

economic revolution in history, brought about by the expanding knowledge from research in every field of endeavor. And the urge to explore the unknown is its stimulus.

A comedian has suggested a possible means of securing all-out public support for Project Apollo. He would put all the women on the Moon and leave the men on Earth. Then, he says, think how busy everybody would be building Moon rockets. And it would solve the unemployment problem.

Project Apollo is a serious, scientific undertaking. It is not an adventurous race to the Moon for dramatic propaganda purposes, although it will be crammed with adventure and drama such as we have never before witnessed. And there will be undeniable beneficial prestige effects when we demonstrate our ability to accomplish lunar exploration. It will reflect the heights which science and technology can reach in a society of free men.

But remember—Project Apollo is only a stepping stone in the effort to expand human knowledge of phenomena in Earth's atmosphere and in space. Beyond the Moon the planets beckon. Will we find life on Venus or Mars? What kind of life will it be? If we should meet with other creatures on another planet, let us hope that they will find us socially acceptable, understanding, tolerant—anything but delicious.

There are many unknowns in space, and many hazards. We are not even certain at this time about the surface of the Moon. Some scientists say it may consist of a coral reef-like structure, similar to cobwebs piled one on another to give it a porous, fairy castle appearance. Others fear that the dust may be so deep that it will swallow anything that lands there. Others say that the dust may be electrostatically charged, and will sweep out to meet the spacecraft, covering it like a cocoon. High-speed meteoroids may puncture the spacecraft, and heavy atomic particles from a solar flare could give the astronauts an excessive dose of radiation unless they are protected by appropriate shielding.

Whether these things are true or not remains to be seen. In spite of the hazards, I believe we can make it.

Whenever I need a bolstering of faith, I try to imagine the conditions at the time Wilbur

Wright climbed into his tiny plane with bicycle wheels at Kitty Hawk, N.C. A horse was considered suitable transportation at that time. What would he have thought if I had walked up to him and said: "You are opening a new era for man today. Fifty years from now a jet pilot will take off from New York in a giant mechanical bug and cross the Atlantic at 600 miles an hour over a raging storm with 100 helpless men, women, and children aboard. Yet they will ride in air-conditioned comfort, with steak, television, and beautiful stewardesses to ease the rigors of the trip." He would not have believed me.

The predictions we are making today of things to come may sound impossible—but they are just as realistic.

Why should we explore space?

First and foremost, man has always explored space. Even before he could read and write he was exploring the world about him, migrating across continents. Later he penetrated the depths of the jungles, climbed the great mountains, and fought his way through Antarctic blizzards to the South Pole. He built devices to explore the subminiature world, then theorized on what was too small to examine even with the most powerful of microscopes. He built larger and larger telescopes to penetrate the universe, and again theorized on that which was beyond his reach. In short, man was born with an insatiable curiosity to learn more about himself and the universe about him. He has always been an explorer, and he always will be.

Second, Sputnik I demonstrated that international preeminence in science and technology is synchronous in the eyes of the world with preeminence in space flight. This identification, whether well founded or not, is a fact that we dare not ignore. The prestige value alone of demonstrating America's technological and financial capability for manned lunar exploration is by no means something to be taken lightly.

Third, our national security demands that we insure that no hostile force will be permitted to use space as an unchallenged avenue of aggression against us. It is impossible to predict now what the military significance of peace will be. That space has

a military significance is amply demonstrated by the intercontinental ballistic missile, which must travel through space to reach its target. What we need now is the general NASA program to accumulate a body of knowledge, and to make the United States a spacefaring nation.

Fourth, the scientific knowledge gained from our space program will offer vast returns right here on earth for years to come. Scientific discoveries advance technology, and improved technology spurs the economy. New products are born, and jobs are created. As one observer put it, "We don't spend the money on the moon, you know; we spend it right here in the United States."

There are other indirect and intangible benefits of space exploration. Not the least of these is its stimulus to education. Space is fascinating to young minds. The space effort's use of practically all the scientific disciplines encourages their study and demands improved curricula and better teachers.

I hope that you share my conviction that we must sail on and on over this new ocean, and that you are eager to explore the mysteries about us. I hope that there is not a caterpillar among you.

#### DR. VON BRAUN WELCOMES CHOICE

The Charleston Chamber of Commerce has scored a small triumph in obtaining the service of Wernher von Braun tonight as speaker at its annual banquet.

