two real gassers of that kind have been bouncing around recently with the usual chain reaction of indignant belief. One was an oldie—a set of aphorisms attributed to Abraham Lincoln.

Every year it gets around in the period of the great Abe's birthday, although the Lincoln National Life Foundation long ago researched it and found it was written by an Erie, Pa., clergyman only 47 years back.

But it always finds umpty-ump hundreds of suckers who excitedly write to editors wanting to know why such important utterances of the 16th President aren't serving as our guiding maxims.

Actually, they are a sort of wrap-up of normally sound and conservative economic principles. What's wrong is that they are couched in sanctimonious language that would have made the author of the Gettysburg Address shudder. Plus the little matter of fact that Lincoln never said or wrote them. Write to the Lincoln Foundation at Fort Wayne, Ind., for full details if you wish.

Another whopper that has been agitating the agitatable ones concerns the United Nations. Recently I ran across it in a pattern of letters to a Florida newspaper that showed the writers had obviously been listening to the same lecturer or read the same mail circular.

They were in a tizzy of indignation. What kind of Government do we have, they demanded to know, that permits American soldiers to be directed by a United Nations military committee which is an instrument for Soviet intrigue because it is always headed by a Russian?

Furthermore, they demanded to know, how can the United States permit such an arrangement when (as apparently the writers believe any schoolboy should know) it grew out of a secret agreement between Vyacheslav "Ironpants" Molotov and Alger Hiss at the 1945 San Francisco Conference which created the U.N.?

The same far-out story has come my way in several forms since.

Having been a newspaperman for enough years so that, unfortunately, I can't claim any longer to be a schoolboy, I proceeded to check out this deep-dyed cloak-and-dagger tale. That's what we are taught to do in our profession.

As Pierre J. Huss, chief of the Hearst Headline Service Bureau at the United Nations, pointed out, who can say what Hiss and Molotov agreed to?

All we can report on is what happened, and if they had any conversation about having the Russians dominate the U.N. military, it just never got past the talk stage.

Yes, Virginia (that's the first name of one of the indignant letter writers) there is a United Nations military staff committee. Yes, reports my niece Millicent P. Hearst, who is working at the reporting trade at the U.N., the staff committee was set up at the San Francisco conference under article 47 of the U.N. Charter.

This U.N. Military Staff Committee was intended to serve a purpose—to advise and assist the Security Council on military requirements or cases where force may be needed.

And, oh yes—just one little, trivial point—the U.N. Military Staff Committee has never been given any work to do. It meets regularly and agrees to meet again.

Meanwhile, back at the shooting range, every military involvement of the U.N.—in Palestine, in Korea, in the Congo, in New

Guinea—has bypassed the committee as if it weren't there.

Here's an outline of its history:

At the time of its founding, it had been generally agreed that the U.N. would have a standing armed force to keep the peace. This was to be furnished by the great powers. *It was to* consist of 12 land divisions and roughly comparable naval and air strength.

Then, in the manner now familiar, the Soviet trapped the plan in a butterfly "nyet." It insisted that naval contributions to the U.N. force must not exceed the capacity of the weakest (navally speaking) of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

That gimmick sabotaged the idea of a standing U.N. military force. The United States, Britain, and France had major naval power. So did the Russians—mostly undersea.

But the fifth member, Nationalist China, had no navy at all, or what was jokingly referred to as two saipans and one junk.

That 1945 deadlock persists to this day. Since it would take a two-thirds vote of the U.N. General Assembly to amend the charter, the shadow military committee goes on existing and holding its shadow meetings.

Its generals and admirals, representing the five permanent Security Council members, gather twice a month and immediately ungather.

And, oh, another yes, Virginia—correspondent Millicent reports that you and the other angry letter writers had the key point all wrong.

The chairmanship is not held by the Russians but rotates among the five nations, a senior officer of another country taking over each new month.

When we check in this office, we check. So now for some onsite inspection.

One of my senior secret emissaries put on his best diplomatic homburg and false whiskers, and armed with all the equipment recommended in the latest catalog for spy hobbyists, went to watch the U.N. Military Staff Committee's coming and goings the other morning. Here is his intelligence report:

From 9:59 a.m.: Arrived front Secretariat Building. Adopted vacant stare so would be taken for an ambassador or such.

From 10:10 a.m.: Baby, it's warm out here. Joined by agent XYZ in green Tyrolean hat, as arranged. To fool anyone who might be listening, he said: "Muggy, isn't it?"

From 10:11 a.m.: Carload of Russians arrive (front of wrong building). Lots of full dress gold braid. Also lots of medals. Moved to other entrance.

From 10:19 a.m.: Fooled again. Navy car pulls up to entrance we left. Admiral arrives. Lots of full dress, gold braid, etc.

From 10:20 a.m.: Agent XYZ repeats: "Damhot out here." Invited indoors by St. Bernard carrying small keg of coffee (on rocks) round neck. Discovered that British, French, Nationalist Chinese all arrived before 10:30 start of meeting. Lots of gold braid, medals, etc. and etc.

From 10:42 a.m.: Learned from secret sources that secret goings-on were secretly brief. Owing to gold-braid curtain, could learn only that Lt. Gen. Garrison H. Davidson of the U.S. Army took chair over from Rear Adm. J. D. F. Bush of Royal Navy (who last month had succeeded Gen. Vladimir A. Dobovik of Red Army). Signing off—Agent QED.

Kidding aside, there is plenty of not-so-funny material for thought in this functionless U.N. Military Staff Committee. Above all, it shows how hopeless it was to expect cooperation from the Soviet, when it had its people in there throwing monkey wrenches from the start.

All three Secretaries General of the U.N. have tried to get a commitment for a standing U.N. armed force instead of the troops furnished by "volunteer" nations each time a force is needed.

President Eisenhower tried for it. And President Kennedy, in his first appearance before the U.N. in September of 1961, proposed that each nation earmarked special units of its armed forces to be on call when required by the U.N.

It is tragic that the factual record shows how faraway the U.N. is from the power needed to fully perform its function of keeping world peace.

It is even more tragic that so many Americans—not possessed of the unhappy facts—believe every tale that reaches their ears which suggests that the United States is always and only represented at international round tables by dolts—or idiots—or saps or spies.

Before reacting so hysterically they might at least check with their nearest and favorite newspaper editor.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on, with the help of Mr. Hearst and other noted Americans, disspelling Birch fiction with hard fact. But I believe my point has been made here today, a point which is being made day after day in my congressional district by members of the American Association for the United Nations—men and women, young and old, who have an allegiance to freedom, who make it a part of their daily lives, who do not spend their time at secret cell meetings where the concept of freedom is distorted by demagogs who feed the flames of fear and frustration in our tinderbox world.

I imagine there will always be a small minority of Americans hostile in the extreme to any U.S. policy of international cooperation. And perhaps, in a way, this is well for the U.N. For the rightwing attack has caused many of our inquisitive citizens to legitimately question and discuss our involvement in the United Nations, as well as our whole foreign policy.

Does the U.N. serve our national interest? Are we paying more than our share of the cost? Can the U.N. bring about changes in the behavior of nations? During the past 18 years has the U.N. justified its existence?

All these questions should be freely debated on the platform of reason. We have only to look at history to see that free debate works for truth and justice. Free debate is in the great American tradition and should always be vigorously sought.

It is during periods of enlightened discussion on great issues that the Presidency, the Congress, the Supreme Court—indeed all of our democratic institutions—have achieved their greatest strength.

The fact that our relationship to the U.N. is now the subject of national debate is, in my judgment, merely a reflection of our desire to come to grips with international problems. Contrary to the ominous predictions of 1945, the U.N. is not dying. It is growing into maturity because we are willing to discuss its functions in an era of turmoil, an era when, of necessity, the U.N. has become a significant force in world politics—a peaceful arena for the exercise of national power.

It is argued by some that present U.S. policy toward the U.N. is not geared to our national interest.

And then there are those who believe that national self-interest is selfish and unrealistic when viewed on a world scale, that our approach to the U.N. should be based strictly on faith. This view obviously cannot be accepted by responsible representatives who are sent to Washington as protectors of the national interest. This must be the first yardstick against which we must measure the wisdom of all our decisions.

Yet I think debate on the subject of national interest versus faith is more semantic than real. Idealism and realism need not be diametrically opposed. When we say that the United States is committed to and supports the United Nations, we actually mean—or should mean—that as people of a sovereign nation we are determined to make the U.N. a success—a determination born of conviction that the best interest of America is firmly linked to the peaceful development of a civilized world, a world where all the parts are protected by the whole.

I think this is the message which we here today are conveying to the United Nations on its 18th birthday—a birthday which traditionally marks the separation between adolescence and manhood.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of this historical milestone—the 18th anniversary of the signing of the charter of the United Nations—I believe it is appropriate for this legislative body to take note of our country's participation in this international organization.

The United States has long supported the concept of multilateral cooperation as one important way of working toward the achievement of basic aims of U.S. foreign policy: The promotion of peace and security, and the promotion of economic and social growth. Today our country is associated with 71 international organizations and programs, to which we are contributing over $346 million.

It is clearly important that the United States take every possible step to assure that the activities of the international organizations are soundly conceived, effectively conducted, and efficiently administered.

Just over a year ago, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Harlan Cleveland, took a significant and far-sighted step in this direction. He appointed an Advisory Committee on International Organizations for the purpose of obtaining the advice and recommendations of informed independent citizens.

This Advisory Committee provides the Department of State with an impressive reservoir of knowledge, experience and expertise which can be drawn on at any time in an effort to strengthen the effectiveness of this country's participation in the international organizations. The members of the Committee, who have been meeting almost monthly, are making an important, generous and patriotic contribution to the conduct of U.S. foreign relations.

I am sure that Members of Congress who know personally members of the Advisory Committee would join me in noting that it is truly a distinguished group.

Indeed, to read the names of the committee is to be assured of advice and recommendations that reflect thorough analysis, objectivity, business acumen and the best interests of the United States:

Sol M. Linowitz, chairman: chairman of the board, Xerox Corp., Rochester, N.Y. Partner, Harris, Beach, Wilcox, Dale & Linowitz.

Harding F. Bancroft, executive vice chairman, the New York Times, New York City; formerly general counsel of the International Labor Organization.

Karney A. Brasfield, partner, Touche, Ross, Baily & Smart, Washington, D.C.; formerly member of the President's Committee on the Foreign Aid Program, 1961.

Andrew W. Cordier, dean, School of International Affairs, Columbia University, New York City; formerly executive assistant to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and Under Secretary in charge of United Nations General Assembly Affairs.

Lawrence S. Finkelstein, vice president, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York City.

Ernest A. Gross, partner, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle, New York City; former Ambassador, Deputy U.S. Representative to the United Nations and Deputy U.S. Representative in the Security Council.

Arthur Larson, director, World Rule of Law Center, Duke University, Durham, N.C.; formerly Director, United States Information Agency.

Joseph Pois, professor of public administration, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; formerly director of finance, State of Illinois.

Marshall D. Shulman, professor of international politics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, Medford, Mass.; formerly special assistant to the Secretary of State.

Francis O. Wilcox, dean, the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, Washington D.C.; formerly Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

Participants from Federal agencies—who have not been asked to assume responsibility for committee reports—are:

John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Robert Amory, Jr., Chief, International Division, Bureau of the Budget.

The able chairman of the committee, Mr. Sol M. Linowitz, I am proud to state, lives in Rochester, N.Y.—my own constituency. I have long known him as one who has earned the genuine respect of the business world, the legal profession, banking circles, educators, his community, and the many local, State, and National organizations in which he has served his fellow man. During the war he served with distinction in the U.S. Navy.

A day containing 25 or more hours would be a welcome innovation for Mr. Linowitz. He is chairman of the board of the Xerox Corp. which has its home in Rochester. He is a member of the boards of the J. Arthur Rank Organization and Rank Xerox in England, and of Rank Xerox, France, traveling frequently to both countries.

He also commutes to Japan where Fugi Xerox is the largest manufacturer of photographic equipment. He is a senior partner of the widely known Rochester law firm of Harris, Beach, Wilcox, Dale & Linowitz. The University of Rochester values his services as a member of its board of trustees, as does the Eastman School of Music.

He has given his time freely to the board of the American Association for the United Nations, to the United Jewish Welfare Fund, and to the New York Bar Association. He is a director of banking institutions in Rochester and a former president of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce. I should also add that he was the founder and moderator of the well-known television discussion program, "The Court of Public Opinion," which won several national honor medal awards from the American Freedoms Foundation.

I have the highest regard and admiration for Mr. Linowitz, and I can say without reservation or qualification that his very deep interest, and his time-consuming participation in the State Department's Advisory Committee on International Organizations guarantee the soundness of the committee's recommendations and constitute a real service to this country.

The advisory committee has prepared two reports which have been made public.

The first report, "Staffing International Organizations," was issued in April. The letter with which Mr. Linowitz sent the report to the Department of State summarizes it in these few words:

> In undertaking this study, our committee had one prime objective: To determine whether we in this country are doing all we properly should to make available to the United Nations and the other international organizations American citizens of competence, integrity, and responsibility as they may be required.
>
> Our committee is convinced that the United States is dedicated to the strengthening of the United Nations and to the development of an independent Secretariat as contemplated by articles 100 and 101 of the United Nations Charter. But we also feel that if the United States is fully to discharge its obligations, it must play a far more effective role than it has in the past in assisting the leadership of these organizations to meet their personnel requirements. We have, therefore, urged that our historic policy of political and financial backing for the United Nations should now be accompanied by a greatly strengthened program of assistance to the staffing effort.
>
> Our advisory committee report makes a number of recommendations toward this end. Some of them call for action on the part of the Government, others suggest steps which can and should be taken by business, educational, professional, and other groups to make available candidates for these positions. We hope that both in and out of Government there will be full recognition of the importance of these recommendations and a willingness to take the necessary action to make them effective.

No one can read this without being impressed by the need for action. The committee, in its conclusion, urged "an early determination in Washington that the staffing of international organizations with the best qualified personnel is a matter of national priority and significance." The report was issued 7 months ago. I hope that the Department of State will soon put these recommendations into effect.

The committee's second report on "The Technical Cooperation Programs of the United Nations System" was made public in June. The committee notes that "these programs have contributed materially to the advancement of economic and social development in the less developed countries." It concludes that they "can continue to do so in the future with increasing effect and promise" if the programs are effectively organized and administered.

I believe that these few sentences from the report capsule the content:

> A large number of technical cooperation programs have been established by the U.N. agencies and a complex organizational structure has been created to support them. In view of the importance of this multilateral effort to the less developed countries, and in view of the significant contribution the United States is making to the total resources of these programs (32 percent for most of the regular programs, 40 percent for the technical cooperation programs financed from voluntary contributions), the committee urges that the United States take a vigorous lead in pressing for a simplification and a better coordination of this organizational structure. A more effective integration of programs and organizations is required to assure the most productive use of limited resources available.

A third report of this hard-working advisory committee is in preparation. It will deal with the problem of financial management in the United Nations system. I understand that the report will make a number of constructive recommendations to accomplish more effective use of the contributions which are made to these organizations. Recommendations will also be made to strengthen this country's own fiscal policies and practices relating to international organizations, in order that the United States may influence more effectively the fiscal processes of those organizations. I hope that the report can be made available to this body in the near future.

The objective of the State Department's advisory committee is very simple. It is to make the participation of the United States in the international organizations as effective as possible. In conclusion, therefore, I would only say to my colleagues that the reports of the committee are well worth the few minutes it takes to read them. The committee is making a significant contribution to the conduct of U.S. international relations.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, last year the Gallup poll released figures showing that some 90 percent of all Americans were in favor of the U.N.—5 percent were opposed and 5 percent had no opinion. Other colleagues have spoken cogently of the many reasons why this Government and this people belong to, and support, the U.N. The reasons must be convincing, because I can think of few other issues in this country where

you can get a division of opinion of 90–5–5. Even back in the days when everyone liked Ike, I do not think he came anywhere near that 90-percent figure. The last presidential election, of course, was nip and tuck.

Who are these people that are against the U.N.? And where does the money come from to support their propaganda?

Some of the opposition to the U.N. comes from people who are extremely devout in their religious convictions. They are against the U.N. because it is "a godless organization." Of course it is. So is the U.S. Government. And our Constitution draws a very sharp line between what is proper for Government activity in the field of religion and what is not. The delegates to the U.N. come from 111 countries. Some of these countries are officially atheistic, as is the Soviet Union. In others there is a direct connection between the church and state, and we have some Catholic countries. We have Israel, we have Moslem nations, Buddhist nations, and we have others, like the United States, which has no state religion and every man is supposed to choose for himself.

Others are against the U.N. because they say "it costs too much." Certainly it costs money, every worthwhile activity does. But the entire amount of assessed and voluntary contributions to the U.N. and its specialized agencies came to about $230 million the last calendar year. This amounts to one five-hundredth of the total Federal budget and about $1.25 per capita. When placed against expenditure for liquor, tobacco, cosmetics, or spectator sports, our contribution to the U.N. can be seen in its proper proportion.

Other people are against the U.N. because they are afraid it is becoming a world government and will soon be messing around in our internal affairs. It is not a world government—it is not intended to be—and cannot become so under its present charter. Furthermore, the charter expressly prohibits the U.N. from getting into matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the U.N. members, including us. In addition, General Assembly resolutions, except for the questions of finances, are only recommendations. The Security Council can act in ways which bind U.N. members, but the United States can veto any such Security Council action.

Other people are against the U.N. because they are afraid. They are afraid that the United States is losing its place in the sun. They are afraid our interests are being submerged in the general interests of the U.N. They are afraid that the clever foreigners will gang up against the country boys from the United States and vote our Nation down the river. They are afraid that the U.N. can order American soldiers into battle and they are afraid that the whole future of the United States is being placed in alien hands. These are real fears. They are just as real as being afraid of the dark. One way to cure fear of darkness is to let in light, and I think the people who are afraid of the U.N. need light.

The United States is not losing its place in the sun, nor in the U.N. We are still the most powerful nation on earth. Our influence in the U.N. is enormous and cannot be measured by our 1 vote out of 111 votes in the General Assembly. We pay 32.02 percent of U.N. assessments and the U.N. is not about to undertake anything involving finances without our OK. We swing a lot of weight at the U.N. because we are on the right side of the issues, and because other nations have the same basic interests that we do in freedom and justice and economic and social development.

I am always intrigued with the myth that in any kind of international negotiations the foreigners are always clever and right, and the United States is always stupid and wrong. When it comes to matching wits in any kind of debate, our U.S. delegation to the U.N. does not have to take a back seat to anybody. We field a pretty good team up there: Governor Stevenson, who has said, "the U.N. is built for trouble and thrives on it," Mrs. Edna Kelly, William Mailliard, Francis Plimpton and Charles Yost as delegates; and Mercer Cook, Charles Stelle, Jonathan Bingham, Sidney Yates and Mrs. Jane Warner Dick as alternates. You will note that two members of the delegation this year are distinguished Members of this House—Mrs. KELLY and BILL MAILLIARD.

As for the power of the U.N. to order American soldiers into battle, this is of course fantastic. The U.N. has no such power. The only time U.S. soldiers have been under a U.N. flag was in Korea, and here the U.N. asked the United States to be its agent and all the commanders of the U.N. operation in Korea have been U.S. generals, with the chain of command running right back to the Commander in Chief in the White House.

I often wish that people who are afraid of the U.N. and our involvement in it could spend a few days in Washington and New York and see what actually happens and talk to their fellow Americans who work in this part of our foreign relations. I think those who came to scoff would stay to praise.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, how many of us have heard it said that "the United Nations is a great idea but that the world is not ready for it, yet"?

I find this idea absolutely charming. Here we have an organization celebrating its 18th birthday, full of vim, snap, bounce; working hard at a million different things; adopting resolutions about outer space, and nuclear weapons, and human rights; getting rid of malaria; working for agreements on atomic energy and safeguards for reactors; regulating the allocation of radio bands; promoting economic development; an organization which every new nation wants to join as speedily as possible; an organization with a total budget of about $200 million—and the world is not ready for it yet.

The United Nations has grown in membership, in size of budget—reflecting an increasing capacity to do something useful about the problems of our time—and the world is not ready for it yet.

In many nations there are voluntary associations for the United Nations. In our own Nation there are two: the American Association for the United Nations and the U.S. Committee for the United Nations. Gallup polls show that overwhelming majorities of the U.S. public are in favor of the United Nations—but the world is not ready for it, yet.

Eighteen years old and we are not ready for it yet.

If we are not ready for the U.N., what are we ready for? The League of Nations, the Holy Roman Empire? or what?

Or do you suppose people who say "the world is not ready for the United Nations" really do not have both feet in their mouths—just tongue in cheek?

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his remarks on the readiness of the world for the United Nations, and would like to add to them.

Back when I was a boy, a famous manufacturer of a quality car had an equally famous slogan. It was: "Ask the man who owns one." This is the acid test.

Let us apply it to just a few of the U.N. activities today. Let us ask our own U.S. scientists whether their work would be further ahead or further behind without the United Nations. The material collected during the International Geophysical Year is still being analyzed and interpreted. The material being gathered during the current "Year of the Quiet Sun" will be of value for years to come.

Let's ask our weather men about the U.N. Are they ready for it? Could they do their work so well without it? Has it made things easier or harder? If you are going to have a really good world weather watch, you have got to have everybody in the act, and use information from all over—land, sea, and in the air, including way up. The U.N.'s World Meteorological Organization is in this business for a very practical reason; it is needed.

Let us ask the farmers of the world, especially in the underdeveloped areas whether they are ready for the United Nations. Ask them about what the Food and Agriculture Organization has done for them—better seeds, better stock, better agricultural methods, better machinery and equipment, and as a result, better crops, higher yields per unit of land, higher output per man, and a higher standard of living.