In an age that is being profoundly altered by science and technology, Dr. von Braun is a towering figure. Through a combination of accomplishments and personal experience, his name is familiar to those who are otherwise oblivious to the impact the technological revolution is having on their world and their lives.

By choosing him as a speaker, the chamber has stressed the importance it places not only on his work but on the work of the countless scientists-technicians he has come to symbolize. In doing so, it is to be congratulated.

In accepting the chamber's invitation, Dr. von Braun is recognizing the responsibility of the scientists to share his knowledge and ideas. And, for a man who goes around with his mind in the clouds, he has an abundance of each.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, DD., offered the following prayer:

Judges 18: 5: *Ask counsel of God, that we may know whether our way, which we go, shall be prosperous.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, today we are praying especially for Thy grace and favor upon Lyndon B. Johnson, who now occupies the exalted office of the Presidency of these United States.

Burdened with tremendous tasks and responsibilities, may he be blessed with those capacities and abilities which will enable him to help solve our many national and international problems.

Believing that all greatness and power begin with faith and humility, may he daily cultivate a great faith and walk humbly with the Lord and keep in step with Thine eternal will and purpose.

Grant that his wisdom and sound judgment may inspire our beloved country to reach the proportions of lofty moral and

spiritual idealism and leadership among the nations.

Although we are bending all our energies to shelter our Republic from the assaults of external enemies, may we realize more fully how absolutely necessary it is to guard our country against the temptation to allow the violent hands of irreligion and paganism, materialism and immorality, to lay hold upon us and undermine our character and corrupt our very soul, as a God-fearing people.

May we all have a glorious part in helping the President, our Speaker, and the Congress to steer the ship of state into deeper and wider and grander channels.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will;

H.R. 3191. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution establishing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on November 27, 1963, at 12:30 o'clock postmeridian.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes;

S. 1406. An act to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes;

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.;

S. 1540. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; and

S. 1964. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charges for learners' permits.

#### THE HONORABLE ALBERT W. JOHNSON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

HARRISBURG, PA., November 26, 1963.  
The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

The returns received in my office clearly show that Hon. ALBERT W. JOHNSON has been duly elected to be Representative in Congress from the 23d Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

The sad events of the past few days have delayed preparation of all official certifications. Our certification under signature and seal will follow within a day or two.

GEORGE I. BLOOM,  
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. HALLECK. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. ALBERT W. JOHNSON, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

#### JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE, HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 238, TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided. The Doorkeeper announced the Presi-

dent pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and personal honor of presenting to you a former colleague, the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

#### ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 178)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the House, Members of the Senate, my fellow Americans, all I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today.

The greatest leader of our time has been struck down by the foulest deed of our time. Today John Fitzgerald Kennedy lives on in the immortal words and works that he left behind. He lives on in the mind and memories of mankind.

He lives on in the hearts of his countrymen.

No words are sad enough to express our sense of loss. No words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America that he began. [Applause.]

The dream of conquering the vastness of space—the dream of partnership across the Atlantic, and across the Pacific as well—the dream of a Peace Corps in less developed nations—the dream of education for all of our children—the dream of jobs for all who seek them and need them—the dream of care for our elderly—the dream of an all-out attack on mental illness—and above all, the dream of equal rights for all Americans, whatever their race or color [applause]—these and other American dreams have been vitalized by his drive and by his dedication.

Now the ideas and the ideals which he so nobly represented must and will be translated into effective action. [Applause.]

Under John Kennedy's leadership, this Nation has demonstrated that it has the courage to seek peace, and it has the fortitude to risk war. We have proved that we are a good and reliable friend to those who seek peace and freedom. We have shown that we can also be a formidable foe to those who reject the path of peace and those who seek to impose upon us or our allies the yoke of tyranny.

This Nation will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin. [Applause.] We will be unceasing in the search for peace; resourceful in our pursuit of areas of agreement, even with those with whom we differ—and generous and loyal to those who join with us in common cause.

In this age when there can be no losers in peace and no victors in war, we must recognize the obligation to match national strength with national restraint. [Applause.] We must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power. We must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest. This is the path that we shall continue to pursue. Those who test our courage will find it strong and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength—and the just can be strong in the defense of justice. And let all know we will extend no special privilege and impose no persecution.

We will carry on the fight against poverty and misery, ignorance and disease—in other lands and in our own.

We will serve all of the Nation, not one section or one sector, or one group, but all Americans. [Applause.] These are the United States—a united people with a united purpose.