Let us ask the people in the field of public health about the need for the World Health Organization—and not just the need in the underdeveloped areas but also in the United States. The control of disease is one of our proudest achievements. A great deal of the credit must go to WHO; to its reporting services which keep track of outbreaks; to its setting of standards in the field of quarantine time for various diseases; to its aid to various national health services; and, lately, to its work as a clearinghouse for information about the effects of new drugs. Are the health people ready for the U.N.? Do they appreciate it?

You can ask the same kind of question about any of the U.N.'s specialized agencies. Or about any of the special programs—like the Children's Fund—just go ask a child who has been cured of yaws and who now gets some milk to drink whether he is ready for the U.N. Or, to take the most costly and most controversial of all U.N. operations, go ask Prime Minister Adoula of the Congo

whether he is ready for the U.N. He has asked that the U.N. forces stay in the Congo until the middle of next year to help train his army and to help keep order until his own people are ready to take over the job of maintaining tranquillity.

Let us ask the citizens of the new nations which were formerly U.N. trust territories whether they are ready for the U.N.

Well, we could keep up this type of rhetorical questioning for a long time. And everyone knows what the answers have to be: The world is not only ready for the U.N., we could not get along without it.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, there is one little point about the United Nations that people sometimes forget to mention and I would not like to have it overlooked. It is a very simple point, but it is also very relevant.

The point is this: The United Nations is a plain necessity.

Can anyone really pretend to imagine a world with thermonuclear weapons—a world with dangerous national rivalries—a world of competing ideologies and systems without a world organization?

Can anyone imagine a world crisscrossed by jet aircraft—a world that is venturing into outer space—a world which can flash a photographic image across the oceans in a fraction of a second and which can reach into nearly every corner of the globe at the speed of sound—without some form of international organization?

Can anyone even think about a world of some 120 separate, independent, sovereign states without some form of international organization?

Can anyone seriously suggest that a world with the capacity to blow itself up, which is interconnected by transport and communication, which is interdependent economically, and which is being forced willy-nilly by scientific advance into the choice between cooperation or chaos—can anyone imagine such a world without world organization?

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations is the world organization which we have created because a world organization was, and is, a plain necessity. We can certainly improve it. But to suggest that we can do without it is to deny the second half of the 20th century.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 18th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. The great dream of Woodrow Wilson for an effective organization to promote peace and understanding among nations has become a reality.

While this world organization has had many crises, its record of success has been impressive. Since the adoption of its charter in 1945, a significant list of accomplishments has been compiled.

Foreign troops were withdrawn from Iran, Syria, and Lebanon as a result of discussions undertaken by the U.N. in 1946. In 1947 the United Nations prevented outside aid from coming to the Communist guerrillas in Greece by keeping watch over the northern borders of that country. A cease-fire in Kashmir was brought about by the U.N. in 1948. Even though the dispute has not yet been fully settled, there has been no further outbreak of armed hostilities.

In 1949 United Nations mediation assisted Indonesia in achieving independence from the Dutch and brought about a cease-fire in Palestine along with the signing of armistice agreements between Israel and her neighbors.

In 1950 U.N. forces halted aggression in Korea and forced the aggressor behind the 38th parallel. When France, Britain, and Israel took up arms against Egypt in 1956, the United Nations obtained a cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops. It also arranged for an emergency force to keep the peace along the Egyptian-Israel border and for the clearing of the Suez Canal. In 1958 U.N. representatives in Lebanon and Jordan helped to protect the peace in those countries.

The United Nations activities in the Congo beginning in 1960 are well known to us all. Regardless of the criticism leveled at these operations, they have prevented the spread of hostilities and aided in the stabilization of conditions. The agreement reached in 1962 by the Netherlands and Indonesia over the territory of West New Guinea and the provisions for interim control by the U.N. prior to Indonesian administration and eventual self-determination is another recent achievement of the United Nations. The assistance provided last year by the U.N. regarding the removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba helped to avert a tragedy which could have resulted in a major conflict.

This impressive record of United Nations achievements speaks for itself. It is an eloquent tribute to the value of this "action agency for peace and progress." I consider it a great privilege to join with my colleagues in commemorating United Nations Day.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, listening to all the nice things being said about the United Nations on its 18th birthday reminds me that not everyone shares the same high opinion of this international organization.

I am not talking about the Communists. They have not really joined the United Nations; they cannot run the outfit; and they do not dare pull out. So they try to sabotage it at every opportunity, and nobody would be happier to see the U.N. weakened or broken up than the Communists.

Nor am I talking about the opposite extreme—the people who have seen so many Communists under so many beds that they think the sun casts a red shadow. There are a few people like this, and any organization that has one single Russian in it is, in their view, part of a vast conspiracy to burn the Bill of Rights, to destroy the Declaration of Independence, and to subvert our society. These people can see nothing good in the United Nations because it has some Communist members. These people are so afraid of the U.N. that they advise us to get out.

No, I am talking about people who, in all seriousness, believe that the United Nations is a failure because of the long list of problems which the U.N. has not solved—Berlin and the wall; Eastern Europe, particularly Hungary; South Vietnam; the Israel-Arab dispute; the India-Pakistan trouble; Cuba; dictators in assorted nations; the Congo; the population explosion; continued poverty; disease, and ignorance, and so on.

We try to convince them that the U.N. is not involved in many of these problems, and that it is helping in others; that the U.N. cannot and will not intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of individual nations; that some of these problems go back to the beginnings of recorded history; or that no one has asked the U.N. to take action.

But it seems to make no difference. Since the U.N. is not perfect, the argument goes on; and since it has not solved all the world's problems, then the U.N. must be a failure.

Does this same line of reasoning apply to any other manmade institution? Does it apply to the U.S. Government? Is our Government a failure because there are still problems in the United States of America? Are the various religions and churches failures because some vestiges of original sin keep cropping up? Is the FBI a failure because there are still crimes unsolved and criminals at large?

This is no reason to be negative about the United Nations. Look at the positive side:

First. It is the best organization we have ever put together for world peace and progress. It may not be perfect, but it is improvable.

Second. We need the U.N.—in fact we cannot get along without it—because it does so many things that we cannot do by ourselves.

Third. The U.N. is our kind of organization and is working in many different, and most important ways for our kind of world. And, as the U.N. is successful, we, the United States are better off.

Fourth. We helped to put the organization together; we have helped to keep it together; and we are its most influential member. This means, in no small measure, the U.N.'s future is up to us.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my distinguished colleagues, including Representatives DANTE B. FASCELL and DONALD M. FRASER, in paying tribute to the United Nations upon the occasion of the organization's 18th birthday.

If modern man is not yet obsolete, Mr. Speaker, he owes a debt of gratitude to the U.N.

The United Nations came into being under a charter that described the organization as "a center for harmonizing the actions of nations" in the achievement of common ends. I believe that, regardless of its less publicized successes in the field of economic development, health, and education, the U.N. has earned its keep by its role in the Korean conflict, the Middle East turmoil and in the Congo.

And by so doing the U.S. national interest has been served.

During the 18 intervening years between San Francisco and today, the U.N. has grown in the direction of a future system of world order and peace. Flawed and imperfect as are all human

institutions, the U.N. at a minimum provides a forum for disputes after other means have been found wanting. True, it cannot impose settlement of an issue. True, it is effective in the measure that its 111 member states permit it to be effective. However, in the cases I have just cited, the record is indisputable that the U.N. has often intervened in hostilities and restored order.

And its accomplishments are enhanced by the gamey enemies it has made during its lifetime.

To anyone who might cast a vote to weaken in any way or destroy the U.N., the question should be put: What is suggested to take its place? Military power in an awesome age of nuclear weapons that can literally depopulate the earth? The arrows launched by the bowmen at Agincourt struck their target with limited damage. Can anyone say the same today when both the Soviet Union and the United States possess a nuclear arsenal of overkill that could kill each other's populations many times over?

As I stated during the discussion on the United Nations bond issue legislation last year, any legislative attempt to constrict the actions of this Government in the U.N. is an attempt to sabotage the position of preeminent leadership which the United States has exercised from the beginning in the political organs of the United Nations. Beginning last year there have been disquieting expressions within Congress that the United Nations should not be relied upon to deal with major matters.

In recent years both a Republican and a Democratic President have spoken out in support of the U.N.

Former President Eisenhower, speaking of the U.N. financial problems in one section, observed that "our country has played a leading role in the development of this great forum and we must not fail it now."

President Kennedy in September 1961 declared that "our dedication to the charter must be maintained. New strength and new roles for the United Nations are required."

I suggest that on this observance we rededicate ourselves to the strengthening and improvement of the United Nations and its ancillary organs. This present crisis of confidence is caused as much by faintheartedness on the part of some of its friends as by its implacable enemies. In this connection we would do well to seek sources of independent financing for the United Nations so that financially it would have a greater degree of initiative.

A policy of strengthening the United Nations means affording it the latitude to improve the chances that there will be no major war at all. And in so doing, we should not compile the statistics on U.N. achievements as if they were baseball batting averages. The U.N., for example, succeeded in the Congo; it failed in Goa. The percentage is 1,000 as far as I am concerned given the historic, frightful disarray of international relations for centuries. The percentage is not 0.500. What was accomplished in the Congo could not have happened without an international organization. What happened in Goa would have happened without an international organization.

Already the U.N. has shown its potential for evolution—the enlargement of the Secretary General's position to that of an operating executive, the establishment of ad hoc military detachments under the aegis of the United Nations and the adaptability of the General Assembly in the face of the veto power that all the major powers want in the Security Council. The evolution is in the direction of increasing the ability of the United Nations to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] for calling to the attention of this body the need for reaffirming our faith in the United Nations, the only international organization devoted to the peaceful solution of problems between nations.

On this day set aside as United Nations Day, we ought to reflect seriously upon our continued membership in the United Nations. There are many well-meaning Americans today who are clamoring for "the United States to get out of the United Nations, and the United Nations to get out of the United States." I am inclined to believe that this view is harbored by those who have been misinformed on the facts about the United Nations. For example, I have received many letters and circulars advising me to wake up to the fact that the U.N. is bankrupt, and urging me to do something about stopping our Government from paying our allotted share of the costs of operating the U.N.

The truth of the matter is that the United Nations is not bankrupt. For a full comprehension of this statement we must first realize that the United Nations finances are handled on the basis of many different accounts. There are accounts set up for the operation of the headquarters in New York and for the payment of salaries and expenses of the staff employed there. Then, there is another account for the so-called working capital fund; another account for the technical assistance program and for the U.N. Special Fund. Each of the 12 specialized agencies has its own budget; then there are accounts for the U.N. peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and in the Congo.

All of these accounts, according to information given me, are in sound fiscal condition, except the so-called peacekeeping accounts relative to maintenance of U.N. forces in the Middle East and in the Congo. The regular budgets are met by regular assessments which are generally well paid up. The special funds are financed by assessments or voluntary contributions and pose no real problem.

The only accounts which are in bad shape are those set up for military operations in the Congo and in the Middle East. In these accounts the U.N. has a deficit of about $100 million, about two-thirds of which is owed by the Soviet Union and other members of the Communist bloc. The Russians have flatly refused to pay anything on these peacekeeping accounts. They have argued that assessments for peacekeeping are not legal, despite the ruling of the International Court of Justice against such argument, and have refused to pay their fair share. Of course, their real reason for not paying is that they were opposed to the sending of peacekeeping troops to the Congo and to the Middle East.

Unfortunately, there is no way to force the Soviet Union and her satellite nations to pay their fair share of the costs of peacekeeping. However, there is a saving provision in the U.N. Charter which may serve to force payment. This is the provision which denies a vote in the General Assembly to any nation which defaults in the payment of its total assessments for 2 years. Whether or not Russia will pay its share when faced with the deadline is to be seen next year when the first meeting of the General Assembly takes place. I cannot believe that the Russians will be willing to suffer the loss of face and the denial of a vote in the General Assembly by refusal to pay when that time comes.

Whether Russia pays into the peacekeeping accounts or not, the truth of the matter is that the United Nations is in good financial condition on all other accounts. The alleged bankruptcy of the U.N. therefore is a baseless reason given for our withdrawal from its membership.

The United Nations has meant as much to the United States as the United States has meant to the United Nations. We need the United Nations just as much as it needs us. To heed the cry that the United States should get out of the U.N. and U.N. out of the United States would be playing directly into the hands of our cold war enemies, for that is exactly what they would want. Let us on this United Nations Day as the elected leaders of this Nation resolve to reaffirm our faith in the United Nations.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with our colleague from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] in speaking today in recognition of the 18 years of fine work done by the U.N.

The U.N. has served the world well in its capacity as a meeting place between East and West, as a forum for the discussion of the world's problems and most importantly as an organization for keeping the peace.

Starting with the efforts to end the Communist-led insurrection in Greece through an armistice between the Indians and the Pakistanis in Kashmir and a cease-fire in Palestine, the U.N. has shown its ability to bring belligerent parties to a cessation of active hostilities, even though it has failed to resolve the differences between the parties. As a police force, the U.N. has opposed, with force, the invasion of South Korea by North Korean and Chinese Communists, has imposed a detente in the Middle East, and in 1960 sent a force to restore order, prevent civil war, and to avoid a confrontation of the major powers in the Congo. The world is a different and better place because of these actions.

The U.N. works: it does not succeed at all in some cases and it rarely bats a thousand. But we must remember that

the U.N. is a human institution and the very notion that it might work perfectly or even nearly perfectly is absurd. What human institution does work perfectly? Which of our local or State governments can claim perfection? Can our National Government claim that it never makes a mistake, that it always fulfills the tasks which it exists to perform?

For some obscure reason some of our citizens seem to feel that if the U.N. does not complete successfully the operations it undertakes, or if it makes an error, that it should be junked, dispensed with. It should be unnecessary to point out the fallaciousness of this argument. If we were to follow this reasoning we would then have to dispense with the House of Representatives as well.

I should think that it would be unnecessary to point out that the U.N. deals only with conflicts which nations or groups of nations are unable to solve otherwise. It deals only with problems that nations or groups of nations are unprepared, incompetent, or unwilling to deal with.

Under the circumstances, it is a curious system of accounting which reports that the U.N. has failed if the particular crisis it happens to be dealing with remains unresolved and the job remains uncompleted.

Yet, if one brush fire has been put out—although the threat of nuclear war has not been averted—if one armistice has been secured—although the source of hostility between the belligerents has not been removed; if one conflict has been put off without solving the underlying problem; if one epidemic has been contained without eliminating the disease; if one food bank has been established without ending hunger; if one conference has brought closer a source of cheap energy without electrifying the last village; if one school system has been started without ushering in universal literacy; if one delegation to the U.N. has gained faith in the democratic process without curing the world of coercion—if any of these things happened as the result of U.N. action—and they do happen with considerable frequency—then the U.N. must be accounted to have succeeded that much. It is no more realistic to measure the performance of the U.N. against the standards of Utopia then it is to measure the performance of a man against the standards of the Deity. I am often astonished when self-styled realists throw up their hands with lamentations because the U.N. has failed clearly to usher in the millenium.

The real U.N. is an organization of sovereign and sometimes hostile states which are represented by fallible men trying to cope with the quarrels, the poverty, the injustices inherited from the ages and compounded in the decade of the sixties. The U.N. can be no better and will be no worse than the nations which are its members, the men who represent them, and the people who support them. But it is a place, an organization, a system, for doing the best that the nations can agree to do.

There is no magic in the U.N. It is not yet good enough. It is only good enough to warrant our unflagging attention, our realistic appreciation and our utmost efforts to sustain and improve an existing piece of machinery that works within limitations for many important and crucial purposes.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in commemorating the 18th birthday of the United Nations. The U.N., and its specialized agencies, has made important contributions to world peace during its short existence.

ILO WORKS FOR US

One of the most unusual of the specialized agencies of the United Nations is the International Labor Organization. It is unusual in that it is older than its parent organization: the U.N. was established in 1945, but the ILO was established in 1919.

It is unusual in its structure, which is tripartite: representatives of workers, employers, and governments join together to determine ILO's policies and to supervise its activities. This is a reflection of the fact that conditions of employment are not solely the responsibility of any single segment of society, but are the joint responsibility of management, labor, and government.

It is unusual in that the ILO recognizes, perhaps more clearly than other U.N. agencies, the intimate relationship of prosperity within a single nation with conditions of labor in that nation, and the interrelationship of conditions of prosperity among all nations.

The ILO is unusual in that it is concerned not only with bread-and-butter issues but with other values of deep concern to human beings. The ILO, in 1944, adopted the "Declaration of Philadelphia" which was later to become part of the ILO constitution. This declaration said, among other things, that "all human beings, irrespective of race, creed, or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security, and equal opportunity." The declaration went on to say that labor is not a commodity; that freedom of expression and association are essential to sustained progress; that poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere; and that the war against want must be carried out with unrelenting vigor within each nation, and by continuous and concerted international effort in which the representatives of workers and employers, enjoying equal status with those of governments, join with them in free discussion and democratic decision with a view to promotion of the common welfare.

Does all this sound familiar to us? Did we not decide, long ago, that labor is not a commodity? Have we not had freedom of speech and association written into our Constitution since almost the beginning of nationhood? Have we not taken steps in the United States to assure that prosperity was general? Have we not tried to get rid of poverty lest it be a threat to prosperity? Have we not had the idea—exemplified particularly during World War II on the War Labor Board—that cooperation on the part of management and unions and the Government was the best way to get things done? The answer to all these questions is "Yes."

This leads to the next question: "Why do we need the ILO?" The answer is a little more complicated. We need it because we are interested in the establishment of minimum standards of work and of production around the world. We know that one rotten apple can spoil the whole barrel, and one country with rotten working conditions may spoil international trade and the livelihood of decent employers and the jobs of those who work for them.

We know that we cannot sell quality products to people who cannot afford to buy them. Hence we, as an international trading nation are interested in prosperity overseas in other nations.

And we need the ILO to act as a searchlight for the conscience of mankind. There is not one of us here who would put his family to work under some of the conditions which are discovered from time to time by ILO people. Until recently, in one South American country, men were used as human brakes on railroads in the coal mines; they stood with their feet on the rails and with their backs against the front of the coal cars. Their feet were wrapped in rags, and the friction of feet against rails provided the braking power. No one considered it cruel or unusual—everybody did it that way, and always had. However, today such working conditions are on the way out, thanks to the kind of assistance which the ILO is equipped to provide.

One of ILO's early projects was in the field of maritime labor. With no international standards of any kind agreed on before ILO got into the act, the working conditions and the living conditions of sailors were unbelievable. And the possibility of ships carrying disease from one port to another was greatly increased. Today, as a result of actions taken in line with ILO recommendations and conventions, there are minimum standards for the employment of seamen, including preemployment medical examinations.

The ILO's interests range from A to Z—from antimony and atomic energy to zinc; from forests to factory; from apprenticeship to old-age benefits.

ILO has undertaken many studies on the safety and health of workers and issued codes and recommendations on regulations for protection from power-driven machinery and for protection of workers in mines and quarries, in atomic plants, in agriculture and forestry, and in the transport of dangerous materials. ILO experts have been sent to advise governments on drafting laws and regulations. It has granted fellowships for study in highly developed countries. It has supplied demonstration equipment.

Many studies on workers' health and safety have been published by ILO, some of which are distributed free of charge.

ILO has headquarters in Geneva, and branch offices in 12 countries and field offices in 7 regions of the world. More than 1,000 officials coming from about 80 different nations make up the permanent headquarters staff. Since 1948 the director general has been an American, David A. Morse.

Activities of ILO have expanded rapidly in the last few years, as reflected in its regular budget—under $10 million in 1961, over $11 million in 1962, and over $14 million in the current year. The United States contributes 25 percent of this assessed budget, or $3.5 million in 1963. This averages less than 2 cents a year for each American. ILO receives about $5 million additional from the U.N. expanded technical assistance program and is executing agency for 37 projects for which it received $29 million from the U.N. Special Fund, over a period of several years.

At the end of 1962, ILO had 358 experts at work in 71 countries and territories, teaching more efficient labor techniques and other means of improving worker productivity, mostly in developing countries. For example:

In Colombia, ILO has a program to train instructors in automobile, diesel and other mechanics; electrical trades, welding, masonry and woodworking, and maintenance of textile machinery. In 2 years, 242 instructors and 347 supervisors were graduated.

In Pakistan, training in labor management and technical supervision is conducted. Advice is being given to government departments, training institutes and private concerns, including the vast jute mills near Dacca. Instructors for building river craft and installing diesel engines are being trained.

In India, $657,000 worth of technical and scientific equipment to improve techniques for mine safety has been installed at the Central Mining Research Station.

Similar training programs are being conducted in Argentina, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, Malaysia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, and so forth.

As wages and working conditions improve overseas, U.S. workers are better off.

And as other countries become better suppliers, better customers and better—and safer—places for investment, all of America will be better off.

That is why we support the ILO.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, like most Members of the House, I receive hundreds of letters each month. Along with the usual brickbats and the unusual bouquets, I sometimes find a letter from an honestly worried citizen. Often as not, it is about the United Nations. The letterwriter will have heard that the U.N. is a creature of international communism, that it was started by the Russians, is mainly staffed by Russians, has a Russian as chairman of the Military Staff Committee—and in general jerks its arms and legs up and down when the Kremlin pulls the strings.

Some of these people are so upset they cannot even wait for me to open my mail. They paste a sticker on the outside of the envelope imploring us to "Get the United States out of the U.N., and the U.N. out of the United States."

In replying to one such worried letterwriter recently, I tried to answer, point by point, this accusation that the U.N., is "run" by Russians. I tried to do this by acknowledging the grain of truth underlying each statement.

The U.N. to be sure, was started by Russians, in that Russia sent delegates to San Francisco. So did we, and 49 other Nations.

It cannot be denied that a Russian heads up the U.N.'s Military Staff Committee—once every 5 months. This position is rotated monthly among the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council. Thus, once every five times, a Russian has the job. The other four times it is held by a representative of the Republic of China, or France, or the United Kingdom, or the United States. Furthermore, this Military Staff Committee has never been implemented as the U.N.'s founders intended, and cuts no ice whatever in any U.N. military operations.

It is also true that there are some Communist-bloc citizens employed by the U.N. How could it be otherwise? They are members of the organization—and the U.N., like any other manmade organization, is a political animal. But of 20 top jobs, they hold only 2. And of the other professional and executive posts, Americans outnumber the Russians by almost 9 to 1.

But in the manner charged by U.N. detractors, a careful review of the record proves that this body in no sense is "run" by the Russians. They were not running it, certainly, when the decision was made to repel Communist aggression against North Korea. They were not running it when the General Assembly voted an investigation of the massacre in Hungary. They were not running it when member nations spurned a Soviet proposal to divide the Secretary General's office into a three-headed monster to be called "Troika." They were not running it, just a year ago, when the Security Council heard documentation of Russian perfidy in Cuba. And—to bring matters right up to date—they were not running it this week when supporters of Red China failed once again to win General Assembly approval for its admission.

We should avoid stating it boastfully, but the fact is that the Russians have never been able to get enough votes to have even one of their proposals adopted when America worked against it.

This does not mean that we run the U.N. either. The organization is composed of 111 members. Only the Communist states vote as a bloc on most issues. Other groups of nations come together for votes on certain issues—like colonialism or apartheid—and drift apart on other issues, such as Chinese representation or disarmament.

I asked the State Department to rack up some kind of box score. They produced some figures showing that, over an 8-year period, when we voted "Yes," 95 percent of the time a sufficient majority of other nations voted along with us to get the proposals adopted. When we voted "No," 70 percent of the time enough other nations voted with us to get the proposals defeated. Out of the total number of our "Yes" and "No" votes, other nations voted the same way we did 86.7 percent of the time.

Translated into baseball terms, this is a batting average of .867. Neither Maris nor Mantle ever approached that record for a season, to say nothing of 18 years.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, during recent months, there have been many occasions on which the United Nations has been roundly abused; there have been few occasions on which it has been praised or even evaluated constructively; it is good on this occasion to find the United Nations, and our participation in it, being treated in friendly terms.

It is said with some accuracy that history does not disclose its alternatives. We shall never know with certainty what the world would have been like without the United Nations, or without some of its actions. However, the horrible alternatives that have presented themselves on the many occasions before the U.N. has acted can lead only to the conclusion that the world, and this country, would be in a far more precarious and explosive state—indeed they might have already disintegrated into international anarchy or war—were it not for the mechanisms of this international organization.

The mere enumeration of the dangerous situations the U.N. has met or helped to solve should suffice to show its worth.

Where would the chaotic Congo be today without the peacekeeping function of the U.N. forces? Surely, unilateral intervention here by any nation would have been likely to touch off worldwide conflict.

How long would the uneasy peace between Israel and Egypt obtain without the U.N. border patrol? Open hostilities between these two nations could certainly touch off war throughout the Near East as it almost did once before.

Who can gage the value of the U.N. truce supervision in disputed Kashmir? Surely, a reopening of the struggle between India and Pakistan in this area would be a tremendous blow to the free world and a boon to the Chinese Communists.

The U.N. administration of the transfer of West Iranian or Dutch New Guinea from the Netherlands to Indonesia has kept a restraining hand on what could have erupted into open warfare involving far more than the two nations directly concerned.

Beyond these well-known examples of preventing open and widespread conflict, the U.N. has served us and mankind well by providing a "window" into potentially dangerous situations. We have used this window in Jordan, in Lebanon, and now in Laos. The threat of exposure and loss of face with the many peacekeeping nations of the world has been a mighty deterrent to Communists and other potential aggressors. In practice, all this "window" consists of is a few U.N. observers.

In looking at the actual peacekeeping activities of the U.N., we should not overlook its very important function as a forum for world opinion. The U.N. General Assembly, and its various councils, have provided both a forum and a means of recognition for the emerging nations of the world. On the whole, the new nations of Africa and Asia have acted with responsibility and restraint on the many questions that concern them in the U.N. They have not tended, as some feared, to vote as a bloc. They have not fallen under the sway or in-

fluence of a Communist bloc, whether it be Chinese or Russian. The dignity with which these new and often impoverished countries have been accepted into the family of nations has greatly contributed to the restraint and dignity with which they have conducted themselves to date.

On balance, Mr. Speaker, I think it clear that the United Nations has been and will continue to be of great benefit to us as a nation and to us as part of humanity. From time to time, we hear the strident calls of the far right to the effect that we should "get the United States out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the United States." I submit that these people not only suffer from a lack of balanced information but they also reflect, in a wildly distorted fashion, this country's old leaning to isolationism. Most of us consciously reject the idea that America can ever withdraw unto itself and forget that the rest of the world exists. Certainly, our position of leadership in the world today prevents this if nothing else does. However, we often have trouble ridding ourselves of the self-conscious wish that if only the rest of the world will go away and quit bothering us, we would be much happier. I am afraid that much of the outcry against the U.N. springs from this visceral and unthinking attitude.

But how close we court disaster. Only a few months ago, this House defeated by a mere handful of votes an attempt to throw us into arrears with our U.N. assessments. Our years of effort to build a position of international strength in the U.N. could have been shattered in a fit of budget-balancing pique.

In all evaluations of the United Nations, I hope that we recognize that what success we have there, and the limited nature of our few failures, is basically due to the people who represent us. All too seldom do we recognize the caliber and the skill of our U.N. mission. I have faith that history will record the debt that we all owe to the tireless energy and humane spirit of people like the late Mrs. Roosevelt and to Adlai Stevenson, to mention but two. Indeed, if we have a history to record, it will be because these and many others struggled to insure that there would be a future. Let us set our minds to making that struggle easier and more fruitful.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, we become so absorbed in the individual problems that the United Nations discusses, that we lose sight of its overall objectives. Today we have an opportunity to stand back and look at the world organization in perspective.

I have little patience with those who would acclaim the United Nations as the only hope for world peace, or who would condemn the organization as a Communist plot to weaken America. Both of these attitudes reflect inability to face up to the complexity and difficulty of international problems. The real picture, as in so many other fields, is a mixed one.

The United Nations is one approach to the achievement of an important international goal: a peaceful, stable world in which nations of diverse political, economic and social systems, religious beliefs and cultural traditions can live in relative harmony with one another.

Such a world will never be possible until we can develop standards of conduct and behavior which will be respected throughout the world. We can no more afford to permit nations to overstep their bounds than we can permit a landowner to trespass on the property of his neighbor.

The United Nations is the product of wartime hopes tempered by peacetime realities. Those who believed in 1945 that the establishment of the United Nations would put an end to world tension have been sobered by the realization that we have embarked upon a voyage bolder than has been attempted before in human history. We should not be surprised or discouraged because the products of centuries of distrust, suspicion and desire for national aggrandizement have not been eliminated in 18 years.

Nor, as has been alleged, has the United Nations operated against the interests of the United States. The General Assembly, on the contrary, has adopted the U.S. position on resolutions against the 50-megaton bomb, practices denying the Tibetan people of their independence, the continued thwarting of U.N. objectives in Korea, and the seating of Communist China in the U.N.

Concern has been expressed in recent years that the large number of newly independent Afro-Asian nations would weaken the U.S. position in the United Nations. Of course, there will be disagreements on specific policy issues. But we must realize that we cannot and should not control the opinions and actions of the whole world. National independence, if it is to be meaningful, must encompass independent political beliefs as well as independent governments and economies. We must not interpret disagreement with a specific U.S. policy as a rejection of the principles of freedom we support. Nations who have so recently gained their independence are not likely to surrender it lightly to the totalitarianism of the Soviet Union.

Why specifically, should we continue our support for the United Nations?

First, if we are to create a climate in which freedom can flourish, we must have "an untrammeled flow of words in an open forum."

Second, the United Nations is an important multilateral peacekeeping agency. It can resolve local disputes and prevent them from escalating into a worldwide conflagration.

Third, the world organization is an important educational tool. The reports and studies undertaken by the United Nations have enlightened the world on subjects ranging from the peaceful uses of atomic energy to the political status of women.

In the limited time we have today, we cannot hope to touch upon all the contributions being made by the United Nations. We can, however, take the opportunity to reaffirm our faith in the principles which underly the United Nations and to assert our continued willingness to cooperate within this framework for the creation of a harmonious, antitotalitarian world.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, 18 years ago, when the world was emerging from a long period of war that had engaged many nations, the United Nations was born. It was a hopeful beginning in a search for true world peace. In the years since its beginning, the world has several times tottered on the brink of war, violence has flared in some areas, and there have been many diplomatic crises. But general war has been abated, and crisis have been resolved through peaceful negotiations. In nearly every instance, the United Nations has played a significant role.

It is itself a troubled organization, but it has had strong, enlightened leadership and administration and it rises above its internal problems to serve effectively the cause of world peace.

It has now twice the number of member nations as were enrolled at its beginning. It fulfills its mission as a forum for discussion and solution of world problems. It has faced up to its responsibilities for preserving the peace, even to the point of using force as in Korea and the Congo.

It is appropriate that on this 18th anniversary of its founding we recognize its important contributions to the maintenance of peace and hope that it shall be ever more effective in its role as peaceful arbitrator of differences between nations. Perhaps the real measurement of the United Nations is the fact that this world is still in existence.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, 18 years have passed since October 24, 1945, when the United Nations was founded.

The ensuing years have been some of the most tumultuous in the history of mankind. The winds of change have blown across whole continents. Colonial empires have been broken up. Dozens of new nations have been created. Peoples everywhere have been swept along on a tide of rising expectations.

There have been grave ruptures in the fabric of world harmony. The cold war between the Communist bloc and the Western Powers has dominated our age. Scientific discoveries harnessing the power of the atom have made even minor conflicts important.

Through all these times of headlong change, of hostility between nations, of danger from nuclear destruction, the United Nations has survived. Thursday as we celebrated the 18th anniversary of the United Nations founding, we also, in effect, observed its coming of age.

That was the theme I developed in remarks to the United Nations Day dinner sponsored by the mayor's committee of Alexandria, Va., for the United Nations, held last Thursday. In the address, which follows, the past of the United Nations was reviewed, its present status was assessed and its future was scanned:

THE UNITED NATIONS: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

(A speech by Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, city of Alexandria, Va., United Nations Day Dinner, Thursday, October 24, 1963)

It is indeed a privilege and an honor for me to have the opportunity to speak to you this evening at this annual United Nations Day observance.

As one who has long been interested in the United Nations, I am particularly gratified when I learn of civic groups such as yours, dedicated to the purpose of better international relations and understanding.

The city of Alexandria, in creating this mayor's committee for the celebration of United Nations Day, has demonstrated an enlightenment unique among American cities. Truly, you may be proud of this community.

Each of you also is to be commended for your attendance here tonight, because it demonstrates your individual interest in international affairs, a subject of utmost importance in this atomic age.

As we are gathered here for this annual observance, the United Nations is 18 years old. To be 18 in this country is to come of age. At 18 an individual reaches—in most cases—full legal age.

Perhaps, then, we are not taking too many liberties if we say that tonight we are celebrating the coming of age of the United Nations. And while aware that the passage of time does not always bring maturity, we can assume that the United Nations is no longer an adolescent.

At such points in the life of an individual—or of an organization—it is fitting to review the past, evaluate the present, and scan the future for signs and portents. This I intend to do—briefly—tonight.

THE PAST OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations was born at the conclusion of the most terrible and destructive war the world had ever known. It was the child of the five so-called great powers which had—at terrible cost—defeated fascism.

When the U.N. was organized many believed that it would insure that World War II was truly the "war to end all wars." How naive that hope was.

For it was based on a mechanism of collective security that took for granted that the wartime allies would remain peacetime allies.

As we know, the ink scarcely was dry on the Charter signatures when the Soviet Union began the aggressive acts that propelled the world into the era of cold war.

The cold war jammed the mutual security mechanism firmly. Not only was war far from being abolished, it became a terrifying and real possibility.

But in spite of this the United Nations survived. Unlike the League of Nations, it was able to overcome structural deficiencies and early, serious problems.

Why? Because—it seems to me—the great powers did not abandon the U.N. For all the animosity that has grown up between the Soviet Union and the Western nations, neither side has quit the United Nations.

Both blocs have flung hot and angry words at each other in the Security Council, in the General Assembly, and in the various technical and social councils. But both have kept talking.

All have realized that to stop talking is to risk fighting—with all the inherent dangers of a nuclear holocaust.

You may remember that shortly before the Korean conflict broke out, the Soviet Union, with much fanfare walked out of the United Nations. When the Russian delegation returned, there was a United Nations army fighting Communist aggression in Korea and the U.N. Charter had been amended to give the overwhelmingly pro-Western General Assembly more actual power.

The Soviets' action was a major tactical error. They have never repeated it.

Subsequently, the great powers have never ceased to actively participate in the activities of the United Nations. With this continuing participation the United Nations has gained greater importance with each passing year.

The inability of the Organization to cope with the Communist subjugation of the peoples of eastern and central Europe, and of Asia, has tended to obscure its concrete achievements. The list of these is an imposing one:

The United Nations has been successful in preventing or stopping war in Kashmir, Laos, the Middle East, Yemen, and New Guinea.

It has resisted aggression in Korea and has put down civil war in the Congo.

It has expressed and stirred the conscience of mankind by condemning Communist aggression and atrocities in Korea, Hungary, Tibet, and other places.

Today, for example; a U.N. team is in Vietnam to investigate charges of Buddhist persecution.

The United Nations has endeavored to enlarge the area of the rule of law in international affairs, thereby working for the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

It has assisted millions of peoples to achieve smooth transition from dependency to independent nationhood.

On this last point, I think it should be noted that between the end of World War II and 1961, more than 20 new nations with a population in excess of 700 million came into existence. Although their transition to independence was not entirely without bloodshed, the record on this score finds no parallel in the annals of man.

The role which the United Nations has played and continues to play in this process has, indeed, been most constructive.

But beyond giving a helping hand to the nations which have emerged from the swift breakup of the old colonial empires, the United Nations offers these newly independent nations a voice in the affairs of the world.

Further, the United Nations—through agencies like the Special Fund, UNESCO, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the Children's Fund—has provided the underdeveloped countries of the world with technical, economic and other assistance. It has sought to help these nations resolve their economic and social problems, and fashion a better future for their peoples.

Those, briefly, are the past accomplishments of the United Nations. But what of the present?

THE PRESENT UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations of today bears only superficial resemblance to the Organization created in 1945.

First, it is more than twice as large.

In 1962, Rwanda, Burundi, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago, Algeria, and Uganda were admitted to membership. On May 14 of this year Kuwait joined the U.N., bringing its total membership to 111.

Thus, the often-expressed goal of universal representation in the Organization is coming closer and closer to realization.

Second, the structural mechanisms that underlie the United Nations Organization have been adapted to meet the realities of our times. The Security Council—doomed to paralysis by the cold war and Russia's constant use of the veto power—is being more and more bypassed in favor of the General Assembly.

The Assembly, originally conceived as little more than a debating society, has become the principal organ of the United Nations. With a majority vote prevailing on most questions and no veto, it has been able to act effectively in many situations.

Of growing importance too has been the Secretariat. This international civil service now numbers about 5,000. As it has grown in size, so has the stature of its chief executive, the Secretary General.

Both Trygvie Lie and Dag Hammarskjold succeeded in expanding and strengthening the executive powers of the Secretary General during their years in that position. U Thant has carried on the thrust of their activities. Today, there can be no doubt that the Secretary General plays an extremely important part in building the power and prestige of the United Nations.

A recent example of this was the request by Indonesia and the Philippines that Mr. Thant determine whether elections in Sarawak and Borneo had indeed indicated the desire of those former British colonies to join the new Federation of Malaysia.

The survey conducted by the Secretariat, under U Thant's direction, proved to the world—although not to Mr. Sukarno—that the principle of self-determination was indeed realized in the forming of Malaysia.

A third change at the United Nations has been the kinds of matters discussed. With the heightened influence of the African nations in the General Assembly, cold war conflicts, to some extent, have been shunted aside. In their place have come issues of self-determination and equality of peoples and races. Portugal and South Africa have been called to accounting before the bar of world opinion.

As a member of the U.S. delegation in 1959 to the 14th General Assembly and from subsequent observations, I have noted a fourth significant change regarding the United Nations.

It is not a structural change, but rather a change in the attitudes of people everywhere about the U.N. and what it can and cannot accomplish.

There is a great deal more realism about the United Nations today than at any time in the past. Extravagant hopes that the U.N. would lead the world effortlessly to a lasting peace have vanished.

The disillusionment that replaced those hopes—a disillusionment that dismissed the U.N. as worthless—has also largely melted away.

In the place of extravagant hopes and black despair, there is today realistic knowledge of the kinds of activities the United Nations can, with success, undertake.

The new emerging nations are discovering that the world problems which seemed so simple of solution when they stood outside the international arena are, indeed, difficult and complex.

We in the United States are learning that while the vote in the General Assembly may sometimes go against us, our country, in general, enjoys the respect and support of the majority of the world's nations.

Even the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc may be learning that table thumping, troika touting, and obstructionism are not the way to win friends and influence delegates.

This new realism about the United Nations is a heartening trend. It indicates that the Organization—and attitudes toward it—are reaching maturity after 18 years.

THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

But what of the future?

It is always risky to don the turban of a visionary, sit down to a crystal ball and pretend to have knowledge of things to come. But one need not be a seer to discern certain forces within the United Nations which will shape its future.

For example, we can expect a mounting campaign by the African nations to increase their representation in the major organs of the United Nations.

In 1945 when the United Nations Charter was signed there were three African nations represented. Today there are 32. With the growth of the African bloc has come pressure to reflect the increasing importance of Africa in the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council. Last May the Addis Ababa conference of African leaders unanimously insisted that Africa—as a geographical region—should have equitable representation in the United Nations. Further support for this position has come from other, non-African member nations.

In order to increase the size of the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council, the United Nations Charter must be revised.

The Soviet Union, however, has perennially refused to consider amending the Charter until its erstwhile ally, Communist China, is seated in the place of Nationalist China.

It remains to be seen what position the Soviet Union will take in the light of the mounting campaign by the African nations—whose good will it hopes to win—as against its commitment to Communist China—whose good will it seems to have lost.

There likely will be agonizing reappraisals in the Kremlin over this issue. We may be able to take some comfort from the discomfort of the Soviets.

The Sino-Soviet split will make itself increasingly felt in the future activities of the United Nations.

There was an indication of this on Monday of this week. The General Assembly, by a slightly larger margin than last year, voted to keep Communist China out of the United Nations for the 14th time, by a vote of 57–41 with 12 abstentions.

No longer was it the Soviet Union which put forth the resolution championing the cause of Red China. Instead, it was tiny Albania. Although the Soviet Union voted to seat Communist China, it refrained from praising that country's regime. There was, in addition, a similar general lack of enthusiasm for the cause among the bloc nations of Eastern Europe.

There is reason to believe that Russia may be coming around to the view of the United States that the Peiping regime should be considered an outlaw on the world scene.

Under these conditions, it is unlikely that Communist China will be seated in the U.N. in the foreseeable future. We can expect continuing success of our efforts to keep them out.

As we happily contemplate the Russians beset by new and difficult problems, let us not forget that our own role in the United Nations will continue to be far from an easy one.

The United States can look for continued difficulties between our NATO allies who have colonies in Africa—such as Portugal and Great Britain—and the newly independent, militantly-nationalistic African states.

There may be increasing trouble as well from France as that nation, under the leadership of President de Gaulle, embarks on a campaign to increase its world influence at our expense.

France may, for example, use the United Nations as a forum to attack or harass our current policies in Vietnam.

Suffice to say that our able Ambassador, Mr. Stevenson, and his staff will be called upon to exercise their highest diplomatic abilities. At the same time, they must offer the same dynamic leadership which has characterized United States participation in the United Nations Organization through the past 18 years.

SUMMATION

In closing, I should like to point out that as a U.S. Congressman I am constantly receiving letters which demand that the United States get out of the United Nations, and vice versa. These came from John Birchers and other extremists in California, Texas, and Arizona; fortunately, few come from my own district.

The persons who write these cards and letters consider themselves anti-Communists. Yet I can think of few actions which the United States could take that would please the Communists more than having our country abandon the United Nations.

Without the United States, the Reds could make the U.N. a vehicle for their own propaganda. They could single us out as abdicating our responsibilities to the rest of the world; and they could blacken us as warmongers and imperialists without rebuttal.

It is certain that for the United States to leave the United Nations would be suicidal. It ill behooves these self-proclaimed patriots to espouse a cause which would be destructive to our Nation and its goals.

Rather, the United States must continue to work within the United Nations to build a community of nations, diverse, tolerant and genuinely independent, but bound together by a common humanity and by a common interest in peace and progress.

If the United Nations, with our help, succeeds in coming close to that goal, then we have truly fashioned a milestone in the history of mankind. If we fail—there may be no one left to write the histories of our failure.

Let us then, this evening, rededicate ourselves to the cause of international justice and understanding as expressed in the Charter of the United Nations Organization.

Our past efforts have aided the United Nations to come of age; now let us work so that nations united may come to peace.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the anniversary of the United Nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

DR. ERNESTO GALARZA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I learned from newspaper accounts that Dr. Ernesto Galarza of San Jose, Calif., would be retained by the House Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation into the tragic bus accident which claimed the lives of 32 human beings on September 17, 1963.