Our American unity does not depend upon unanimity. We have differences; but now, as in the past, we can derive from those differences strength, not weakness, wisdom, not despair. Both as a people and as a Government we can unite upon a program, a program which is wise, just, enlightened, and constructive.

For 32 years, Capitol Hill has been my home. I have shared many moments of pride with you—pride in the ability of the Congress of the United States to act; to meet any crisis; to distill from our differences strong programs of national action.

An assassin's bullet has thrust upon me the awesome burden of the Presidency. I am here today to say I need your help. I cannot bear this burden alone. I need the help of all Americans in all America. [Applause.] This Nation has experienced a profound shock and in this critical moment it is our duty—yours and mine—as the Government of the United States—to do away with uncertainty and doubt and delay and to show that we are capable of decisive action [applause]—that from the brutal loss of our leader we will derive not weakness but strength—that we can and will act and act now.

From this Chamber of representative government let all the world know, and none misunderstand, that I rededicate this Government to the unswerving support of the United Nations [applause]—to the honorable and determined execution of our commitments to our allies [applause]—to the maintenance of military strength second to none—to the defense of the strength and stability of the dollar [applause]—to the expansion of our foreign trade [applause]—to the reinforcement of our programs of mutual assistance and cooperation in Asia and Africa [applause]—and to our Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere. [Applause.]

On the 20th day of January, in 1961, John F. Kennedy told his countrymen that our national work would not be finished "in the first thousand days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But"—he said—"let us begin."

Today in this moment of new resolve, I would say to my fellow Americans, let us continue. [Applause.]

This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny that history has set for us. Our most immediate tasks are here on this Hill.

First, no memorial oration or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought so long. [Applause.] We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in the books of law. [Applause.]

I urge you again, as I did in 1957, and again in 1960, to enact a civil rights law so that we can move forward to eliminate from this Nation every trace of discrimination and oppression that is based upon race or color. [Applause.] There could be no greater source of strength to this Nation both at home and abroad.

And second, no act of ours could more fittingly continue the work of President Kennedy than the early passage of the tax bill for which he fought all this long

year. [Applause.] This is a bill designed to increase our national income and Federal revenues, and to provide insurance against recession. That bill, if passed without delay means more security for those now working, more jobs for those now without them, and more incentive for our economy.

In short, this is no time for delay. It is time for action [applause]—strong, forward-looking action on the pending education bills to help bring the light of learning to every home and hamlet in America, strong, forward-looking action on youth employment opportunities, strong, forward-looking action on the pending foreign aid bill, making clear that we are not forfeiting our responsibilities to this hemisphere or to the world, nor erasing executive flexibility in the conduct of our foreign affairs [applause]—and strong, prompt, and forward-looking action on the remaining appropriation bills. [Applause.]

In this new spirit of action the Congress can expect the full cooperation and support of the executive branch. And in particular I pledge that the expenditures of your Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. [Applause.] I ask your help. I will insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. The Government will set an example of prudence and economy. [Applause.] This does not mean that we will not meet our unfilled needs or that we will not honor our commitments. We will do both.

As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and the integrity of the legislative branch. [Applause.] I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones.

With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and I believe in the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, to act vigorously, to act speedily when the need arises.

The need is here. The need is now.

We meet in grief; but let us also meet in renewed dedication and renewed vigor. Let us meet in action, in tolerance and in mutual understanding.

John Kennedy's death commands what his life conveyed—that America must move forward. [Applause.] The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and to respect one another. [Applause.] So let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. [Applause.] Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream. [Applause.]

I profoundly hope that the tragedy and the torment of these terrible days will bind us together in new fellowship, making us one people in our hour of sorrow. So let us here highly resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain. [Applause.] And on this Thanksgiving eve, as we gather together to ask the Lord's blessing, and

give Him our thanks, let us unite in those familiar and cherished words:

America, America,  
God shed His grace on thee,  
And crown thy good  
With brotherhood  
From sea to shining sea.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escorts, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

#### JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m. the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

#### REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER TO FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 29

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House, until Monday, December 2, 1963, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

# A DETROIT MEMORIAL FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RYAN] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill in Congress proposing that the Federal building heretofore authorized by Congress to be constructed at Detroit, Mich., be named the "John F. Kennedy Federal Building."

To have one of our most beautiful buildings in Detroit dedicated to the memory of our beloved President would be a special honor for the people of Detroit. It would be a fitting and appropriate memorial named after a most courageous, a most effective, and a most energetic American leader.

The House and Senate Public Works Committees authorized the construction of a new Federal office building on April 4, 1963.