In a special order on October 16, I exposed Dr. Galarza as a man who had a conflict of interest and could be expected, judging from his long history of agitation and distortion of the truth, to use the investigation to further his long-standing campaign to discredit Public Law 78. In making my presentation, I cited a report by a majority of a committee of the Congress and an incident I personally observed. This evidence conclusively showed him to be unreliable and lacking in objectivity.

Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to me that a man such as Galarza, who has related this unfortunate accident and his opposition to Public Law 78 over his own signature, should be allowed to use the prestige of the Congress to continue his record of self-serving distortion of fact. Yet, he has been given such an opportunity after no consultation whatever between the chairman of the full committee and any member of the minority.

New information which I learned about just a few days ago makes the investigation stand out even more clearly as a ridiculous waste of taxpayers' funds and a duplication of what has already been done by perhaps as many as ten other agencies.

It is now obvious from this new information that this investigation itself should be investigated.

Galarza will be the consultant to two staff investigators, a Mr. Odell Clark and Miss Corrine Huff.

I know nothing about Mr. Clark, but I do know that Miss Huff was at one time a runner-up in the Miss Universe contest and is better remembered from an experience she had last year investigating another matter.

On August 8, 1962, she sailed for Europe at taxpayers' expense, aboard the *Queen Mary*. On this trip, she was part of a two-woman/one-man investigating committee scheduled to study equal job opportunity for women, while seeing Europe and cruising among the islands of the Aegean Sea. She and another female staff member of the Education and Labor Committee went along to assist the committee chairman, Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, in ferreting out information for the committee.

As representatives of the Congress, traveling at taxpayers' expense, the trio traveled first class, stopping at the finest hotels. According to a well-known columnist, the chairman requested that the *Queen Mary* be met by a U.S. official at Cherbourg, France, with $100 U.S. equivalent in local currencies for each member of his party. The columnist stated that Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL requested Army cars and chauffeurs and tickets for the first show and best dinner table at the Lido in Paris for himself and his feminine companions, tickets for the Venice Film Festival, London plays, and use of the Consulate's motor boat in Venice. He inquired concerning the possibility of a 6-day boat trip around the islands of the Aegean Sea and a possible visit to Rhodes for himself and his companions.

Miss Huff is undoubtedly an attractive person and may be well qualified as an investigator. But in light of the unfavorable publicity she brought upon the Congress by reason of her trip abroad a little over a year ago, I think it is unfortunate that she is involved in this very peculiar investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I have previously quoted from a report signed by a majority of a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor which reveals case after case of a shocking distortion of the truth by an organization of which Dr. Galarza was the educational director. This report which I have previously mentioned consistently refers to a film, entitled "Poverty in the Valley of Plenty," as a "disregard of the truth," "wholly false," and "a shocking collection of falsehoods, almost wholly unrelieved by any regard whatever for the truth and the facts."

Neither Dr. Galarza nor his defenders have made any effort to challenge the truth of this report. Rather, they have sought to discredit it, since it was not

officially filed by the Democratic majority as an official House report but was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 9, 1950, a fact which I clearly stated in my speech of October 16.

I have talked with former Congressman Thomas H. Werdel who placed the report in the RECORD. He has assured me that it was signed by a majority of the committee. Former Congressman Werdel also assures me that a copy of the signed report was filed with the chairman of the committee and that he—Werdel—filed a signed copy, along with his extension of remarks, with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk.

Mysteriously, all of these copies have disappeared from the files and the only record left is the signed report as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an extension of remarks by Congressman Werdel. Were it not for his action of March 9, 1950, this majority report would not only have been denied official status for reasons which can only be imagined, but it would have been lost for all time.

It continues to strike me as more than strange that peculiar things happen whenever Dr. Ernesto Galarza is involved.

Whether the report was officially filed or not is immaterial. The fact still remains that it was signed by and is the opinion of a majority of a duly constituted committee of the Congress.

If anyone doubts the truth of this statement, I urge him to contact our highly respected colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], who is one of the signatories. He will tell you, as he has told me, that the report was signed by three members of a five-man committee and reflects majority opinion. TOM STEED is well known to all of us and we all know his word is good.

It has been inferred that this report is not genuine and I say again with the support of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], that this report genuinely reflects the opinion of a majority of the subcommittee and was signed by Richard Nixon, Thurston Morton, and Tom Steed. As the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman STEED, told me within the last 24 hours, every word of that report is the truth.

Justice Schottky of the Third District Court of Appeals in California thinks enough of this committee report to make reference to it in one of his decisions. On April 30 of this year he refers to it as reported in volume 30, California Reporter, page 353. He says:

> In February 1950 the subcommittee rendered its report and concluded that the charges made in the film, and hereinbefore enumerated were false. The report was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a copy reposes in the library of the AFL-CIO Washington Headquarters.

Now, let us prove my point in still another manner with absolutely no reference to the challenged report. Let us look to the judicial records of the State of California.

On May 18, 1949, a libel action was brought against several defendants in the superior court in and for the county of Los Angeles. The libel consisted of false statements made in a film "Poverty in the Valley of Plenty" for which the defendants were responsible. Named as one of the defendants was Ernesto Galarza.

Let me quote once again from Dr. Ernesto Galarza's sworn testimony on November 12, 1949, from the printed subcommittee hearings which can be found in the Library of Congress. Regarding this libel suit he says, and I quote:

> I have just been served and I am named as defendant in this suit.

Later on the same page he says in part:

> So whatever I had to do with this film, I am rather proud of that film.

Thus, it is established that Dr. Galarza was a defendant in this libel action. Because of his position as educational director of the union and his own sworn statement there is no question that he bears some responsibility for the film. The decision of the court further verifies his responsibility.

On May 24, 1950, the defendants confessed judgment and agreed to pay damages in the amount of $1 and further agreed not to make further showings of the controversial and libelous film and to destroy all copies, negatives, and duplicate negatives. Dr. Ernesto Galarza, as one of the defendants, joined in a confession of judgment. This is entered by the clerk of Los Angeles County as consent judgment No. 566888.

Mr. Speaker, what further proof is required that this man who has been retained to work with a well-traveled beauty queen and conduct an impartial investigation for the Committee on Education and Labor is capable of libel and distortion than his own confession?

Several years later when Dr. Galarza had severed his connection with the union, the film was again shown and a subsequent suit resulted in the award of $60,000 in damages plus interest from the date of the judgment for a total award of approximately $66,500. This case was appealed to the district court of appeals where Judge Schottky on April 30, 1963, sustained the decision of the trial court and adjusted the general damage to $10,000 plus $50,000 punitive damages.

This decision can be found at volume 30, California Reporter, page 350.

Though Dr. Galarza had left the union's employ prior to the offensive repeat showing of the film, the case is still pertinent because after 13 years two different courts found a film to be libelous in which Galarza shared a legal responsibility.

So, Mr. Speaker, Galarza stands as having confessed to participating in a libel in the production of the film "Poverty in the Valley of Plenty" and the majority opinion of the subcommittee is proven by the judicial record to be correct.

Within the last week Galarza has handled truth as though it were a Yo-yo with him pulling the string. He was quoted in the Palo Alto Times and the San Jose Mercury as saying that he had nothing to do with the film "Poverty in the Valley of Plenty" and that there never was a subcommittee report on it.

The extent to which he went to make this statement is incredible. To do so he must indirectly accuse not only me of lying but three Members of Congress, one of whom is still in this body, one who is today a U.S. Senator, and one who is a former Vice President of the United States. Additionally, he must believe that the superior court in and for the county of Los Angeles was guilty of distorting the truth. But what is most amazing is that he indicts himself as a purveyor of falsehood when he contradicts his own statement made under oath on November 12, 1949, and his own confession of judgment for libel. Which time must we believe Ernesto—when he testified under oath or when he talked to the newspapers last week?

Mr. Speaker, my remarks should not be interpreted as opposition to a fair-minded and impartial investigation of the tragic bus accident by a committee which properly has jurisdiction. It is my belief that several thorough and complete investigations are being made and there is no need for a further drain upon the taxpayer. But if the majority should feel that an investigation is warranted, then we as Congressmen and taxpayers have the right to be assured that it will be made by competent, unbiased personnel.

We have a right to something more than a "beauty queen" who was all over the paper a year ago as the traveling assistant to Representative Powell and a man such as Ernesto Galarza who stands convicted by his own confession of participating in a libel.

IMAGE OF CHILE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, when President Kennedy announced the Alliance for Progress in his noble address of March 13, 1961, he made clear that the Alliance was not to be a one-way street. In particular the President urged the countries of Latin America to share with us their rich traditions of artistic and intellectual achievement.

Said President Kennedy at that time:

> We invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need teachers of your literature and history and tradition, opportunities for our young people to study in your universities, access to your music, your art, and the thought of your great philosophers. For we know we have much to learn.
>
> In this way you can help to bring a fuller spiritual and intellectual life to the people of the United States, and contribute to understanding and mutual respect among the nations of the hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that President Kennedy's challenge has met with a warm response on the part of at least one of the greatest countries of Latin America, Chile.

For the Embassy of Chile has organized here in Washington, D.C., a series of presentations of Chilean music, art, and literature under the general title of the "Image of Chile." The series began last month and will continue into November.

As the distinguished Ambassador of Chile to the United States, The Honorable Sergio Gutierrez-Olivos, said, in announcing the "Image of Chile" series:

We willingly take up President Kennedy's friendly invitation and challenge, for it affords us a unique opportunity to fulfill several desirable objectives.

It permits us to portray, even in fragmentary form, the cultural heritage of a distant land still too little known and understood in this great sister Republic.

It encourages us to pioneer an effort which we are sure will be emulated by other nations of Latin America, each with an eloquent and important expression of our common spiritual legacy.

Finally, it permits us to reciprocate in some small measure the wealth of knowledge and ideas that flows from the United States to the rest of the world, and give form to the esteem and affection in which we hold this Nation and its people.

Ambassador Gutierrez-Olivos's remarks represent the imaginative response of one Latin American nation to President Kenendy's plea for increasing cultural communications between the countries of North and South America. Certainly the "Image of Chile" presentations offer a unique opportunity to North Americans to acquaint ourselves with the artistic and intellectual achievements of that country and to enjoy the works of some of Chile's leading figures in the performing and visual arts.

INAUGURAL OF SERIES

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure on September 22, 1963, of attending the inaugural program of the "Image of Chile" here in our Nation's Capital. Participating in this opening event as speakers were our distinguished Secretary of Labor, the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz; Ambassador Gutierrez-Olivos; and our renowned conductor, pianist and composer, Mr. Leonard Bernstein, director of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra.

A splendid concert was presented that evening in the auditorium of the Department of State by the Ancient Music Group of the Catholic University of Chile as well as a brilliant recital of contemporary Chilean poetry, which was offered by a distinguished Chilean actress, Fellicia Montealegre, also known in our country as Mrs. Leonard Bernstein.

Among the cultural programs which have already been or are to be presented during the "Image of Chile" are an exhibit of contemporary Chilean painting, a program of traditional songs, dances, and music by a Chilean folklore group and three roundtable discussions by leading American and Chilean authorities on Latin American poetry, fiction, and theater and several recitals by outstanding Chilean musicians.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to salute this pioneering effort by the Embassy of Chile and in particular to congratulate Ambassador Gutierrez-Olivos. His vigor and imagination are in large measure responsible for this contribution to the enrichment of the cultural life of our own country.

I must also note that this effort has been supported financially and in other ways, by many educational, business and private interests in both the United States and Chile.

May I also say that I hope this venture will prove to be only the first of many such efforts to increase the number and quality of intellectual and artistic exchanges between our country and the nations of Latin America.

The relative mutual isolation in which artists and creative thinkers in our hemisphere have so long found themselves is, I think, a great misfortune and programs such as the "Image of Chile" represent an important milestone in the direction of remedying this shortcoming.

THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to pay tribute to an organization which is working full time for the development of such cultural exchanges between the United States and Latin America, the Inter-American Committee.

The Inter-American Committee, which by the way, was one of the organizations which cooperated in organizing the "Image of Chile," is a private, nonprofit foundation established in January of this year. The IAC was formed precisely in order to cope with the serious vacuum which to too great an extent exists between intellectual and creative leaders in Latin America and their counterparts in the United States as well as the equally serious void which exists among many such persons in Latin America itself.

The Inter-American Committee undertakes to arrange for outstanding Latin American thinkers and artists to visit the United States and for leading Americans in the arts to go to Latin America.

In particular, the IAC directs its efforts toward enabling artists and writers from Latin America and the United States to meet each other and exchange ideas and views, to consider mutual problems, and to study and work with their counterparts from the different cultures of this hemisphere. The goal of these efforts of expanded cultural exchange is to develop a greater sense of community and of mutual respect among creative people in the Americas.

The executive director of the Inter-American Committee is Mr. Robert M. Wool. The chairman of the board of directors is Mr. Flavian Levine. Members of the board of directors are: Edward Albee, John Harrison, Andrew Heiskell, Israel Klabin, Richard M. Morse, Rodman C. Rockefeller, Robert Rossen, William Styron, Gore Vidal, and Robert M. Wool.

ADDRESSES AT INAUGURAL OF "IMAGE OF CHILE"

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the addresses delivered at the inaugural program of the "Image of Chile" on September 22, 1963, in Washington, D.C.

The addresses follow:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF LABOR W. WILLARD WIRTZ AT THE INAUGURAL PROGRAM "IMAGE OF CHILE," SEPTEMBER 22, 1963

It is my privilege to represent my colleagues of the President's Cabinet in welcoming you here this evening, and in expressing our deep appreciation to Ambassador Gutierrez-Olivos for bringing us the "Image of Chile."

If you were to inquire, or even wonder, why this privilege should be conferred upon the Secretary of Labor, I would not know the answer, but would find here at least the reminder that a nation's true culture is only what has, over the days and years, inspired its people's commonest labors.

The realization that each word of mine stands between you and the true pleasures of the evening reminds me that brevity is the child of silence, and a great credit to its paternity.

You would want me to say, though, for you, how grateful we are to Ambassador Gutierrez-Olivos and his associates, and to the participants in this program, for enriching our knowledge and understanding of a neighbor we know too little, for letting us renew our realization that "life is painting a picture, not doing a sum."

You would ask me to express, too, our pleasure at this response to President Kennedy's invitation, and our admiration for its coming first, in this generous fashion, through an embassy for which we know it represents a very major undertaking.

SETTING OF THE CULTURE

Perhaps you will feel, too, that it is not amiss that I mention briefly a few of the things that will make it easier to transport ourselves into the setting of the culture we are this week to share.

So it is that we think this evening of a country so far to the south, that it is warmest in December and coldest in July—a country only 200 miles wide but stretching a distance as far, in terms we know, as from Alaska to Mexico, a country resting on the west shoulder of the Andes and sloping down with them to the sea.

I think, Mr. Ambassador, of the coincidence of geography with the history and friendship of the Americas, or perhaps it is more than coincidence: that all of America's mountains, from our own Rockies, down through the Sierra Madres, then on down along the length of the Andes, run north and south, so that they are not even barriers between us, but a backbone, rather, for freedom and friendship.

To turn from geography to history is to note that Chile, like the United States, is a country whose culture combines the influence of a people who were there earlier with that of others who came inspired sometimes less by culture than by conquest, from Europe. The native Araucanian of Chile played a very large part in the founding of its culture. The pivot point of your history, like our own, was one of revolution—ours in the late 18th century, yours in 1810, and marked 4 days ago, on September 18.

We remind ourselves of our freedom's genesis in terms of the rigors of Valley Forge and the crossing of the ice-filled Delaware, you in terms of the 18-day crossing of the ice-covered Andes by Jose de San Martin, Jose M. Carrerra, and Bernardo O'Higgins.

Your revolutionary doctrines were printed on a press which arrived in Chile in 1811—an important import from the United States. So you had your Tom Paines, too. One of the patriots of the junta which began the march toward Chilean independence on September 18, 1810, wrote, in words which could have been spoken tonight—when he looked toward what he spoke of as "the day when America, whether of the two continents, or of the South, shall speak to the rest of the world with a voice which will make itself respected so that her resolve will be opposed with difficulty."

EDUCATION

If there is a segment of culture which we accept, labeling it as "primitive," we recognize that it is education which releases the fuller power "to give forms to one's dreams, to give shape to one's fancy, to change one's

ideas into images, to express one's self through a material that one makes lovely"—to perform, in short, what Oscar Wilde identified as the function of art. And so we exalt, in our two countries, the importance of education—with universities that have now the age of centuries in their walls, with laws that make education compulsory, with the accomplishment in both Chile and the United States of a level of literacy well above the 75-percent mark.

A century and a half ago, our two countries collaborated in armed revolution. It was necessary, first, to put in freedom's foundations.

Two years ago we declared jointly—in the Alliance for Progress—a new, 10-year war against disease, and poverty, and inadequate housing, and hunger, and hopelessness—to give more meaning to freedom in more people's lives.

Tonight, and this week, we join—thanks to Chile's initiative—in tasting some of the fruits of our centuries of common aspiration and endeavor. We know that what we will learn anew this week is that while there may be boundary lines between nations, there are none between ideas, or beauty or people.

It is, finally, my particular privilege to introduce the evening's speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF LEONARD BERNSTEIN

To say anything to you of who he is or what he has done would be to disregard the common knowledge of the part he has come to play in all our lives—that he has brought beauty and pleasure to us and has given them in their finest form to our children.

I should like to introduce him rather by reading what I came upon some time ago: a "six-part definition of an old-fashioned artist."

"First, and above all, a fiercely hard worker, an agonizer, never satisfied, yet always rewarded by the simple act of creating.

"Second, an extender of tradition, acutely aware of roots and lineage, who extends these by measuring them incessantly against the future: Therefore, of course, an insatiable progressive.

"Third, an inward-looker, a self-searcher, a soul-picker, who will spare no part of his body or spirit to achieve expressive cleanliness, stylistic rightness and moral truth.

"Fourth, a socially oriented conscience, a society-lover and implacable critic: Therefore, of course, a persistent radical.

"Fifth, a fountain of humor, of laughter, be it savage, snide, or shy; a sport, in love with the very athletics of creating art.

"And sixth, an experimentalist; but one who experiments with personal, interior materials. Which, in fact, sums up all the elements: You cannot make this kind of inner experiment without the agony of labor, the respect for traditions, the sense of future, the self-searching, the direct wire to human society, or the gift of laughter which protects against every undue pomposity and solemnity.

"This is the artist who will cackle and hoot if you call him dedicated, and rush off in a fit to create a very old-fashioned thing which men still call in their fumbling, old-fashioned way * * * beauty."

Ladies and gentlemen, the author of these words I have read, the director of the New York Philharmonic, a man who stands, a colossus of culture, astride our continents and brings them together by the miracles of music and marriage: Mr. Leonard Bernstein.

REMARKS OF LEONARD BERNSTEIN AT THE "IMAGE OF CHILE" PROGRAM, SEPTEMBER 22, 1963

Mr. Secretary, Ambassador Guttierez, distinguished guests and dear friends: I am afraid that I stand here tonight in a rather oblique relationship to you all; my formal connection with the "Image of Chile" is a purely marital one. It is a curious experience for me to appear as a speaker-in-law, so to speak; but I do it warmly and willingly, because my affections for Chile have gone far beyond the confines of mere husbandly interest. Chile is a country that you love, that you cannot help loving, wife or no wife. Have you ever met a traveler returning from Chile who was less than in love with it? I haven't. There is a special charm in that country, and in its people—a mixture of Old World civility and New World freshness: a vitality born of that life-giving air and climate, together with the gentleness and peacefulness of a people snuggled into a sweet strip of earth between the Andes and the Pacific. It is a country wonderfully alive without being hectic; and that is a magic formula we Norteamericanos may well envy.

The first direct news of Chile I can remember came from my friend, Aaron Copland, our leading American composer, who in 1942 made a tour for the State Department of the principal countries of South and Central America—with an eye, of course, on what was happening musically in those parts. I will always remember the enthusiasm with which he returned: his excitement at finding new younger composers like Blas Galindo and Pablo Moncayo in Mexico, Guarmieri in Brazil, Juan Orrego-Salas in Chile, Hector Tosar in Uruguay—of course, that was over 20 years ago, and there have been many new names in the meantime. But way back then those were almost like names from Mars; and when Mr. Copland subsequently brought a good many of these young composers to study at Tanglewood, where I, too, was working, one had the feeling at first of meeting Martians, who upon closer acquaintance turned out to be real, live, gifted, dedicated musicians, not very different from our own. Copland also brought back stirring tales of a frontier culture: of Indians playing Schoenberg; of German refugees playing Indian drums; of disappearing Colonial social structures, of new nationalistic impulses. But what I recall most vividly of all his reports was his impression of Chile—warm, vital, simpático—so far away geographically, and so near to us in spirit and in humor.

My next brush with Chile occurred some 4 years later when I met Felicia Montealegre, who became my wife. In her I met that same warmth, vitality, simpatía; and through meeting her family and friends I began to be able to see and feel for myself the very special quality of that country.

TOUR OF LATIN AMERICA BY NEW YORK PHILHARMONIC

But it wasn't until 1958 that I was finally privileged to go there. In that year the New York Philharmonic and I made an extensive tour—also under the sponsorship of the State Department—of every country in South America plus Mexico. It turned out to be one of the happiest and most exciting trips of my life, especially when I discovered the power of music in establishing friendships and lasting relationships on the widest basis. I am not speaking idly, or boastfully, or simply as a musician, but as a citizen of the United States, of the Americas, and, hopefully of the world. That tour happened to coincide with another South American tour that was being made by our then Vice President; and the coincidence yielded some striking observations, especially when the Nixon tour and the Philharmonic tour happened to intersect in Quito, Ecuador, where we exchanged notes. I reported to the Vice President tumultuous receptions, record crowds, cheering, stamping audiences, kisses, roses, embraces; while he reported to me the unpleasant, distasteful incidents of Caracas, Lima, and other places. Where did the difference lie? After all, we were both Americans, both on goodwill missions, and both vulnerable to the same demonstrations of anti-Yankee feelings, whether Communist inspired or not. Where did the difference lie? In music: in the exchange of the deepest feelings and revelations of which man is capable—those of art. We had music on our side. In other words: If we are really serious about communicating with one another, about knowing ourselves through our neighbors—in short, about peaceful civilization—then we can never overestimate the good that comes from artistic communion. When we touch one another through music, we are touching the heart, the mind, and the spirit all at once.

PAUCITY OF ARTISTIC VISITS FROM SOUTH AMERICA TO THE UNITED STATES

As you can see, our State Department has been aware of this truth for a long time, and has stood behind such tours as those I have mentioned by Copland, the Philharmonic, and others. But it has still not been enough—it can never be enough. And of late there has been something of a falling off in this area, to say nothing of the paucity of artistic visits in the other direction—from South to North America. That is why this "Image of Chile" convocation is so important and necessary. There should be many more like it. I cannot stress strongly enough the need for constant artistic interchange—constant, not de vez en quando. The cries of budgetary strictures are really not to be taken that seriously. If I am not mistaken our entire tour of South America cost the State Department a great deal less than it costs to make one wing of an obsolescent bomber, and it accomplished a good deal more, if I may say so, in the matter of international understanding. Mrs. Rusk, please do convince the Secretary of State to send us back to Chile. Apart from anything else, I long to sit again in a little room on the outskirts of Santiago, and listen to the magical folksinging of Violeta Parra. I have always been a folk music fan, ever since I can remember—any kind—Hindu, Swahili, hillbilly. But I must say I have never felt so close to a newly discovered folk music as I did to those hearbreaking saludos and parabienes that poured out of Parra's mouth and soul. I only wish she too could be here for this "Image of Chile."

SELF-KNOWLEDGE HAS BECOME A HEMISPHERICAL MATTER

I had not meant to get so seriously involved in this subject tonight; after all, I am only a speaker-in-law, and I intend to leave the bulk of the speaking to my dear wife, who will speak far more beautiful words than I can. But when I come near to this subject of cultural exchange, I can't help becoming a bit polemical; and I can't resist pressing home this one point. The future of our world is obviously an international one—or else it is a bleak future indeed. We have got to continue to know our neighbors better and better; the time of complacent isolation is over; and national boundaries must become increasingly purely geographical symbols. The road to peace is the road to universality; and this road is fed into by all kinds of smaller byways and avenues that come from self-knowledge, and knowledge of our immediate neighbors, growing into broad highways that lead to all parts of the world. But we must begin with ourselves; we must be exposed to images of all kinds. How interesting it would be now to have an "image of Alabama," for instance—and go from there to the great original concept of America—North, South, and Central, all together. History is rushing by; and self-knowledge has now become a hemispherical matter, at the very least. I was startled into a reminder of this concept the other day while I was in the process of solving one of those tricky British crossword puzzles—the Manchester Guardian, I think it was. The clue read: "Italian city starting in America"—answer in seven letters. After much brain racking, I discovered the answer to be "Perugia"; of course, an Italian city

starting with Peru. But is Peru in America? Of course it is. Only we North Americans still don't think big enough to accept that natural concept. And we must begin to think that way soon, before it's too late. This presentation of Chilean art and thought is a significant step in that direction; and I congratulate all of you who have helped it to come to be, and hope that it will achieve everything you expect of it—especially those deep, warm ties that arise from artistic communion, and that lead to a fruitful, peaceful life on this earth.

Thank you.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HIS EXCELLENCY MR. SERGIO GUTIERREZ-OLIVOS, AMBASSADOR OF CHILE, AT THE OPENING OF THE "IMAGE OF CHILE," ON SEPTEMBER 22, 1963

Your Excellencies, Senators and Congressmen, Mrs. Bernstein, distinguished guests: Abraham Lincoln made a statement in his first inaugural address more than a hundred years ago that is pertinent to our own inaugural tonight, and to the "Image of Chile" program to follow:

"Physically speaking," he said, "we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them."

Lincoln referred to an existing union threatened by division and disintegration. We, as North Americans and Latin Americans, are concerned with a union in evolution, a union still incomplete in many respects, but a union that gives every promise of growing strength and permanence.

Geography unites us in the physical sense and we cannot separate. More important, we have no desire to separate and our determination is to draw ever closer to one another. Our economic and political unity is still in evolution, but it moves steadily forward.

In the cultural and spiritual sense, we are confronted by the paradox of possessing all the elements of unity, and of yet being separated by a wall which has no reason for being, and which we must tear down.

Our economic underdevelopment is an impediment to unity that we are doing our best to overcome, but we are moving at par with you and others in our cultural and spiritual development, and we are like you in so many respects that we should almost be able to take our cultural and spiritual unity for granted.

A ONE-WAY CULTURAL FLOW

But that is not the case. We Latin Americans know you well, but you do not know us as well. For some extent, we have performed a one-way cultural flow, and our presence here tonight is to help to remedy that deficiency.

Chile is a tiny land in comparison with the United States, but for many generations it has been giving expression in song and dance, in prose and verse, in sculpture and on canvas, to a cultural heritage and evolution that is uniquely its own, yet which has a common origin in the Parthenon and Scriptures which nourish your own cultural and spiritual values.

We are a people, like yourselves, with a highly developed and jealously guarded tradition of political democracy. Like yourselves, we predicate our democracy on a profound respect for man as an individual.

We are, like yourselves, a melting pot, an amalgam of varied national and racial strains. We need go no further than the participants in this evening's program to illustrate this truth. Besides such names as Montealegre, Lopez, Ramos and Mendoza, we have Soublette, Minoletti and Stratigopoulou. The folklore group soon to arrive from Chile includes a MacKenna, a Lathrop, a Dittborn, a Sauvalle, and guest artists to appear in this series include a Bronstein and Fischer, Chileans all.

Just as the internal strength and unity of a democracy derive from unwavering respect for man as an individual, so must the strength and unity of our international community derive from respect for the individuality of each nation and people in our midst. Here is the reason for President Kennedy's call to Latin America to "contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States," and here is where we must level the wall that holds us apart in the cultural and spiritual sphere.

AN ANSWER TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CALL

We are here tonight in answer to that call. We are here to inaugurate a modest, but honest presentation of our cultural heritage and evolution.

This evening and on evenings to come you will see something of a culture that differs from your own in many ways, but which certainly will find an echo and response in your minds and hearts, for your culture and our own, each in its own way, are but expressions of our common Western inheritance.

In this venture, we have met with generous support and cooperation from many sources in this country and my own—so many, that it becomes increasingly difficult to enumerate them all. To all the organizations and individuals who gave so warmly of their material, moral and artistic support, to all who contributed to this series, who cooperated in its organization and participate in it, I give my sincerest thanks.

TWO ANNIVERSARIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the week which we are now in is the anniversary of two of the important dates in free man's struggle against the force of godless communism and I cannot let the week pass without making note of the curious celebration of these anniversaries this Nation is engaged in.

It was 7 years ago this week that the spark of freedom, smoldering so long under the hated dominance of Russia, flared into a brilliant fire in Hungary.

The people, demanding the ouster of Erno Gero, the Hungarian Communist Party secretary and the formation of a new government under the leadership of Imre Nagy, broke forth in open revolt against communism. Revolutionary councils sprung up like mushrooms across the nation while the people, armed with clubs, axes, knives, and make-shift weapons, threw themselves against the Russian battle machine and carried their fight to the brink of victory. Nagy pleaded with the United Nations for help but the cries of the Hungarian people fell on deaf ears. To its eternal shame, neither this Nation nor the Communist-dominated U.N. lifted a finger to help these freedom fighters in their quicksilver moment of victory.

The forces of the Soviet, sensitive to the fact that a people's revolt against communism was on the verge of success, rushed 200,000 troops, 2,500 tanks and armored cars into the breech.

While the free world stood mutely aside, the Soviets slaughtered gallant men and women in a day of carnage, probably without parallel in human history. Some estimates of the slaughtered and executed reached 32,000. Another 200,000 fled the city as blood ran in the streets.

On the anniversary of this event, I can only find shame in my heart as I read how the administration is celebrating this black week of history.

On the seventh anniversary of this event, a group of Soviet Communists arrived in this Nation to accept our generous offer to sell the Russians enough wheat to bolster their economy, to save them from having to admit to the world that the Communist agrarian reform has dismally failed again and to permit them to ship $33 million worth of wheat purchased from Canada to Communist Cuba.

The administration has also announced its agreement to ship great quantities of corn to the Communists as well.

It staggers the sensibilities to capsule this absurdity in this way.

In other times, when men's backbones were straighter, this consorting with the enemy would be labeled for what it is: treason.

Some weeks ago, I asked Averell Harriman, the chief negotiator of the coexistence test ban treaty if he believed the Russians had deviated in any degree from their sworn purpose of burying us. He said that anyone who thought they had changed one iota was a fool. I accept his statement and believe it is true.

Yet it seems to me that every sinew of this administration is being strained toward every possible means of assisting the Soviets in what may be the hour when communism is in its worst difficulties. Many of us have prayed for the inevitable day when the Communist system would stagger and begin its collapse. At the first sign that this day may be close at hand, the administration advocates rushing to their rescue with whatever material and cooperation is needed to keep them propped up and alive.

No matter how thin you slice this attitude, it is still "baloney."

Communism is the deadly enemy of democracy.

Russia is the committed enemy of the United States.

Khrushchev is the arch enemy of President Kennedy.

It is that simple. It is undeniable.

If there is joy in Communist-held Hungary on this seventh anniversary, it is the rejoicing of the Red commissars who have their heels ground down on the necks of freedom-loving Hungarians.

If there is joy in Cuba on the first anniversary of our confrontation with Russia over their missiles 90 miles from Florida, it is joy emanating from within the Castro government.

If there were any way I could apologize to the people of Hungary for the sorry anniversary observation we are celebrating this week, I would.

If there were any way I could express my shame to the Cuban freedom fighters for the celebration of our confrontation anniversary, I would do that, too.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during the past year I have been researching the impact of psychological, or what I more appropriately call "brainpicking," tests in American education. Parents are vitally interested in these tests which pry into parental, religious, and personal relations and beliefs of students. One of the greatest needs has been for parents to know more about the types of tests which are given and their background. In a series of addresses on this floor, I intend to detail as broad a picture as I possibly can concerning the so-called personality tests. These tests range from those which are mildly offensive and snooping to the outright inexcusable brainpicking test. They range from the established commercially published test to the teacher-prepared test in local schools.

As a setting for this work, I want to present a bibliography of the publishers of personality type tests with their frank catalog or brochure statement regarding what their tests purport to do. Often it is significant to take a good look at the self-serving statements of the publishers who brag up their tests in catalogs which are sent to guidance counselors throughout the country. Take for example, this interesting statement which appears in the catalog of Psychometric Affiliates regarding their liberalism-conservatism test: "Recommended for use in courses in the social sciences to clear up 'fuzzy' thinking about the meaning of 'liberalism.'"

As a start, I include at this point part I of the bibliography of standard American personality-type tests:

APPENDIX I—PUBLISHERS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL OR PERSONALITY-TYPE TESTS

Acorn Publishing Co., Inc., Rockville Centre, Long Island, N.Y.: 1. Life adjustment inventory, R. C. Doll.

American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

American Guidance Service, Inc., Educational Test Bureau, 720 Washington Avenue SE., Minneapolis, Minn.

The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1720 East 38th Street, Indianapolis, Ind.; also 4300 West 62d Street, Indianapolis, Ind.:

1. Detroit adjustment inventory.
2. High school personality questionnaire.
3. IPAT anxiety scale questionnaire.
4. Neuroticism scale questionnaire.
5. Sixteen personality factor questionnaire.

Martin M. Bruce Co., 71 Hanson Lane, New Rochelle, N.Y.; also 340 Oxford Road, New Rochelle, N.Y.:

1. Association adjustment inventory.
2. Test of social insight, youth edition.
3. Polyfactorial study of personality.

Bureau of Educational Measurements, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kans.:

1. Character-conduct self-rating scale (Brown).
2. Heston personal adjustment inventory.
3. Parsons social comprehension test.
4. Personality adjustment scale (Schrammel-Gorbutt).
5. The personality inventory.
6. Social comprehension test (Furbay-Schrammel).

Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio: 1. The Wishing Well.

Bureau of Educational Research and Service, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa:

1. Adjustment inventory (Bell).
2. Personality inventory.

Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

California Test Bureau, Del Monte Research Park, Monterey, Calif.; also 206 Bridge Street, New Cumberland, Pa.; also 1415 Slocum Street, Dallas, Tex.; also 916 Williamson Street, Madison, Wis.:

1. Behavior preference record.
2. Bonney-Fessenden sociograph.
3. California test of personality.
4. Johnson temperament analysis.
5. Mental health analysis.
6. S–O Rorschach test.

Center for Psychological Service, 1835 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.: 1. Social intelligence test.

Committee on Diagnostic Reading Tests, Inc., Mountain Home, N.C.

Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, Calif.:

1. Adjective check list.
2. Adjustment inventory.
3. Analysis of relationships.
4. California psychological inventory.
5. Children's hypnotic susceptibility scale.
6. Harvard group scale of hypnotic susceptibility.
7. Holland vocational preference inventory.
8. Orientation inventory.
9. Personality inventory.
10. School inventory.
11. Security-insecurity inventory.
12. Social competency scales (Cain-Levine).
13. Welsh figure preference test.

Cooperative Test Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.; also 4640 Hollywood Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

Educational Test Bureau, 720 Washington Avenue SE., Minneapolis, Minn.: 1. Vineland social maturity scale.

Educators' Employers' Tests & Services Associates, 120 Detzel Place, Cincinnati, Ohio:

1. Hildreth personality and interest inventory,
2. Child personality scale.

Family Life Publications, Inc., Post Office Box 6725, College Station, Durham, N.C.:

1. A dating problems checklist,
2. Sex knowledge inventory.

C. A. Gregory Co. (see the Bobbs-Merrill Co.).

Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., Tarrytown-on-Hudson, N.Y.; 750 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.; 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; 680 Forrest Road NE., Atlanta Ga.; 703 Browder Street, Dallas, Tex.; 1855 Rollins Road, Burlingame, Calif.

Depositories:

Georgia School Book Depository, Inc., 680 Forrest Road NE., Atlanta, Ga.

Lone Star School Book Depository, Inc., 703 Browder Street, Dallas, Tex.

J. K. Gill Co., 408 Southwest Fifth Avenue, Portland, Oreg.

John W. Graham, 708–716 First Avenue, Spokane, Wash.

New Mexico School Book Depository, Inc., Post Office Box 4128, Santa Fe, N. Mex.

1. Aspects of personality (Pintner),
2. Behavior rating schedule (Haggerty-Olson-Wickman),
3. Billett-Starr youth problems inventory,
4. Gordon personal profile and inventory,
5. Heston personal adjustment inventory,
6. KD proneness scale and checklist,
7. Rorschach method of personality diagnosis,
8. Syracuse scales of social relations,
9. Washburne social-adjustment inventory.

Houghton Mifflin Co., 432 Park Avenue, South, New York, N.Y.; 3108 Piedmont Road, NE., Atlanta, Ga.; 1900 South Batavia Avenue, Geneva, Ill.; 2 Park Street, Boston, Mass.; 715 Browder Street, Dallas, Tex.; 777 California Avenue, Palo Alto, Calif.; 1120 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.:

1. Pupil adjustment inventory (cum-file).

Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1602-4 Coronado Drive, Champaign, Ill.

1. Children's personality questionnaire,
2. Contact personality factor test,
3. High school personality questionnaire,
4. IPAT anxiety scale questionnaire,
5. IPAT 8-parallel form anxiety battery,
6. IPAT humor test of personality,
7. IPAT music preference test of personality,
8. Motivation analysis test,
9. Neuroticism scale questionnaire,
10. O-A personality test batteries—youth and adult,
11. Objective-analytic (O-A) anxiety battery,
12. School motivation analysis test,
13. Sixteen personality factor questionnaire.

Ohio scholarship tests, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio.

Personnel Press, Inc., 188 Nassau Street, Princeton, N.J.

Personnel Research Institute, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Psychological Corp., 304 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.:

1. Adjustment inventory (Bell).
2. Bender revised visual retention test.
3. Bender visual motor Gestalt test.
4. Blacky pictures.
5. Children's apperception tests.
6. Driscoll play kit.
7. Examining for aphasia.
8. Gordon personal profile and inventory.
9. Harris tests of lateral dominance.
10. Holtzman inkblot technique.
11. Make a picture story.
12. Minnesota counseling inventory.
13. Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory.
14. Mooney problem check list.
15. Picture-story test (Symonds).
16. Rotter incomplete sentences blank.
17. Thematic apperception tests (TAT).
18. Vineland social maturity scale.

Psychological Research Services, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Psychometric Affiliates, Box 1625, Chicago, Ill.:

1. Academic freedom survey.
2. American home scale.
3. Children's personality questionnaire.
4. Ego strength test.
5. Family adjustment test and/or Elias family opinion survey.
6. High school personality questionnaire.
7. Human relations inventory (Bernberg).
8. IPAT anxiety scale questionnaire.
9. IPAT music preference test of personality.
10. Power of influence test.
11. Science research temperament scale.
12. Self-interview inventory.
13. Sixteen personality factor questionnaire.
14. Speech screening test (Weidner-Fensch).
15. Tulane factors of liberalism-conservatism.

Public School Publishing Co. (see the Bobbs-Merrill Co.).

Scholastic Testing Service, Inc., 3774 West Devon Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Science Research Associates, Inc., 259 East Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.:

1. Curtis completion form.
2. Michigan picture test.
3. Personal audit.
4. SRA junior inventory-form A.
5. SRA youth inventory-form A.
6. SRA junior inventory-form S.
7. SRA youth inventory-form S.
8. Survey of interpersonal values.
9. Thurstone temperament schedule.

Sheridan Supply Co., Post Office Box 837, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Stanford University Press, (see Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.).

C. H. Stoelting Co., 424 North Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.:

1. Behavior cards—a test-interview for delinquent children.
2. Children's apperception tests.
3. Free association test (Kent-Rosanoff).
4. Personality inventory.
5. Rorschach psychodiagnostic tests.
6. Szondi tests.
7. Thematic apperception tests (TAT).
8. Twitchell-Allen three dimensional personality test.

Western Psychological Services, 12035 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.:

1. Bender visual motor gestalt test.
2. Cassel group level of aspiration test.
3. Children's apperception tests.
4. Children's personality questionnaire.
5. Drawing completion test.
6. Five task test.
7. Forer structured sentence completion tests.
8. High school personality questionnaire.
9. House-tree-person projective technique.
10. IPAT anxiety scale questionnaire.
11. IPAT humor test of personality.
12. IPAT music preference test of personality.
13. Insight test.
14. KD proneness scale and check list.
15. Leadership ability evaluation.
16. Personality evaluation form.
17. Philo-phobe projective technique.
18. Picture world test.
19. Plastic doll play family.
20. Polyfactorial study of personality.
21. Rogers test of personality adjustment.
22. Rohde sentence completion test.
23. Rorschach psychodiagnostic tests.
24. Sixteen personality factor questionnaire.
25. Symonds personality survey.
26. Szondi tests.
27. Test of social insight—youth edition.
28. Twitchell-Allen three dimensional personality test.
29. Vineland social maturity scale.

World Book Co. (see Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.).

APPENDIX II—ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF PSYCHOLOGICAL OR PERSONALITY-TYPE TESTS

ACADEMIC FREEDOM SURVEY (AFS)

Author: Academic Freedom Committee, Illinois division, American Civil Liberties Union.

Publishers and distributors: (1) Psychometric Affiliates.

Administration: Not given.

Range: Not given.

Time: Not given.

From: AFS—Psychometric Affiliates, from catalog, page 7:

"With the aid of the ACLU booklet entitled 'Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility,' a two-page test of academic freedom was constructed. It contained 12 items on rights of students, 7 on rights of teachers, and 4 general rights. Each item was answered on a three-point scale of 'Extent to which right is effectively assured—complete; as a general rule; very little or none.' Possible scores could range between 23 to 69."

THE ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST (ACL)

Author: Gough, Harrison G., University of California (Berkeley).

Publishers and distributors: (1) Consulting Psychologists Press.

Administration: Group or individual.

Range: No age limit.

Time: No time limit.

From: ACL—1. Consulting Psychologists Press, catalog, page 15:

"A standardized 300-adjective list widely used in personality assessment and psychometric research, the ACL is made available with a comprehensive manual which included descriptions of the need scales for the ACL developed by Alfred B. Heilbrun, Jr. The adjectives and the scales have proved useful in studying descriptive correlates of test scores and in reducing interview or clinical judgments to statistically manageable units. Accessories include an attractive profile sheet."

THE ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY (BELL) (TAIS)

Authors: Bell, Hugh M., Chico State College.

Publishers and distributors: (1) Consulting Psychologists Press, (2) the Psychological Corp., (3) the Bureau of Educational Research and Service.

Administration: Group or individual.

Range: Junior high through college.

Time: Usually completed in 35 minutes or less.

From: TAIS—1. Consulting Psychologists Press, catalog, page 18:

"This time-tested diagnostic aid for counselors and guidance workers has just been revised by the addition of two new scales to the four previously available. It now yields six scores: home adjustment, health adjustment, submissiveness (formerly social adjustment), emotionality (formerly emotional adjustment), hostility, and masculinity-femininity. New norms for high school and college students are included in the expanded manual. The straightforward simplicity, brevity, and ease of scoring have made the Bell a favorite for 20 years; the 1962 revision should continue this popularity. For junior high through college."