The bill states:

Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such building is referred to shall be held to refer to such building as the "John F. Kennedy Federal Building."

## SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have had a number of occasions to express my concern over the direction taken by our program in space.

Because of the staggering cost of all our space efforts, I have always maintained the position that our primary motivation must be military in scope. Heretofore, the emphasis has been unclear in definition. Perhaps, the haze which has surrounded our motives for a lunar landing, for instance, has been because of our uncertainty of Russian intent. That same uncertainty exists today and we must be ever mindful of it, but our purpose in space is solidifying in the posture all of us can support and promote: military superiority for this Nation over the Soviet Union.

A recent editorial in the Shreveport Times sums up the position I have taken since becoming a member of this committee and I ask unanimous consent to insert it here in the RECORD for the attention of all.

[From the Shreveport Times, Nov. 8, 1963]  
CHANGING EMPHASIS ON SPACE

As Khrushchev continues to take himself out and put himself back into the moon

race, the American price tag for the trip has shrunk suddenly from \$20 billion to a tenth of that figure. Khrushchev must be given the credit for bringing the whole U.S. space effort into focus and making it clear that a lunar landing can be made only a culminating item in our plans. The Government is prepared to go military in space.

To say that it will cost only \$2 billion to put a man on the moon is just another way of saying that Project Apollo is the end aim of a broadly based intermediary space effort whose counterpart the Russians have no intention of giving up, whether they go to the moon or not. The U.S. effort can be viewed either as intermediary or as an end in itself. The moon landing gives it coherence and drive but a lunar landing isn't vital, and the program has important features that can be made to serve a military instead of a civilian end. It is already partly military.

The moon project is now worth the money; for the Government is now giving the space effort a military focus it has always lacked. It needs doing for the reason that the Russians are doing the same thing, and evidently have the edge on us.

The United States has planned a two-step program, ending in 1970 with an actual lunar landing. First comes Gemini, a two-astronaut near-earth project with controlled orbiting, space rendezvous, inspection of other space vehicles, and the ability of the space-men to leave and return to their ship as the aims. The Russians made a long stride toward achieving these things when they launched a maneuverable spacecraft last Friday. The emphasis was military as it has always been with the Russians. Now ours can and should be, too, Federal officials say.

Thus, Gemini, a planned forerunner of the Apollo mooncraft will, along with the huge upcoming Saturn rockets, and new launching and testing facilities, cost plenty, but it's not a "moondoggle." If we don't continue with it, the Russians will have a decided military advantage in near-earth space, an advantage they already have a start on because of more powerful rockets.

Officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency have in the past few months been trying to make clear that Gemini and Apollo are both needed, but when Khrushchev began talking equivocally, NASA went heavily over to the military tack where before it had talked only peaceful pursuits. It is well that the Agency is able to make the switch, however reluctant it may be, and however much the urgency of getting to the moon is diminished thereby. For the House, partly because of the purely civilian aspects of the space program, has already cut \$600 million off the 1965 NASA budget of \$5.6 billion. If the expected compromise comes, it will not be long before the intermediary stages of the U.S. moon plan will, after being converted to military focus, have priority over the lunar landing itself, which may well dim well past the 1970 target date.

One telling point NASA officials have made is that the United States should by no means slack off the urgency of the moon program to where it would affect delivery date of the huge Saturn rocket-booster, now scheduled for 1966. When Saturn reaches the pad it will be the most powerful booster in the world, and whatever advantage the Reds have enjoyed since 1957 will diminish; for we will be able to loft payloads far in excess of theirs—whether we're heading for the moon right away or not.

The U.S. space program from the start has been geared to catching up with Russia in rocket power. By 1966, we will have done that, perhaps permanently, for our intelligence reports do not show that the Russians are building the equivalent of the huge Saturn.

So, 2 years from now should be time enough in which to assess the American position in

space and to take our own initiatives so far as actual space travel goes. It will be the first time we will not have had to react to a Russian threat to do something or get somewhere first in space.

Meanwhile, we should let no word or deed of the Russians deter us from launching a military program in space to match theirs, regardless of U.N. compacts not to test or use space for warlike purposes.

# THANKSGIVING TO A PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no need to recount for the people of my State and my community, any part of the tribute, the funeral and requiem or the burial at Arlington. In the East Room of the White House, in the great hall of the people at the Capitol Rotunda, and finally at Arlington Cemetery, I was there humbly in person and all the world was there more vitally in spirit.

This message is simply to pledge the continuum of that spirit.