TAIS—2. The Psychological Corp., catalog, page 50:

"Aids the counselor and guidance worker in discovering the extent and sources of personal maladjustment in students and adults. The separation of adjustment into four types—home, health, social, and emotional—aids in the location of specific adjustment difficulties."

THE AMERICAN HOME SCALE (AHS)

Authors: Kerr, W. A., Purdue University; Remmers, H. H., Purdue University.

Publishers and distributors: 1. Psychometric Affiliates.

From: AHS—1. Psychometric Affiliates, catalog, page 9:

"This scale is designed to measure the cultural, esthetic, and economic environment. Construction is based on profile and factor analyses. Discriminates between sociological areas. Scores correlate .92 with scores of interviewers completing the scale during home calls. Norms are based upon over 16,000 8th grade pupils in over 42 American cities."

ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIPS (AOR)

Author: Chiselli, Edwin E., University of California (Berkeley).

Publishers and distributors: (1) Consulting Psychologists Press.

Administration: Group or individual.

Range: Nine industrial and school groups.

Time: No limit. Usually requires 30 minutes.

From: AOR—1. Consulting Psychologists Press, catalog, page 19:

"A 40-item power test of intellectual ability with a wide range of difficulty, the Analysis of Relationships test has great promise for business and industrial use as well as for schools. The test eliminates the speed factor and gives finer discriminations at the higher ability levels than older I.Q. measures used in many personnel offices. Administration and scoring are extremely simple. Preliminary manual gives tentative norms for 9 industrial and school groups, 30 different reliability and validity coefficients, data on age and sex differences. Norms on a national basis are in process of collection."

ASPECTS OF PERSONALITY (PINTNER) (AOP)

Authors: Pintner, Rudolf, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University; Loftus, John J., assistant superintendent of schools, New York City; Forlano, George, assistant in educational psychology, Teachers College, Columbia University; Alster, Benjamin, teacher, Public Schools of New York City.

Publishers and distributors: (1) Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Administration: Group or individual.

Range: Grades 4–9.

Time: Not given.

From: AOP—1. Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., catalog, page 80:

"An inventory consisting of three sections covering ascendance-submission, extroversion-introversion, and emotionality."

ASSOCIATION ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY (AAI)

Author: Bruce, Martin M.

Publishers and distributors: (1) Martin M. Bruce Co.

Administration: Not given.

Range: Not given.

Time: 10 minutes.

From: AAI—1. Martin M. Bruce Co., catalog, page 2:

"Personality test in multiple choice word association format. Approximately 10-minute administration. Provides indications of overall adjustment in terms of deviate thinking, extent of juvenile ideas, and 11 other personality traits."

BEHAVIOR CARDS: A TEST-INTERVIEW FOR DELINQUENT CHILDREN

Author: Stogdill.

Publishers and distributors: (1) C. H. Stoelting Co.

Administration: Individual.

Range: None given.

Time: None given.

From: (1) C. H. Stoelting Co., catalog, page 5:

"Subject sorts 150 cards as the statements apply to him. A measure of delinquency potential."

BEHAVIOR PREFERENCE RECORD (BPR)

Author: Wood, Hugh B., Ed. D. (Columbia), professor of education, University of Oregon; director, Curriculum Materials Laboratory; and editor, Curriculum Bulletin. Dr. Wood has had 8 years of experience as an elementary and high school teacher, principal, and superintendent in the public schools of Ohio and Colorado. He was research associate in curriculum at Teachers College, Columbia University, and held several fellowships while there. He was an instructor at St. Peters College, Jersey City, N.J., and associate professor of school administration at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, before going to Oregon in 1939. He commanded college V–12 units for the Navy during the war. He has been curriculum consultant for the public schools of Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Alabama, and Oregon. He is now curriculum consultant to the Oregon State Department of Education. Dr. Wood is coauthor of a "Checklist of 50 Crucial Social, Economic, and Political World Problems," and 3 books on curriculum. He is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Kappa Delta Pi, and the American Association of University Professors.

Publisher and distributors: (1) California Test Bureau.

Administration: Group or individual.

Range: Elementary, grades 4–6; intermediate, grades 7–9; advanced, grades 9–12.

Time: No time limit, 30–45 minutes are usually sufficient.

From: BPR—1. California Test Bureau, catalog, page 84:

"The behavior preference record is designed to: (a) provide a systematic sampling of some behavior situations related to the individual's understanding of democratic ideals, (b) elicit the individual's expressed preferences for various types of behavior, (c) discover the individual's reasons for the preferred behavior, and (d) stimulate discussion

and decisionmaking about desirable behavior. It consists of a series of problem situations, followed by three to five possible courses of action from which the student selects one. Following the choices is a list of possible reasons for a particular choice. The student marks the reason or reasons which determined his choice. Scores are obtained for the following aspects of behavior: (1) Cooperation, (2) friendliness, (3) integrity, (4) leadership, and (5) responsibility, as well as the level of critical thinking used in explaining his preferences. Discussion periods in which the relative merits of different courses of action are considered, together with the adequacy of the reasons for choosing them, are recommended."

BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULE (HOW)

Authors: Haggerty, M. E., Ph. D., dean of the College of Education, University of Minnesota; Olson, W. C., Ph. D., director of research in child development, University of Michigan; Wickman, E. K., the Commonwealth Fund, New York City.

Publishers and distributors: (1) Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Administration: Group or individual.

Range: Grades kindergarten to 12.

Time: Not given.

From: HOW—1. Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., catalog, page 78:

"Standardized scales for identification and study of the child's capacity to adjust to the demand of his environment."

BENDER REVISED VISUAL RETENTION TEST (BRVRT)

Author: Benton, Arthur.

Publishers and distributors: (1) The Psychological Corp.

Administration: Not given.

Range: Age 8 to adult.

Time: About 5 minutes.

From: BRVRT—1. The Psychological Corp., catalog, page 46:

"A standardized measure of visual memory, designed to supplement the usual mental examinations of persons suspected of abnormality or impairment. Useful also in experimental research. The 30 design cards are bound separately and cased with the manual. Examinee draws on plain paper; record form is used by examiner to record results."

BENDER VISUAL MOTOR GESTALT TEST (BENDER-GESTALT)

Author: Bender, Lauretta.

Publishers and distributors: (1) The Psychological Corp., (2) Western Psychological Services.

Administration: None given.

Range: None given.

Time: None given.

From: Bender-Gestalt—1. The Psychological Corp., catalog, page 46:

"A diagnostic and experimental technique of interest to clinicians and research workers. The subject reproduces a series of designs, his departures from the originals being interpreted in terms of the Gestalt laws of perception and organization. Studies of both children and adults are reported in the Monograph (American Orthopsychiatric Association, No. 3). The text by Pascal and Suttell includes 45 protocols for practice in scoring and 40 clinical case discussions."

BILLETT-STARR YOUTH PROBLEMS (BILLETT-STARR)

Authors: Billett, Roy O.; Starr, Irving S.

Publishers and distributors: (1) Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Administration: Group.

Range: Junior level, grades 7–9; senior level, grades 10–12.

Time: No time limit, allow about 60–75 minutes.

From: Billett-Starr—1. Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., catalog, page 74:

"An inventory of student problems in junior and senior high school. Eleven areas cover; physical health, fitness, and safety; getting alone with others; boy-girl relationships; home and family life; personal finance; interests and activities; school life; personal potentialities; planning for the future; mental-emotional health and fitness; morality and religion."

THE BLACKY PICTURES (BLACKY)

Author: Blum, Gerald S., Department of Psychology, University of Michigan.

Publishers and distributors: (1) The Psychological Corp.

Administration: Individual.

Range: 5 years old on up.

Time: Not given.

From: Blacky—1. The Psychological Corp., catalog, page 55:

"A set of 12 black-and-white cartoons designed expressly to elicit projective responses which can be sensibly interpreted in the language of modern dynamic personality theory. Although it can also be useful as a general diagnostic tool, clinicians and research workers find it especially valuable for the appraisal of the psychosexual development of individuals. The drawings picture the adventures of a dog named Blacky and Blacky's family; the use of canine characters minimizes the danger of resistance in the definitely structured situations, but does not seem to reduce projection and identification on examinee's part."

BONNEY-FESSENDEN SOCIOGRAPH (B–FS)

Authors: Bonney, Merl E., Ph. D. (Columbia), professor of psychology, North Texas State College; Fessenden, Seth A., Ph. D. (New York University) professor of education and speech, Orange County State College.

Publishers and distributors: (1) California Test Bureau.

Administration: Group.

Range: All age levels.

Time: None given.

From: B–FS—1. California Test Bureau, catalog, page 86:

"The sociograph is essentially a chart upon which sociometric data can be recorded. It consists of a manila folder, the inside of which is printed with a triangular-shaped graph that is used for recording the sociometric choices of up to 40 students. The graph is so constructed that the data can be summarized easily and quickly. Space is provided for recording the following interpretations: class characteristics, individual characteristics, and natural groups. The sociograph has been developed in response to the growing awareness that the status and lines of interpersonal relationships of members of any group are important influences toward harmony, friendliness, and democratic functioning of that group. It aids in promoting these goals and in integrating discordant or isolated members in a constructive way."

CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY (CPI)

Author: Gough, Harrison, G., Ph. D., associate professor of psychology, and associate research psychologist, Institute of Personality Assessment and Research, University California, Berkeley.

Publishers and distributors: (1) Consulting Psychologists Press.

Administration: Group or individual.

Range: Adolescence through adulthood.

Time: No limit. Normally 45 minutes to 1 hour.

From: CPI—1. Consulting Psychologists Press, catalog, pages 6 and 7:

"A 48-item true-false questionnaire for normal individuals, based on the Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory, the CPI offers a combination of features which justify its description as 'a new achievement in personality testing':

"1. It provides 18 scales measuring easily understood and socially desirable behavioral tendencies rather than esoteric and pathological characteristics. These scales fall into the following categories: (a) poise, ascendancy, and self-assurance (includes measures of dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, self-acceptance, sense of well-being); (b) socialization, maturity, and responsibility (includes measures of responsibility, socialization, self-control, tolerance, good impression, communality); (c) achievement potential and intellectual efficiency (includes measures of achievement via conformance, achievement via independence, and intellectual efficiency); (d) intellectual and interest modes (includes psychological-mindedness, flexibility, femininity).

"2. Its scales have been repeatedly cross-validated and most were empirically developed, i.e., based on the actual test responses of persons known to exhibit various kinds of effective behavior. The test contains three internal checks on the validity of responses to guard against faking.

"3. Its emphasis on universal behavioral tendencies makes it applicable from adolescence through adulthood, particularly in settings where one is interested in identifying and maximizing the positive and favorable personality assets of individuals.

"4. It provides the most complete manual ever published for a personality inventory—40 pages which contain practical advice on use and interpretation, including seven sample cases, plus summaries of extensive validity data and suggestions for further research.

"5. Norms are based on over 13,000 cases distributed through 30 States. Means and standard deviations are also given in the manual for 30 special educational, professional and other groups."

CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY (CTP)

Authors: Thorpe, Louis P., Ph. D. (Northwestern). Professor of education and psychology, University of Southern California. Also, was formerly director of the psychological clinic at University of Southern California. Dr. Thorpe has had public school experience, and taught in colleges in Michigan and Washington before going to the University of Southern California, where he offers courses and has written textbooks in the fields of personality, mental hygiene, and child development. He is a member of Phi Kappa Phi, Phi Delta Kappa, the International Mark Twain Society, and a Fellow of the American Psychological Association. He is co-author of the "Mental Health Analysis," the "Occupational Interest Inventory," and the "Musical Aptitude Test."

Clark, Willis W., Ed. D. (Southern California). Executive vice president and formerly director of research and technical services, California Test Bureau. Previously director of research and guidance for the Los Angeles city schools. Since 1922, Dr. Clark has conducted many university courses in guidance and evaluation. He is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association. He is author of numerous research studies appearing in professional literature and coauthor of the "Ingraham-Clark Diagnostic Reading Tests," "Lee-Clark Reading Readiness and Reading Tests," "Mental Health Analysis, California Test of Mental Maturity," and the "California Reading Test," "Arithmetic Test," and "Language Test."

Tiegs, Ernest, Ph. D. (Minnesota). Editor in Chief, California Test Bureau. Formerly dean of University College and professor of

education at the University of Southern California. Dr. Tiegs served for 15 years as principal and superintendent in the public schools of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota, before going to the University of Southern California where he offered courses and wrote textbooks in the fields of tests, measurements, and statistics. He is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Delta Kappa, and Phi Kappa Phi. He is co-author of the "California Reading Test," the "California Arithmetic Test," the "California Language Test," the "California Test of Mental Maturity," and the "Mental Health Analysis."

Publishers and distributors: (1) California Test Bureau.

Administration: Group or individual.

Range: Primary, kindergarten to grade 3; elementary, grades 4–8; intermediate, grades 7–10; secondary, grades 9 to college.

Time: No time limit. 40–50 minutes are usually sufficient.

From: CTP—1. California test bureau, catalog, page 87:

"This questionnaire helps to identify certain important components in personality and social development often referred to as 'intangibles'. It is designed to provide information on personal and social characteristics of individuals and groups, and to assist guidance personnel.

"By responding 'yes' or 'no' to the carefully chosen questions, students indicate how they feel, think, and act regarding a wide variety of situations which effect them as individuals or as members of groups. The instrument is divided into two sections: personal adjustment and social adjustment.

"Section 1 indicates how the student feels and thinks about himself—his self-reliance, his estimate of his own worth, his sense of personal freedom, and his feeling of belonging. Tendencies toward withdrawing and nervousness are also revealed. Section 2 consists of social adjustment components. It helps to show how the student functions as a social being, and how he feels about social standards, social skills, family, school, and community relationships."

THE CASSEL GROUP LEVEL OF ASPIRATION TEST (CGLAT)

Author: Cassel, R. N., Ed. D.

Publishers and distributors: (1) Western Psychological Services.

Administration: Not given.

Range: Not given.

Time: Not given.

From: CGLAT—1. Western Psycholgical Services, catalog, page 4:

"A new approach to measuring and evaluating global aspects of personality levels of aspiration, reality adjustments, delinquency proneness, and psychopathy. Presents many stimulating research potentialities."

CHARACTER-CONDUCT SELF-RATING SCALE (BROWN'S) (BCSS)

Author: Brown, Dr. Edwin J., Ph. D., Kansas State Teacher's College, Emporia, Kans.; professor of education, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Publishers and distributors: (1) Bureau of Educational Measurements.

Administration: Group.

Range: For students of junior and senior high schools, Boy Scouts, Girl Reserves, and similar groups.

Time: No time given.

From: BCSS—1. Bureau of Educational Measurements, catalog, page 25:

"The purpose of this scale is to secure improvement in the character and conduct of individuals through self-rating. It contains 100 carefully selected items, provides a character-conduct point score for each student, and is an excellent device for creating a desire within each individual for attaining improvement in his character and conduct."

CHILD PERSONALITY SCALE (CPS)

Author: Amatore, S. Mary.

Publishers and distributors: (1) Educators' Employers' Tests & Services Associates (ETSA Co.).

Administration: Group.

Range: Kindergarten to ninth grade.

Time: No time limit.

From: CPS—1. Educators' Employers' Tests & Services Associates, catalog, page 6:

"This scale measures the personality traits of pupils in kindergarten to ninth grade. The child can see both the strengths and weaknesses of his own character and personality. Rating may be made by teacher, parent, or pupil. By securing the rating of others, the teacher is able to secure a better all around picture of the child. Here is a valuable help to the teacher, counselor, and the child himself."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAGGONNER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. FINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARSHA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOW.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FUQUA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. HEALEY.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. HEMPHILL.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. TEAGUE of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LLOYD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NEDZI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FASCELL.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 844. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 845. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 2635. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations;

H.R. 6225. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6481. An act to permit the government of Guam to authorize a public authority to undertake urban renewal and housing activities.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1064. An act to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity; and

S. 1576. An act to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction of community mental health centers, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 28, 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:

1328. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to exempt therefrom "special Government employees" as defined in section 202(a), title 18, United States Code, 76 Stat. 1121; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1329. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to aid in the administration of the Pribilof Islands, in Alaska, by the Secretary of the Interior and to provide for the self-sufficiency of the inhabitants thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 777. An act to amend the Arms

Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7457. A bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts; with amendment (Rept. No. 864). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 554. Resolution taking H.R. 4955 from the Speaker's table and sending it to conference; without amendment (Rept. No. 865). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 555. Resolution taking H.R. 6143 from the Speaker's table and sending it to conference; without amendment (Rept. No. 866). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 556. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5838, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 867). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 551. Resolution declaring the House delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conferences to be an appropriate committee of the House of Representatives for the purpose of implementing the act of July 11, 1956 (Public Law 689, 84th Congress); without amendment (Rept. No. 868). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 552. Resolution providing for an official picture of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 869). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 8912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit an employer, in his discretion, to deduct the required withholding tax from the wages of his employees only once a month even though their regular pay periods are less than a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 8913. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 8914. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the value of a decedent's real property (or interest in real property) which was used as a ranch or farm or in some other trade or business shall be determined, for estate tax purposes, solely by reference to its value for such use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 8915. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as it relates to certain leases, licenses, or assignments of ocean terminal facilities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 8916. A bill to protect American Indians from the flooding of their lands by any department or agency of the United States before suitable provision has been made for their relocation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 8917. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8918. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as it relates to certain leases, licenses, or assignments of ocean terminal facilities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 8919. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 8920. A bill to revise the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 8921. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as it relates to certain leases, licenses, or assignments of ocean terminal facilities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8922. A bill to authorize grants to assist the States in strengthening professional nurse education, in order to relieve the shortage of well-trained professional nurses and to meet the requirements of Federal, State, and local governmental hospitals and health agencies, as well as of nongovernmental hospitals and other employers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 8923. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the Touro Synagogue; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 8924. A bill to provide for the disposition by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of certain real property acquired by the United States for the use and benefit of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 8925. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide that a disability which has been rated at or above a certain percentage for 20 or more years may not thereafter be reduced below such percentage; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 8926. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as it relates to certain leases, licenses, or assignments of ocean terminal facilities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 8927. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 8928. A bill to amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to permit the granting of free transportation to guides or guide dogs accompanying blind persons and to attendants of disabled persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 8929. A bill to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 8930. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8931. A bill for the relief of Maj. Victor R. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 8932. A bill for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 8933. A bill for the relief of Antonio La Diana and Livia La Diana, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 8934. A bill for the relief of Compton B. Thierens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 8935. A bill for the relief of Eumelia Custodia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 8936. A bill for the relief of Leonard M. Dalton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

400. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to Congress initiating legislation to require that an appropriate committee make a study of racism in nonsouthern college and university fraternities and sororities in the United States, and report same to said House as a House document; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

401. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to the Ngo family of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

402. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to initiating legislation amending the Rules of the House so that it will be out of order for a Member on the floor or in committee, to speak or hint slightingly of another Member's legal occupation before coming to Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

403. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to the use of much better grade of paper by the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on House Administration.

404. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to increasing the membership of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

405. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to a constitutional amendment relative to modification of 50-year-old laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

406. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to requesting Congress to initiate a constitutional amendment to preclude any chance of the selection of the President being taken out of the electoral colleges, or away from the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

407. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to a resolution relative to American economics and U.S. financial integrity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence Day of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on October 26 the Republic of Vietnam will celebrate the ninth anniversary of her independence. On this auspicious occasion, we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President, Ngo Dinh Diem; and His Excellency the Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, Do Vang Ly.

At the Geneva Conference in the summer of 1954 Vietnam was partitioned along the 17th parallel. At that time, Western observers gave South Vietnam almost no chance of withstanding the challenge of Communist North Vietnam. I think it is worthwhile remembering this fact at a time when our thoughts on South Vietnam are filled with doubts and apprehension.

The situation that faced South Vietnam after the Geneva Conference was filled with many difficulties. The years of war had destroyed almost all transportation and communication, and the economy of the country had come to a virtual standstill. Political power was in the grip of the armed Cao Dai and Hoa Hao religious sects, the Binh Xuyen crime syndicate, and a number of other organized groups intent upon obstructing the development of a strong government at Saigon. There was the national army, but the soldiers were demoralized by recent military defeat and the very loyalty of the army was uncertain. Another major problem was the influx of more than 800,000 destitute refugees who had abandoned all they possessed in the north and fled southward from communism. On the credit side, South Vietnam's important assets were the firm leadership of Mr. Ngo Dinh Diem, the patriotism of the Vietnamese people, and the backing of the United States.

The independence of South Vietnam was officially proclaimed on October 26, 1954, but this event did not really alter the anticipation of a Communist takeover. It was considered only a question of time before the unstable south fell into the clutches of the Communists of North Vietman. Mr. Speaker, it happens that South Vietnam will celebrate the ninth anniversary of its independence. It means that for almost a decade now the Government and people of South Vietnam have been solving many of the problems that once threatened to destroy the country. Above all, it means that they have been successfully resisting the Communist attempts at aggression and subversion. It has been a long and terrible struggle, with a heavy toll in ravaged crops, confiscated livestock, burned homes, misery and death.

Since the Communists opened their all-out attack on South Vietnam, our country has increased both military and economic assistance and has repeatedly stated its determination to help the Vietnamese defend themselves. The United States sees the Communist attempt to conquer South Vietnam as a threat to our own security, because a Communist victory there might lead many people to believe that communism is in fact the wave of the future. The defeat of South Vietnam would increase the difficulty of defending the rest of southeast Asia and place in jeopardy the independent development of all free Asian countries.

The people of South Vietnam and their government have fought bravely against Communist aggression and subversion, and they have shown the world again that it is possible to stand up to the forces of communism. There are few people in the world today who have had to fight so steadfastly to preserve their freedom and independence as those who live in South Vietnam. They deserve our admiration, and I take this opportunity to salute them on the anniversary of their country's independence.

No. 20—New Hampshire: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to tell the Members of this House a few things about gambling in the State of New Hampshire.

In 1962, $82 million was bet on New Hampshire's race tracks. This legal activity brought into the coffers of its State treasury almost $6 million in revenue.

According to the McClellan committee hearings, illegal gambling may be roughly calculated as having been slightly under $400 million last year. But New Hampshire realized that this illegal gambling was nothing but a gangster's grab-bag. So it acted—wisely and courageously.

I have no doubt that the New Hampshire lottery, to become operative next March, will flourish as an example of financial and social realism. The vast revenues now buoying the underworld will be significantly diverted into public coffers, to the benefit of the people rather than a select coterie of crime bosses.

New Hampshire has sensibly recognized that gambling must be controlled as it cannot be eradicated. Human nature cannot be molded to fit bluenose dreams. If New Hampshire's commonsense can be contagious, it will spell out the end of gambling as a major form of criminal sustenance, for gambling must be outlawed to be a fruitful source of government revenues.

I am certain that the New Hampshire congressional delegation is fully cognizant of the many ways in which their State lotterly will benefit the State. I hope they will join in seeking to give the wisdom of their State national scope by supporting my fight for the establishment of a national lottery.

My hat is off to New Hampshire for taking the necessary action to change their State from a gamblers' paradise to the people's haven.

Educational Rhythmics for Mentally Handicapped Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, any dedicated effort to improve the lot and increase the happiness of our mentally retarded children deserves the hearty support of this body.

I have been impressed with the inspiring efforts of Ferris and Jennet Robins on behalf of these unfortunate children. Mr. and Mrs. Robins were saved during the evacuation of Dunkirk. Subsequently they came to this country and spent 22 months entertaining our servicemen for the USO. Later they became American citizens. Much of their wartime work was in military hospitals, and they were startled at the impact of certain music and dance rhythms on the mentally disturbed.

From this discovery evolved the Robins special "schools of movement," which have pioneered what has become known as "educational rhythmics" for mentally retarded children. Through the use of carefully selected music and an adaptation of classical ballet techniques and syncopated rhythms, they have created a series of imaginative body movements that come naturally to the retarded child.

They learn to tie their shoes, walk up and down stairs, brush their teeth, and perform many tasks normally beyond their capacity. The story of the success of the Robins has spread, and has created a demand for wider dissemination of their unique and beneficial methods.

The outcome has been the preparation and publication of a stirring book entitled "Educational Rhythmics for Mentally Handicapped Children," a book

designed to help the parent, the teacher, and anyone else working with these children.

One of the most touching sections is devoted to 100 unposed photographs of children reacting to the Robins method. It is exciting to see photographically how the music and movements appeal to the child's natural urge to imitate and play. The pictures again and again emphasize the actual beauty of a retarded child in its joy of movement—just where beauty is least expected. The enlightenment and happiness, the satisfaction of achievement, shows in each face.

Gentlemen, this book is a distinguished volume and a landmark in the unending battle on behalf of the handicapped child. It can do untold good. I am pleased to report that it is being placed on the shelves of the Library of Congress.

B'nai B'rith: 120th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, B'nai B'rith, the first national service organization to be founded in the United States is now marking its 120th year.

This celebration with its Biblical connotations—120 years being the lifespan of Moses—underscores B'nai B'rith's devotion to perpetuating the traditional moral values that underlie our Judeo-Christian heritage.

From its earliest days, B'nai B'rith has undertaken works of philanthropy, community service, and youth education. In the latter field, it met an urgent need by sponsoring the Hillel Foundations which provide religious and cultural centers for Jewish students on 247 campuses.

B'nai B'rith's work in the field of human relations and civil liberties is well known. Its Anti-Defamation League, founded in 1913, has pioneered to eliminate discrimination in employment, housing, and the like, and to promote intergroup harmony.

B'nai B'rith organized the first disaster relief for the victims of the Baltimore flood of 1868. It established a free employment bureau in Chicago, and manual and technical schools in Philadelphia and New Orleans, mobilized relief drives for victims in the Chicago fire and the San Francisco quake. During the Civil War, B'nai B'rith conducted a recruitment drive of its own, outfitted a Jewish company and cared for the families of the company's soldiers. B'nai B'rith began with a contribution of $60, and today it is a great service organization which spends millions in programs for youth activities, education, social work, and vocational training.

Of great significance is the fact that these accomplishments are the work of a widespread voluntary organization. Such a group has the imagination, flexibility, and vitality to adjust old causes to new needs. Our democratic society flourishes when civic and charitable work is carried on through service groups like B'nai B'rith. B'nai B'rith has rendered valuable service not only to the Jewish community, but to our entire Nation.

I salute B'nai B'rith as it celebrates its 120th anniversary this month.

Czechoslovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, October 28 marks the beginning of a most glorious period in the modern history of the Czechoslovak people. Forty-five years ago on that day the Czechoslovak National Council in Prague proclaimed the independence of the Czechs and Slovaks and the establishment of the Republic of Czechoslovakia. That historic event marked the culmination of the centuries-old struggle which these sturdy and stouthearted people carried on against the overlords of their historic homeland. This national goal was attained as the result of ceaseless determination to work for its realization and also partly as the result of devoted, wise, and persevering leaders headed by the late great Thomas Masaryk.

The rebirth of the Czechoslovak Republic soon after the First World War also highlighted most startling revolutionary changes in the heart of Europe. The polyglot Austrian empire was shattered; imperial Germany was no more, and at the time there seemed to be no danger from any direction to freedom and peace in this part of Europe. The Czechoslovak people took full advantage of this auspicious circumstance, and with the aid of their friends abroad, in a relatively short time they succeeded not only in rebuilding their wartorn country, but made it a model democracy in central Europe where peace and freedom reigned. The country's economy was put on a sound basis, politically its stability seemed assured, and it became a prosperous, progressive state. But this happy state of affairs did not last long; Czechoslovaks enjoyed their hard-won freedom for only 2 decades, for the catastrophic events beginning in 1938 proved most disastrous to them. First, their country was dismembered, then they were robbed of their freedom, and with the beginning of the last war their fate was in the hands of ruthless Nazis. And we all know what has been their lot since the end of the war, especially since 1948, when they were forced to submit to Communist totalitarianism.

Throughout their long and turbulent history these people had not lost sight of their national goal, and they attained it in 1918. So today, even when suffering under an implacable and unrelenting totalitarianism, they are not downhearted, they are not in despair, but are confidently looking forward to the day when the chains which now hold them in check will be shattered and they will once more regain their freedom. I say this confidently because I have known many of these fine and hardworking people in my own State in California, especially in San Francisco where they have domiciled for generations and where they have proved themselves a real and indispensable asset to our community as loyal, industrious, patriotic, and gallant citizens of this great Republic. On the 45th anniversary of the Czechoslovak Independence Day, I join hands with these Americans of Czechoslovak descent and solemnly observe the anniversary of that historic event.

H.R. 333, a Bill To Lift Antitrust Immunities From Labor Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a good deal of mail lately concerning H.R. 333, a bill which amends the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Norris-La Guardia Act, and Taft-Hartley Act so as to lift antitrust immunities from labor organizations. By far the great majority of these letters have been in support of this bill. Yet I have received other letters which condemn this bill and similar attempts to curb union monopoly power. These letters reveal certain misconceptions about the nature and effect of my bill.

First of all, my bill would not eliminate health and welfare benefits or pension plans. International unions and brotherhoods could continue to administer such plans, providing, of course, that these benefits could not be withheld as a lever to regain control of collective bargaining activities. If the large national and international unions did not see fit to continue these benefit and pension plans, they could be taken over and administered by the local unions on the basis of contributions received from local members. All benefit, pension, and strike funds must come ultimately from the local union member anyway, and if these contributions went no further than the local union, there is less likelihood that they would be diverted to pay for marble palaces in Washington and black Cadillacs for union leaders.

By the same token, sick leave pay, vacation pay, and overtime pay would not be eliminated. These and other issues would be negotiated by the unions with each individual company, neither having an unfair advantage in size or power over the other.

It is further charged that H.R. 333 would destroy craft unions, replacing

them by industrial unions. This is not true. The Landrum-Griffin Act specifically states:

It shall not be an unfair labor practice under subsections (a) and (b) of this section for an employer engaged primarily in the building and construction industry to make an agreement covering employees engaged (or who, upon their employment, will be engaged) in the building and construction industry with a labor organization of which building and construction employees are members.

My bill does not amend the Landrum-Griffin Act, and, as a consequence, bargaining in the construction industry is not affected by H.R. 333.

These and similar attacks on my bill are merely attempts to divert attention from the central problem—the overweening power of big unions. They are red herrings drawn across the path of rational examination—see the "International Teamster," January 1963, page 25.

Union leaders, of course, deny that their power is excessive. They point to such large corporations as A. T. & T., which has net assets in excess of $24 billion, or Standard Oil of New Jersey, with $10.5 billion in assets, or General Motors, with $8.8 billion. In comparison, they say, all unions, national, international, and local, had combined net assets of only $1.3 billion—1960 figures.

Furthermore, they argue, only a third of the nonagricultural work force is unionized—unions being not yet significant in retail and wholesale trade, services, Government employment, finance, and the white-collar occupations generally.

On the surface, these are plausible arguments, yet, in a sense, cash assets and membership rolls are irrelevant to the issue of union power. A comparison of union financial assets with those of the giant corporations obscures differences in basic character and purpose. The function of the labor union is merely to represent workers at the scene of their employment and negotiate labor contracts acceptable to a reliably determined majority of them. A corporation, on the other hand, must invest in productive facilities costing billions of dollars to erect, and equip, millions of dollars a year to maintain and improve and replenish—an investment representing billions of dollars of built-in risk that must hold itself together through competitive sales and pay its taxes and expand its plants and refine its methods and pursue all manner of research in order to serve the public, its only source of revenue and perhaps eventual reward—see Maurice R. Franks, "What's Wrong With Our Labor Unions?" The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., New York, 1963, pages 117–118.

Union strength, then, is strategic rather than quantitative. Union membership is concentrated in key industries: steel, coal, automobiles, construction, public utilities, communications, and transportation; and the power of such unions to disrupt the orderly processes of the economy and to damage the general welfare in the pursuit of their objectives is as awesome as these numbers suggest. The economic power of even the largest business organizations, subject as they are to a variety of legal and economic restraints, is as nothing compared to the power of the great international unions.

Unionism's power derives from the fact that the economy of the United States is a highly differentiated, complex, and interdependent system in which the cessation of only one activity or the breaking of only one link in the chain of production and distribution—if the interrupted function be a crucial one—can put a substantial part of the economy out of commission, if not paralyze it completely. Significantly, unions have succeeded in establishing control over just such crucial points in the economy. Moreover, the union rule that picket lines are not to be crossed, regardless of the merits of a particular strike, places strategic power in the hands of even the smallest union.

It is needful to point out at the same time that the strike itself, justified or unjustified, by no means represents the major harm that unions can inflict on society. It is the settlement which follows the strike, or even the settlement reached in lieu of a strike which may impose the harshest burden on society at large. Strikes end, their disruptions are temporary if severe, but the settlements which follow them may cause permanent distortions in factor and product markets yielding chronic unemployment, diminished rates of private investment and thus of growth, lessened international competitiveness and balance-of-payments problems. The occurrence of any one of these developments, and a fortiori where several are taking place simultaneously, diminishes the social dividend and contracts the economic alternatives open to producers and consumers. In sum, the community suffers a reduction both in its material welfare and in freedom.—Patrick M. Boarman, Union Monopolies and Antitrust Restraints, Labor Policy Association, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1963, pages 10–11.

Unrestrained union power, then, has an adverse effect upon the economy. What effect does it have on the individual union member?

With nationwide master contracts negotiated by the national union officers directly with their national counterparts in the corporation, it is clear that local unions in most mass-industry organizations no longer do their own bargaining on major issues. There is thus a widening gap between the rank-and-file member and the collective-bargaining process. He no longer has any significant control over the men who negotiate his wages, hours of work, and working conditions. Just as the corporation has had the effect of depriving ownership of decision-making, so big unions deprive the rank-and-file of similar privileges. My bill would correct this by providing that no union could represent employees of more than one company for purposes of collective bargaining.

H.R. 333 is not an attempt to put unions in an inferior position vis-a-vis management. It merely seeks to restore the balance which outmoded laws have tipped in favor of big unions.

Our Government prosecutes as a monopoly the A. & P., whose stores handle about 6 percent of the Nation's food supply, which must keep its prices competitive with those of tens of thousands of other stores, and which is without power to make anyone go hungry.

Yet, the Government does nothing, and it can do nothing, about the Teamsters Union, whose members handle not a small fraction of the Nation's food supply but virtually all of it; which can, without fear of substantial competition, raise the cost of food almost at will, and which has the power to shut off our entire food supply and make us all go hungry.

Clothing manufacturers may not lawfully conspire together concerning their dealings with suppliers—that is, contractors—or to fix their own selling prices on the basis of uniform labor costs, but they may lawfully conspire with a union to fix their suppliers' principal charges, to determine with what suppliers each will do business and what suppliers can do business at all, and to price their own products according to uniform, arbitrary, and even fictitious labor costs. And they do just that.

If any combination of soft-coal operators had the power to reduce the output of coal or to stop it for even a few days in order to raise prices or keep them high, the Government could enjoin them and prosecute them, even though they never used the power, and it doubtless would. If they used the power, their victims could sue for triple damages. But the Mine Workers Union may reduce output or stop it altogether. No one can move against them under the antitrust laws or under any other law for having the power. And, even when they use the power, only the Government can move against them, and it only when they have brought us to the brink of a national catastrophe.

Steel companies may not lawfully conspire together to fix suppliers' costs or prices, or their own costs or prices, or their customers' costs and prices. But James MacDonald, a labor monopolist, for reasons of internal union politics or interunion rivalry, and no other, may regulate labor costs in the iron mines, in the steel mills, and in hundreds of shops in scores of industries that use steel; and in the process he may close all the mines, all the mills, and all the shops, paralyze our economy, and force the Government to meet his terms.

Businessmen may not conspire together to put a competitor out of business, or to raise his prices, or to limit the territory in which he will sell his goods, or to exclude his goods from the market, or to use wasteful, expensive methods and techniques, or to block progress, but they may, through a labor union, do indirectly what the law forbids them to do themselves, notwithstanding that the adverse effects upon the public are the same in one case as in the other.

These oddities and others like them in our laws present one of our most important and most pressing problems if our system of free enterprise and our system of free collective bargaining are to survive. My bill, H.R. 333, represents, I think, the best approach to a solution of these problems. Such an approach has been supported by thinking people for many years. As long ago as 1950, Gustav Peck, senior specialist in labor for the Legislative Reference Service, concluded his report to Congress on "The Application of Antitrust Laws to Labor Practices Harmful to Market Competition" in the following way:

In consequence, it would appear from this perspective that inclusion of restrictive labor practices within the scope of jurisdiction of the antitrust laws would not encroach upon labor organization and bargaining any more than upon corporate organization and bargaining in the productive process, but would prevent the monopolization of commerce, the exclusive control of supply of commodities, or the use of unreasonable restrictions upon the market. The public interest as defined in the antitrust laws would then include both industry and labor to the end that genuine competition in the market for production should prevail. (Hearings, U.S. Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, "To Protect Trade and Commerce Against Unreasonable Restraints by Labor Organizations", Feb.-Mar. 1950, p. 16.)

I believe it is time we acted.

Tweter: The New Sweater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, some months ago, with the wonderful assistance of the Small Business Administration, we of my district were proud to welcome into York County the Huntley Knitting Mills. The mill now employs over 400 people and the citizens of York and the surrounding community are most happy to have the industry there and have welcomed the personnel and the new shot in the arm that this concern has given to the economy of York and the area.

Now, Huntley Knitting Mills have presented to the sports-loving population a new, exciting, and revolutionary sweater, called the Tweter. It is made of 100 percent Orlon acrylic in big, bold stripes, and I quote from a recent advertisement which is most attractive:

Destination: Any place that's wild and wonderful. The latest rage of the student body. An absolute discourager to winter winds in the grandstand * * * cozy "togetherness" on an evening's walk. Get hep and "in step" with the season with a genuine collegiate Tweter.

I salute Huntley Knitting Mills and its bright new innovation in casual wear. I am proud to represent a district in which the industrial effort is always forward.

I wish for Huntley Knitting Mills every success in this and other innovations.

Representative Edna F. Kelly, of New York, Successfully Opposes Effort in United Nations Committee To Open League of Nations Treaties to Accession by Red China and Other Non-U.N. States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from New York, Congresswoman EDNA F. KELLY, long recognized as one of the outstanding experts in the Congress in the field of foreign policy and international affairs, has further distinguished herself and brought honor upon this House by her success in presenting the U.S. position in a highly controversial issue in the United Nations' Sixth, or Legal, Committee.

Mrs. KELLY—one of the few Members of the House of Representatives ever accorded such responsibility—was chosen by President Kennedy to serve this fall on the U.S. delegation to the 18th United Nations General Assembly. As a ranking member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and as chairman of its Subcommittee on Europe, Mrs. KELLY brought to this assignment a fine grasp of the complexities of international affairs and an ability we have all seen demonstrated many, many times, in cutting through the window-dressing language to get to the key points of an issue.

She has now proved that this ability to push aside the nonessential elements to get to the heart of a controversy can be put to very good use in behalf of her country in the deliberations of the United Nations as well as in the Congress.

The Sixth, or Legal, Committee of the U.N., on which Mrs. KELLY has been representing the United States, handles questions relating to international law, treaties, conventions, and other international agreements. In addition, she has been handling before other committees of the U.N. General Assembly items dealing with atomic radiation, outer space, and enlargement of U.N. bodies, among others.

AMENDMENT VOTED DOWN 42 TO 38

The issue on which Mrs. KELLY successfully led a fight to uphold the U.S. position, over strong opposition from the Communist bloc and others, arose in connection with the proposed opening for participation by new nations of some of the old League of Nations treaties still in effect and serving a useful purpose, such as the one on counterfeiting. An amendment was offered to permit accession by any state. This, as Mrs. KELLY ably pointed out in a speech in the Committee on October 18, would have included not only those new countries which are members of the United Nations, but Red China and East Germany, or other non-U.N. states.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I am submitting the text of the remarks made by Congresswoman KELLY on this highly controversial issue. But first, I want to add that Mrs. KELLY's fight on behalf of our country to prevent Red China and East Germany to come into treaty relationships with the United States and other free nations through this subterfuge resulted in victory. The vote on the proposal was 42 to 38, in our favor with 10 abstentions. And yesterday, a new formula was adopted under which no non-U.N. state could accede to any League of Nations treaty without the approval of the General Assembly. All of us, I am sure, are proud of the manner in which Mrs. KELLY represented our Nation in this important matter, and thus I am sure there will be widespread interest here in reading the text of her U.N. address, as follows:

STATEMENT BY EDNA F. KELLY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN THE LEGAL (SIXTH) COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON THE QUESTION OF EXTENDED PARTICIPATION IN GENERAL MULTILATERAL TREATIES CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, OCTOBER 18, 1963

Mr. Chairman, as chapter 3 of the report of the International Law Commission indicates, an examination of the substance and utility of open-ended multilateral treaties concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations is needed. Such an examination should determine which treaties are still in force and hold interest for states and what action may be necessary to adapt them to contemporary conditions. Draft Resolution L. 532 wisely calls for such a study but does not, in the meantime, delay opening for extended participation the multilateral treaties involved. Certain of the treaties, especially the Convention and Optional Protocol for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, may be of immediate interest to states and should be opened for accession. As indicated by Interpol and as proved by recent accession by the United Kingdom, the treaties concerning counterfeiting remain useful and contemporary.

Perhaps there are other multilateral treaties concluded under the auspices of the League which are not, however, of interest to states or which are useful only if adapted to modern circumstances. The procedures set forth in the nine-power draft resolution is a simple and expeditious method of determining the usefulness and adaptability of such treaties. If they are no longer useful, no further action is necessary. If, on the other hand, certain of the treaties are currently outdated but are adaptable to contemporary circumstances by substantive amendments the protocol of amendment procedure suggests itself. In accordance with Resolution 24(I), the General Assembly, between 1946 and 1953, approved seven protocols which made necessary amendments of substance and replaced old participation clauses with clauses opening them to accession by new nations.

A substantive examination of the treaties should not, however, delay extended partici-

pation if certain states wish to accede immediately. The treaties should be opened to accession now. As the International Law Commission points out in its report, the original parties to such treaties intended them to be open for accession. The procedure for extended participation proposed in the nine-power draft resolution provides a simplified and efficient method of achieving the object of extending participation in useful treaties.

Such a procedure is not, in the view of the U.S. delegation, open to objection. The parties, by voting for the resolution, may consent to opening such treaties for extended participation. As stated before, the participation clauses of the treaties indicate an intention to make them open ended. What is involved is a simple adaptation of the participation clauses to the fact that the League of Nations has been succeeded by the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, let me turn now to the two amendments L. 533 and L. 534. The United States regrets that a highly controversial political issue has been injected into the consideration of extended participation in multilateral treaties.

The amendment proposed by Ghana and others, contained in document L. 533, would request the Secretary General to invite "any state" not otherwise eligible to become a party to these treaties to accede thereto by depositing an instrument of accession with the Secretary General. On the other hand, the amendment tabled by Australia, Greece, and Guatemala, in document L. 534, would request the Secretary General to invite "each state member of the United Nations or of a specialized agency" to accede to the conventions. The United States strongly supports this latter amendment and hopes that the members of this Committee will vote in favor of it.