Thank you, thank you very much, Mr. President.

This is the day we press on. Twenty-four hours after the mortal part of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was placed before the altar of God for his requiem, we resumed the business of the Congress in which he served so long and well.

Because he led us for a thousand days our aims are high, our goals clear. We have no time for the indulgence of self pity that he was with us so short a time or so swiftly departed. Rather let us reflect on our fortune that he was here in our dark and dangerous hours. In his name, let us be impatient with futility of the present and move to the high promise of the future. If his sacrifice is to have full meaning, our pace must be urgent, our steps determined.

We mourn and our memories of the moments we spent with him are precious to us no matter how brief. Because they are precious, I will share mine on another day and set them forth so they will not be lost to our children and my countrymen. But at this time as we approach the day set for Thanksgiving let us have one recollection.

As he walked among the people he loved with outstretched hand and his smile of friendship, he was not silent. While he had a special word of wit, of intimacy for some, these words he had to all:

"Thank you, thank you very much." "Thank you" was his constant expression to the children, the men and women, the crowds, the country, because his heart was full of gratitude for their high honor, for their support, but most of all for the opportunity to serve mankind which he had firmly sought and fully won.

Now as we press on in that same service, if we pause, let it be only for grati-

tude, for thanksgiving. Let us now respond.

Thank you, Mr. President.

For the faith in God and fellow man your life personified, we are grateful.

For the unity and strength you left us as a country, we are grateful.

For teaching us that there must be an end to venom as a means of vengeance and hurt for the sake of hate, we are thankful.

For the lesson that we measure mortality in the mystery of eternity not in days but in deeds, we are thankful.

For your interest in our children, your concern for their education, your determination that the handicapped among them who "had felt the hand of fate would never be victims of neglect," we are grateful.

For the path to peace you found amid the thicket of tension and threat of war, we are most grateful.

For your words and works, your "Profile in Courage," which you brought to life in your own sacrifice, we are most grateful.

For your judgment, that favorite word of yours which guided us toward well-being for all men, toward order and understanding in the whole world, we are most grateful.

For your heroism in war and peace which won you your rightful resting place among our brave departed you will be well remembered.

But above all, Mr. President, we give you thanks for the self you left to lead us in the person of your wife and family.

For Mrs. John F. Kennedy who raised us from despair and summoned up in all of us the spirit we needed and did not have, for her example, her calm, her love, and, hopefully, her forgiveness.

On Thanksgiving Day to you, Mr. President, Mrs. John F. Kennedy, and all your family, thank you, thank you very much. Thank you.

#### NAMING OF CULTURAL CENTER FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Wednesday, November 27, 1963. I wholeheartedly endorse and subscribe naming the Cultural Center for John F. Kennedy. I think that this is a wonderful suggestion, and I will introduce a resolution in the House to have the new memorial named for John F. Kennedy.

The article follows:

##### A LIVING MEMORIAL TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

It was just 1 year ago this week—on November 29, 1962—that President and Mrs. John F. Kennedy inaugurated a nationwide fundraising campaign to erect a National Cultural Center in Washington.

The late President and First Lady were guiding spirits in the development of this

project to fulfill a longtime need in the Nation's Capital for facilities to accommodate the performing arts.

We propose that the Center be named in honor of John F. Kennedy and that it be dedicated as a national living memorial to him.

This would be fitting and appropriate. President Kennedy and Mrs. Kennedy, in addition to their devoted interest in the National Cultural Center itself, were intensely active in the encouragement of all things culturally and artistically worthwhile. No President and First Lady in the country's history have done more than they to promote the arts and to infuse the American people with a greater sense of appreciation for esthetic endeavor.

A John F. Kennedy Memorial Cultural Center overlooking the Potomac River—not far from the White House and the final resting place of President Kennedy at Arlington—would serve as a useful and enduring monument to honor John F. Kennedy and to perpetuate the priceless treasure of principles and ideals that are his legacy to the American people and all mankind.

##### GREAT NATIONAL FORUM FOR THE ARTS

The National Cultural Center in Washington has been planned as a national forum for the performing arts in the United States.

Designed by the noted American architect, Edward Durell Stone, the monumental building will be built on the east bank of the Potomac not far from the Lincoln Memorial. The Center will house 3 auditoriums: a 2,750-seat symphony hall; a 2,500-seat theater for opera, ballet and musical productions, and a 1,200-seat auditorium for theatrical performances.

On the roof will be an area for band concerts, art exhibits and festivals.