The Under Secretary, Mr. Stavropoulos, has previously explained to the Committee the extremely difficult position in which the adoption of an "all states" formula would place the Secretary General. As Mr. Stavropoulos has pointed out, unless the Secretary General is given precise directions by the Assembly, he would be put in the untenable situation of having to decide which entities that are not United Nations members should be invited to become parties to these treaties. Let me illustrate his difficulty by an example which is less embarrassing to those in this room than others I could cite. Suppose we had adopted this resolution a year ago. Would the Secretary General have been obliged to communicate it to Katanga? I could multiply examples. But what I have said demonstrates that the amendment of Ghana would impose upon the Secretary General the making of a political decision of a highly controversial and acutely embarrassing nature. The Secretary General quite rightly wishes to avoid this political function. If the supporters of the amendment proposed in document L. 533 really would like to spend some weeks discussing which entities, not members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies, are states, then they should say so. Otherwise, they should withdraw their amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this highly charged political issue cannot be decided by the Secretary General. It cannot be decided by the Sixth Committee. The Sixth Committee has no competence to determine, or business in attempting to determine that, for example, the so-called Peoples' Republic of Korea is a state. This is no more a question for the Legal Committee than for the Secretary General.

Every year, since the beginning of the United Nations, there have been proposals that all states should be invited to adhere to United Nations treaties or to participate in United Nations conferences. No such proposal has ever been accepted. The General Assembly has uniformly followed the principle that United Nations treaties and United Nations conferences are open to participation only by members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

We should follow that principle in the case now before us. The purpose of the nine-power draft resolution contained in document L. 532 is to welcome participation in League of Nations treaties by the great number of new states which have achieved their independence since the demise of the League. Those new states are virtually all members of the United Nations. They are participating here in the work of the General Assembly and in the work of our Committee. The amendment of Australia, Greece, and Guatemala will make possible their participation in these treaties if they desire to participate.

On the other hand, we doubt that the draft resolution, if amended as Ghana and others propose, would be acceptable to many of the members of the League who are represented here—and whose assent to this resolution is necessary, as stated in operative paragraph 2 of the resolution. We believe that most of these former members of the League would not be willing to accept this resolution if it implied that, whether they like it or not, they would be required to enter into treaty relations with entities which they do not recognize as states. Adoption of the all states formula would thus destroy the chance of implementing the underlying resolution. Indeed, adoption of the all states formula would effectively negate the possibility of participation by any of the newer states members of this organization, and our consideration of this agenda item would have been fruitless.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we urge the members of this Committee to vote against amendment L. 533 and to vote in favor of amendment L. 534.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Market News Service Problems Solved by Secretary Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks a number of my colleagues have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials and news stories warning of dangers in the Agriculture Department's expansion of the Federal-State Market News Service. As a member of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, I looked into this matter and I am happy to report that Secretary Orville Freeman has agreed to solve the three problems which the press has been highlighting.

Last August Secretary Freeman announced that farm market information which the Department collects will be directly available to anyone who wishes to lease facilities from the telephone service. In announcing the new service, Secretary Freeman said the Department must reserve the right to cancel the service to any subscriber who misused it. This raised the fear of censorship if the Department could cancel the service as retaliation against a newspaper or farm organization which happened to disagree with the Department on some political issue. Because the announcement of the new service stated that various U.S. Department of Agriculture news releases also would be sent on the market news wire, a number of newspapers warned that Government press releases sent over the new system would make it a propaganda function instead of an information service. Others warned that the Agriculture Department would be in competition with some private organizations which now pick up the Department's market information, edit it, add other facts, and wire the information to private subscribers.

I am happy to report that Secretary Freeman has agreed to solve each of these three problems. He explained that the right of cancellation was necessary to prevent speculators who subscribed to the news service from adding false market quotations as part of the Federal report. Secretary Freeman has now agreed to surround this right of cancellation with safeguards to prevent its use as a tool of censorship. Before any action will be taken, he said, a subscriber facing cancellation will be able to file a written statement or have a hearing on the proposed action. The proposed findings will be issued and the subscriber will have 20 days to file an answer before any ruling could be issued. Even after that, Secretary Freeman said, the subscriber facing cancellation would have his day in court, for the Department's action will be subject to judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act.

On the question of the new market news service becoming a Government news agency, Secretary Freeman said that the various U.S. Department of Agriculture news releases will only be market quotations on purchases of commodities for the school lunch and surplus food distribution programs. On the question of competition with private organizations which now disseminate farm market information, Secretary Freeman agreed that the new system will not provide specialized service which now can be purchased from private organizations. These organizations identify various products and producers, thus making it possible for persons using the services to have more detailed information on farm market facilities. Secretary Freeman said the new Agriculture Department service will not identify producers or products, but will only carry the standard market quotations which are now available in Washington and at other Agriculture Department offices throughout the Nation.

I am confident the results which I am able to report to you would not have been possible unless the Nation's press had highlighted the situation. These developments prove once again the necessity for a free press able to analyze

and criticize the Government and for a continuing fight for the people's right to know the facts of government.

Following is Secretary Freeman's letter spelling out the conditions under which the news service will operate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 22, 1963.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: This is in further reply to your letters of August 22 and September 24 enclosing editorials on the expanded use of the Federal-State market news leased wire system.

As you know, the arrangement for individual use of the leased wire circuits was requested by agriculture producers and distributors who make extensive use of market information. The Department acted only after discussions with the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee and after a request for public comments which resulted in overwhelming approval of the plan for expanded use of the existing leased wire system.

The editorials commented on whether the Department's authority to cancel the Market News Service could be used as a device for censorship. I can assure you that safeguards surrounding the Department's authority for cancellation make this impossible.

The Department must reserve the right to cancel service to an individual solely as a safeguard against false reports being issued which are identified as official Federal-State market news quotations. This administrative remedy is needed because there is no Federal statute which prohibits the false or fraudulent use of Federal-State market news reports. For example, in our opinion, intermingling data from various sources and ascribing them entirely to the Federal-State Market News Service, if practiced by a subscriber, should be stopped or the service should be canceled in order to protect the interests of producers and marketers who rely on the integrity and authenticity of official Federal-State reports.

An agreement in effect for several years between the Department and the PAM News Corp. which distributes market news to private subscribers, requires the corporation to separate the Department's official market reports from other market information. This agreement also reserves the right of cancellation.

In the unlikely event that it became necessary to exercise the Department's authority to cancel service under the market news leased wire system, the Department would follow the established procedure for withdrawal of voluntary fee services, such as inspection and grading, which are also provided under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946. The procedure gives the respondent the opportunity to file a written statement—or, if he wishes, have an oral hearing—to show cause why the service should not be withdrawn. Next, the respondent must be served with a proposed suspension order including tentative findings and conclusions, specifying the suspension period and providing 20 days to file exceptions. Only after ruling on the exceptions can the Agriculture Marketing Service issue a formal suspension order for the specified period.

This procedure, set forth in the Department's AMS Instruction 910-1, provides administrative safeguards against any abuse of the authority for cancellation. In addition to the internal procedure the Department would follow if cancellation were necessary, the action is subject to judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act. This act provides, among other things, that the reviewing court shall decide all relevant questions of law and shall set aside any agency actions found to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, contrary to constitutional right, or for other specified reasons.

The editorials pointed out that the Department's announcement of the expanded Market News Service stated it would carry various U.S. Department of Agriculture news releases of importance to marketers. No general press releases or U.S. Department of Agriculture policy statements are carried on the leased wire circuits. We occasionally send administrative instructions during idle circuit time. The releases of importance to marketers refers to announcements giving the quantities and prices of commodities purchased for the school lunch or food distribution programs. Such information is carried as part of our market news program because they have at times a direct bearing on the market for the particular commodity.

The editorials commented on whether the expanded Market News Service will include identification of specific producers, thus competing with any private market information service. The dissemination of such information is prohibited by Department regulations, and it could not be made available under the new system. Section 536b (5) and (9) of title I of the Department's regulations prohibit publication of—

"(5) Information and reports furnished by dealers, manufacturers, associations, or others covering quantities of commodities processed, purchased, or sold during prescribed periods and the prices paid or received therefor."

* * * * *

"(9) Information furnished voluntarily by individuals or firms, relating to their farm or business operations, for use in making statistical analyses as a foundation for official estimates and reports."

I hope this has provided the information which the subcommittee desires. If you have further questions, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

The Death of the President of the Ogden, Utah, Branch of the NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, a leader from Utah in the civil rights movement has been killed while carrying out his public responsibility. His death occurred on October 18.

Detective Sgt. Marshall N. White, an 18-year veteran with the Ogden Police Department, was shot and killed while searching a home for a prowler.

Mr. White was President of the Ogden branch of the NAACP.

His life and death reflect the dual demands of American citizenship for individual rights and responsibility. Rights without responsibility is anarchy; responsibility without rights is tyranny. Mr. White gave full devotion to both.

Mr. White's life was taken while he was in the service of his fellow citizens, preserving law and order so that men and women living in freedom would be safe in their pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness.

His life added merit to the causes to which he dedicated himself.

Ohio Electric Co. and Rural Electric Cooperatives Join in New Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Ohio Power Co. and the rural electric cooperatives of Ohio are joining in a new generating project that will provide hundreds of additional jobs in our coal industry as well as the inexpensive electric power needed for continued development and expansion of Ohio industry.

The Ohio Power Co., and Buckeye Power, Inc., the latter a subsidiary of Ohio's rural electric cooperatives, will build a jointly owned, major electric powerplant.

The steam-electric station will have an initial generating capacity of 1,230,000 kilowatts and an ultimate capacity of 2 million kilowatts. Even initially, the plant would be the largest in Ohio and require an investment estimated at $125 million.

The new station will be named the Cardinal plant after the State bird of Ohio. It will be built on the Ohio River adjacent to Ohio Power's existing Tidd plant, at Brilliant, south of Steubenville.

Construction is expected to start immediately, with ground breaking to take place next Monday, and initial operation is scheduled for mid-1966. The plant will be operated entirely independently by a new corporation to be formed and jointly owned by the Buckeye group and Ohio Power.

The announcement was made jointly by Owen T. Manning, president of Buckeye Power, of Columbus, and Donald C. Cook, president of American Electric Power Co. and of Ohio Power, of Canton, in a press conference here attended by Governor James A. Rhodes. Ohio Power is one of six operating electric utilities in the seven-State American Electric Power System.

The announcement by Manning and Cook said:

> Because it encompasses new concepts in the electric utility industry, not only in its engineering and design but in the fact that here, for the first time, a major electric generating facility will be jointly owned by an investor-owned utility and member-owned electric cooperatives and financed entirely by funds obtained from the private money market. Also, plans call for the plant to be tied in to the transmission systems of six of the State's principal utilities, which will transmit, under contract, the cooperatives' portion of its power generation to the co-ops' transmission systems, substations, and load centers.

These utilities, in addition to Ohio Power, are: the Cincinnati Gas & Elec-

tric Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., the Dayton Power & Light Co., the Toledo Edison Co., and the Marietta Electric Co.

Virtually all of the bulk power supply needs of Ohio's co-ops today are purchased from the State's investor-owned utilities. This supply would be taken over by Buckeye Power sometime after completion of Buckeye's new plant facilities.

Howard Cummins, Buckeye general manager, emphasized that the co-op's investment in the Cardinal plant, through Buckeye power, is being financed by private sources, since their equity and net worth are now sufficient to attract private capital. The 30 co-ops in Buckeye Power serve about 135,000 electric customers in 74 of Ohio's 88 counties, according to Cummins.

Announcement of Ohio Power's proposal to the co-ops for their joint ownership and operation of a major plant was made in late 1962 and has been under study since then.

According to A. N. Prentice, vice president and general manager of Ohio Power, the new Cardinal plant will burn an estimated 3 million tons of coal or more per year in its initial two units. Virtually all of it will come from mines in eastern Ohio and the Wheeling Panhandle area of West Virginia, Prentice said, adding that this fact alone would "provide a tremendous economic impact" on the two-State area.

This supply of coal, Prentice estimated, would require the employment of approximately 500 miners, in addition to scores of other workers in the transportation and allied fields. He added that 3 million tons of coal were the equivalent of a 40,000-car railroad train extending 300 miles—or the distance between the Cardinal plant and Indianapolis.

The studies, planning, design, and negotiations for the new plant have been actively underway for close to 2 years, under the direction of Philip Sporn, retired president of American Electric Power and Ohio Power and now chairman of the AEP System Development Committee.

In discussing the new plant, Sporn described it as representing an entirely new stage of development in the history of power generation technology. It will be ultramodern in concept and design and will initially house two 615,000 kilowatt turbine-generator units, which in themselves will further advance the frontiers of the generating art. Each unit will be of tandem design, with all sections of its turbine—the high-, intermediate-, and low-pressure elements—as well as the generator, all revolving on the same single shaft 200 feet long. They will be the largest single-shaft turbine-generator units in the world. The electrical generators themselves will also be the world's largest and will be water cooled.

The units will operate under steam conditions of 3,500 pounds per square inch pressure and a temperature of 1,000° F., with double reheat temperatures of 1,025° and 1,050°.

When in operation, Cardinal is expected to achieve a new low in steam-electric production costs, brought about by a combination of the units' anticipated generating efficiency and the entire plant's projected capital investment cost of about $100 per kilowatt of capacity. At 1,230,000 kilowatts, Cardinal will be Ohio's largest power station—with a capacity about 15 percent greater than that of the present largest plant, the Ohio Valley Electric Corp.'s huge Kyger Creek plant at Cheshire, also on the Ohio River.

The new plant will be complete in itself but will be located only several hundred feet south of Ohio Power's 220,000-kilowatt Tidd plant. The location, on the west bank of the Ohio, until recently was the site of the AEP system's 500,000-volt Tidd transmission test project, where high-voltage research was carried out during the period 1947–52 to pave the way for many of the Nation's major transmission lines of today.

The plant will be interconnected with, and backed up by, Ohio Power's six other major steamplants, as well as those of its affiliated utilities throughout the AEP system.

The co-ops were organized in the late 1930's for the specific job of building power lines to Ohio's unserved rural areas, where only 18.8 percent of the State's farms had such service. The first pole set anywhere in the Nation by an electric co-op was in Ohio—near Piqua—on November 14, 1935.

During the intervening years, the co-ops and the investor-owned utilities have made electric service available to all Ohio farms, of which 99 percent are now served. Member co-ops of the Buckeye organization have built over 30,000 miles of lines that deliver power to approximately 135,000 customers over roughly 65 percent of the State's land area. Much of this expansion has been with the aid of 100-percent loans from the Rural Electrification Administration.

A list of the Ohio rural electric cooperatives follows:

Pioneer Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Piqua, Ohio.

Delaware Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., Delaware, Ohio.

Inter-County Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Hillsboro, Ohio.

Marion Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Marion, Ohio.

Holmes-Wayne Electric Co-op., Inc., Millersburg, Ohio.

Belmont Electric Co-op., Inc., St. Clairsville, Ohio.

Midwest Electric, Inc., St. Marys, Ohio.

Paulding-Putnam Electric Co-op., Inc., Paulding, Ohio.

Licking Rural Electrification, Inc., Utica, Ohio.

Darke Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Greenville, Ohio.

Union Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Marysville, Ohio.

Tuscarawas-Coshocton Elec. Co-op., Inc., Coshocton, Ohio.

Lorain-Medina Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Wellington, Ohio.

Morrow Electric Co-op., Inc., Mt. Gilead, Ohio.

North Central Electric Co-op., Inc., Attica, Ohio.

South Central Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Lancaster, Ohio.

Tricounty Rural Elec. Co-op., Inc., Napoleon, Ohio.

Logan County Co-op Power & Light Association, Inc., Bellefontaine, Ohio.

Butler Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Hamilton, Ohio.

North Western Electric Co-op., Inc., Bryan, Ohio.

Firelands Electric Co-op., Inc., New London, Ohio.

Carroll Electric Co-op., Inc., Carrollton, Ohio.

United Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Kenton, Ohio.

Guernsey-Muskingum Electric Co-op., Inc., New Concord, Ohio.

Hancock-Wood Electric Co-op., Inc., North Baltimore, Ohio.

Buckeye Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Gallipolis, Ohio.

Washington Electric Co-op., Inc., Marietta, Ohio.

Adams Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., West Union, Ohio.

Lake Erie Electric Co-op., Inc., Kelleys Island, Ohio.

Southeastern Michigan Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Adrian, Mich.

Ohio's first electric co-op (Pioneer) was also the first in the Nation. It was organized in 1935, with construction started on November 14 of that year. Ohio's last co-op, Lake Erie, was organized in 1949.

Co-op lines have been financed to date by 100 percent loans from the Rural Electrification Administration. The total borrowed to date is $72,372.571. Payments on the principal amount to $30,454,299—approximately $3 million of which has been paid ahead of schedule—and the debt outstanding to REA amounts to $41,918,272.

Starting with "zero" figures in 1935, Ohio's co-ops today have: 30,000 miles of power lines in operation; 134,967 consumers receiving service; annual sales totaling 942,168,639 kilowatt-hours, and an average of 6,981 kilowatt-hours sold per consumer.

Ohio Rural Electric Cooperatives, Inc., with headquarters at 4302 Indianola Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, was founded in 1941. It is similar to a trade association functioning to solve mutual problems in power supply, safety, employees' insurance, legislation, scholarship program, supply of construction materials, warehousing, membership education, power-use education, legal problems, public relations.

Its officers are: President—Foster Scott, Chandlersville, Ohio; first vice president—Frank Clay, LaRue, Ohio; second vice president—Lloyd Leatherberry, Carrollton, Ohio; secretary-treasurer—Howard Mosier, Haviland, Ohio; executive manager—Howard Cummins, Columbus, Ohio, and counsel—John W. King, Columbus, Ohio.

Buckeye Power, Inc., with headquarters at 4302 Indianola Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, was organized in 1959, and is owned by all Ohio electric cooperatives for the purpose of generation and transmission of electric power to member co-ops.

Its officers are: President—Owen Manning, Coshocton, Ohio; vice president—Charles Wyckoff, Piketon, Ohio; secretary-treasurer—Powers Luse, North Baltimore, Ohio; executive manager—Howard Cummins, Columbus, Ohio, and counsel—John W. King, Columbus, Ohio.

The Buckeye group's engineering consultants are Southern Engineers, of Atlanta, Ga., and Loeb & Eames, of New York City.

Ohio Power Co. is one of six major operating companies comprising the American Electric Power System.

In its 15,400-square-mile service area, Ohio Power provides electric power for 485,000 customers. This area embraces parts of 53 counties in a broad belt across north-central Ohio and a wide area in the central, southeastern, and southern sections of the State. Population of the area is approximately 1,750,000.

To serve its customers, Ohio Power maintains a staff of approximately 3,700 employees. General offices are in Canton, with division offices located in Steubenville, Canton, Coshocton, Zanesville, Newark, Portsmouth, Tiffin, Findlay, and Lima. Offices and service facilities are maintained in 31 other cities and towns.

Ohio Power operates six steam-electric generating stations on the Ohio and Muskingum Rivers. Their combined power-producing capability is 2,900,000 kilowatts. These plants, plus 10 other major plants and several smaller ones, give the AEP system a generating capability of 7 million kilowatts—largest of any investor-owned electric system in the Nation. In addition to this capacity, Ohio Power has available for its customers backup generation from 19 other utilities with which the AEP system has interconnections.

The company operates more than 4,000 miles of transmission lines ranging from 23,000 to 345,000 volts, the latter being the highest in general use in the Nation. To carry electricity from transmission substations to the customers, Ohio Power operates more than 17,000 miles of distribution lines.

Ohio Power's history dates back to 1883 when the earliest predecessor companies came into being. Throughout its 80 years of existence, the company has pioneered many technological advances which have become standards for the industry.

Ohio Power is the Nation's 10th largest investor-owned electric utility company from the standpoint of sales of electricity, approximately 14½-billion kilowatt-hours having been sold in 1962. While Ohio Power sells more electricity than any other Ohio electric company, it ranks third in revenues received from electric sales and third in the number of customers served.

To provide its customers with electric service, Ohio Power has a net capital investment of nearly $700 million. This amounts to about $1,450 for each customer served and $200,000 per employee. During the past decade, Ohio Power has invested an average of $42 million per year for the expansion and modernization of its facilities.

Ohio Power's six major powerplants, their locations and capabilities follow:

Muskingum River plant, Beverly, Ohio, 888,000 kilowatts; Philo plant, near Zanesville, 497,000 kilowatts; Tidd plant, Brilliant, Ohio, 220,000 kilowatts; Philip Sporn plant, Graham Station, W. Va., owned jointly with Appalachian Power Co., 1,100,000 kilowatts—Ohio Power's portion, 816,000 kilowatts; Kammer plant, Captina, W. Va., owned jointly with Ormet Corp., 675,000 kilowatts—Ohio Power's portion, 305,000 kilowatts; and Windsor plant, Power, W. Va., owned jointly with West Penn Power Co., 300,000 kilowatts—Ohio Power's portion, 150,000 kilowatts.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 22, 1963)

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

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

O God, Thy word is written in the very framework of the universe; Thy image is stamped at the very core of our being. It is Thy voice which, if we have but ears to hear, soundeth in the experiences which sing and sob and sigh across life's changing scenes.

Discarding every mask and disguise of pretense, which, alas, too often we wear before the face of man, we come praying that the fretful fears that film our sight may be cast out by a love that takes the dimness of our souls away.

In the vision splendid of divine Fatherhood and of human brotherhood, may we dream our dreams, fashion our lives, enact our laws, build our Nation, and plan our world until this shadowed earth, which is our home, rolls out of the darkness into the light and it is daybreak everywhere.

We ask it in the name of the One whose life is the light for all men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 24, 1963, was dispensed with.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, with statements in connection therewith limited to 3 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW AND WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may be permitted to meet during the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and Wednesday of this week.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Fred M. Dean, 1450A, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code, to be lieutenant general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS, THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations, placed on the Secretary's desk, in the Marine Corps and in the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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.