Sheathed in white marble, the building will be 600 feet long and 100 feet wide. Its roof will be 100 feet from the ground, 18 inches shorter than the Lincoln Memorial.

Plans call for the Center to play host to visiting artists and groups from throughout the United States and from foreign countries. Washington's own cultural institutions, like the National Symphony and the opera society, will be given preference in scheduling but will not be considered permanent tenants. The planners want to keep the Center a national enterprise.

The land on which the Center will be erected has been set aside for that purpose by Congress, which originally authorized the project in 1958. Congress provided that the funds be raised privately and set a deadline of September 1963.

The project languished for 3 years until President John F. Kennedy took an interest in it and appointed Roger L. Stevens, New York financier and theatrical producer, as chairman.

Fundraising got underway in earnest last November 29 in a cultural spectacular on closed-circuit television seen in five cities, including Philadelphia.

President and Mrs. Kennedy headed the cast of 100 notables which included former President and Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower; Pianist Van Cliburn, Singer Marian Anderson, Poet Robert Frost, and Cellist Pablo Casals. Leonard Bernstein, conductor and composer, was master of ceremonies.

Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Eisenhower have served as honorary cochairman of the Center.

President Kennedy put his support in these words: "A great cultural Center which expresses the interest of the people of this country in this most basic desire of mankind is a most important responsibility."

Since that kickoff event, some \$13 million has been raised toward construction of the Center. This includes a \$5 million gift the Ford Foundation has earmarked on a 3 to 1 matching basis.

Last August, Congress extended the deadline for fundraising by 3 years, to September 2, 1966. Chairman Stevens said he was confident the money could be raised in that time.

#### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last Mrs. Rooney and I attended holy mass at the hospital chapel at Walter Reed Army Hospital here in Washington. The celebrant of the mass was Rev. Eugene L. A. Fisher, C.S. Sp., chaplain—lieutenant colonel—AUS, retired. For his sermon during the sacrifice of this memorial mass, which was for the happy repose of the soul of the late President John F. Kennedy, Father Fisher read to the congregation the following beautiful prayer poem which he had written out in longhand the evening before:

##### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By Eugene L. A. Fisher, C.S. Sp., chaplain (lieutenant colonel), AUS retired)

We know not track time or lone hour  
When God will say, "Come see."  
The great, the grand, with all their power  
Can hardly set us free.

Within a triumphal parade  
Mid shouts of joyous praise  
The call may come in sudden raid  
Or as explosive blaze.

Our President was jubilant  
The crowds acclaimed with pride  
Not knowing that the time was scant  
Sad tragedy the ride.

Assassin's bullets turned the joy  
To grim reality  
It could have been his wife or boy  
It hurt both you and me.

A great man, lover of world peace  
Who kept our country strong  
Given the time, would still increase  
Our strength to right the wrong.

Cut down in virile prime of life  
With aspirations high  
To conquer in world's bitter strife  
Keep flag safe in the sky.

A gifted man with talents rare  
To help his fellow man,  
He labored with that special care  
As only masters can.

Our States have lost their greatest friend  
The world a man most kind  
Whose labors and great toll could lend  
A key to freedom find.

He now rests in a hero's grave  
Life's trials for him are o'er  
A martyr's palm archangels wave  
God blessed his latest chore.

His passing is our country's loss  
God called him when ready,  
Like you, we shall not shirk the cross—  
John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

#### TURN TO HIM WITH CONFIDENCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. MULTER] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the November 26, 1963, edition of the New York Herald Tribune. In spite of our tragic loss we, as Mr. Lippmann says, "have much hope in the healing art of Lyndon Johnson. We can turn to him with confidence."

The article follows:

#### MURDER MOST FOUL

(By Walter Lippmann)

The first need of the country is to take to heart the nature of this unspeakable crime. There is no public crisis at home or abroad which demands such instant attention that it cannot wait until we have collected ourselves and can proceed deliberately. But there is a searing internal crisis within the American spirit which we have first to realize and then to resolve.

The American future depends on it, and our capacity to govern ourselves. What we have to realize is that, though speech and gossip and rumor are free, the safety of the Republic is at stake when extremists go unrestrained. Extremists may profess any ideology. But what they all have in common is that they treat opponents as enemies, outside the laws and the community of their fellow men.

What happened in Dallas could, to be sure, have happened in another city. But it must be said that the murder of the President was not the first act of political violence in that city but one in a series. The man who is now the President of the United States was manhandled by his fellow Texans. The man who represents the United States at the United Nations was spat upon.

In this atmosphere of political violence lived the President's murderer, himself addicted to the fascination of violence in his futile and lonely and brooding existence. The salient fact about him was his alienation from humanity, from country, family, and friends. Nothing within him, it would seem, bound him to the President or to the Governor as human beings. No human feeling stayed his hand.

In his alienation Oswald turned to the left. But that was incidental. Those who spat on Mr. Johnson and on Mr. Stevenson had turned to the right. The common characteristic of all of them was their alienation, the loss of their ties, the rupture of the community.

An extremist is an outsider. For him the Government in Washington is a hated foreign power and the President in Washington is an invading conqueror. There is no limit, therefore, to his hatred, which feeds upon the venom of malice, slander, and hallucination. In Dallas today there is much search of conscience, and well there should be. For Dallas has long been conspicuous for its tolerance of extremists, and for the inability of its decent citizens, undoubtedly the great majority, to restrain the extremists and restore a condition of honest and temperate and reasonable discussion.

It was comforting, therefore, to read on Sunday that the mayor of Dallas, Earle Cabell, had said that "each of us, in prayerful reflection, must search his heart and determine if through intemperate word or deed we might have contributed in some fashion to the movement of this mind across the brink of insanity."

We must all follow the mayor of Dallas in that prayerful reflection. For it is only too easy to forget that in a free country there must be not only liberty and equality but also fraternity.

The only solace for the Nation's shame and grief can come from a purge, or at least the reduction of, the hatred and venom which lie so close to the surface of our national life. We have allowed the community of the American people to be rent with enmity. Only if and as we can find our way back into the American community will we find our way back to confidence in the American destiny.

We must stop the flow of the poison that when men differ, say about taxes or civil rights or Russia, they cannot be reconciled by persuasion and debate, and that those who take the other view are implacable enemies. In the light of this monstrous crime, we can see that in a free country, which we are and intend to be, unrestrained speech and thought are inherently subversive. Democracy can be made to work only when the bonds of the community are inviolate, and stronger than all the parties and factions and interests and sects.

I wish I felt certain that the self-realization into which grief has shocked us will endure when we go back about our business. The divisive forces of hatred and ungovernability are strong among us, and the habit of intemperate speech and thought has become deeply ingrained. It is deepened by the strains of war and the frustrations of this revolutionary age, by the exploitation of violence and cruelty in the mass media, by the profusion of weapons and by the presence of so many who know how to use them.

But I do have much hope in the healing art of Lyndon Johnson. We can turn to him with confidence. For his great gift is in finding the consensus without which the American system of government with its States and regions, its checks and balances, is unworkable.

To find the consensus among our divided and angry people is his historic opportunity. To restore the internal peace of the United States is his unique mission.

That done, all else will be manageable.

#### DEDICATION OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AS MEMORIAL TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ULLMAN. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that an idea so catches the imagination of the American people as has the proposal to dedicate the National Cultural Center as a memorial to John F. Kennedy. All over the country the idea has spontaneously appeared. No better evidence could be asked to demonstrate the appropriateness of such a dedication; the identification of President Kennedy and his great First Lady with culture and the performing arts makes the naming of the Cultural Center in his honor a most fitting tribute.

I, therefore, have joined the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, in introducing a bill changing the name of the National Cultural Center to John Fitzgerald Kennedy

Memorial Center, and authorizing funds not to exceed \$25 million to be expended on a matching basis with privately donated funds, and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee. I also strongly urge its early adoption.

PRESS RELEASE BY MR. ULLMAN

AL ULLMAN, Democrat, of Oregon, and GEORGE F. SENNER, Democrat, of Arizona, today announced their intention of introducing a resolution dedicating the National Cultural Center as a memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and said they hoped it would receive early consideration by the Congress.

The two Congressmen also wrote Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the National Cultural Center, asking his support of the resolution. In their letter to Mr. Stevens, the Members said:

"In the heart of every American today, there is a desire to honor the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and a resolve to magnify the causes he so magnificently represented.

"As you know, no American President has done more to foster the development and the appreciation of the performing arts. Through the leadership of both the President and his wife, culture in our national life has taken on new meaning. We, therefore, intend to introduce a resolution dedicating the National Cultural Center as a memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy and will ask for its early adoption.

"We wish to urge you and the members of the Commission to support this effort as a fitting tribute to the man we all loved so well."

The two Representatives in a joint statement said: "President Kennedy brought to this Nation, and to this Capital, an intellectual and cultural reawakening that has made a profound impact on our national life. The Cultural Center is one of the most dramatic expressions of that reawakening. The Nation needs his continuing guiding spirit to insure that we do not lose the stimulus to a higher realization of our cultural heritage."

The sponsors of the resolution urged other Members of Congress and all people associated with the Cultural Center to unite behind their effort. They pointed out that the love of every American for President Kennedy would be of great value in bringing early fulfillment of the plan for the Center.

#### ASSASSINATION OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. GOODELL. 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. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday on a sunlit thoroughfare in the city of Dallas, an assassin's bullets snuffed out the life of our President. Those malicious shots cannot be undone, but we have a solemn obligation to the memory of President Kennedy, to President Johnson, and to those who will follow in their places to do our best to prevent repetition of such cruel and senseless acts.

I am today introducing a House resolution to create a joint committee of seven Senators and seven Representatives to explore all facets of the problem and report back to the Congress.

Throughout the feverish and painful hours of investigation of the President's assassination, while Americans watched in suspenseful horror, it is shocking to know that our best Federal police authorities were participating only as invitees of the State of Texas and the city of Dallas. I repeat—as invitees. They might well have been treated as interlopers by local authorities. Fortunately, they were not so treated, but the FBI and the Secret Service were obviously not in charge of the situation. They should have been.

Federal criminal law today presents many unbelievable inconsistencies. The shooting of a game warden is a Federal crime—title 18, U.S.C. 1114. The assassination of a President is not. Assault upon a Federal judge, a U.S. attorney, or their assistants, is a Federal crime—18 U.S.C. 1114. The murder of a President is not. The murder of the lowest paid and newest employee of the Department of Agriculture is a Federal crime—18 U.S.C. 1114. The murder of John F. Kennedy was not. An assault on a Federal process server is a Federal crime—title 18, U.S.C., section 1501. Assault on the leader of our Republic is not. Indeed, under title 18 U.S.C., section 1951, it is a crime against the United States to interfere with interstate commerce by violence; section 1361-1364 of the same title makes it a Federal crime to injure or destroy Federal property. Yet, it is not a Federal crime to injure or destroy the President's life. Threats against the President or Vice President are offenses against the United States under section 871 of title 18. Even the utterance of contemptuous words about the President by commissioned officers of the armed services is punishable by court martial—title 10, U.S.C., section 888. But the devastating acts following upon mere threats or contemptuous words violate no Federal law.

Interestingly enough, U.S. Senators, U.S. Representatives, and Cabinet officials are completely unprotected by Federal law. Actions against the person or property of such high Federal officials do not violate any Federal criminal law.

President Johnson has rightly ordered a full investigation into the facts surrounding the assassination. It is shameful that such an investigation can only be justified under Federal law by stretching and straining Federal jurisdiction that does not directly apply to this kind of situation. The general powers of the FBI contained in title 5, U.S.C., section 556 do not deal specifically or by inference with this type of situation. Some sections of the Subversive Activities Control Act, involving investigation of plots to overthrow the Government of the United States by force, might be invoked to justify FBI involvement. Other less pertinent grants of authority may be cited, but the fact remains that the FBI and other Federal investigating agencies do not have the kind of direct and unambiguous jurisdiction that they should have in matters of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, the murder of a high Federal official has ramifications far beyond the personalities involved. The officials of Dallas found this out the hard

way. It is not fair to any local officials to place such a responsibility on their shoulders. How humiliated and ashamed we all would have been if the Supreme Court had been compelled to reverse the conviction of President Kennedy's assassin because the defendant's basic rights had been violated. This could well have happened. Denial of counsel for 48 hours places conviction in jeopardy. If they failed to explain to the defendant his right not to make any statement, and the fact that any statement he made could be used against him, a conviction could be reversed. Dallas officials were under fantastic pressure from the public to issue statements with reference to the guilt of the defendant. Trial and conviction by television could have forced a higher court to reverse a jury's verdict. Dallas officials were placed under unique and almost irresistible pressures from the public because the victim was not just an ordinary citizen. He was our national leader.

And then the final touch of shame to our country: a self-appointed executioner deprives the assassin of his basic rights. The guarantee of such rights, even to those we hate, is one of the proudest adornments of our civilization. Suddenly, the law of the jungle took charge and America looked no different to the world than the harshest tyranny of communism or fascism. And not the least of our concerns here is that the assassin carried with him to the grave information that could well be important to the security of our country.

Mr. Speaker, there is another area that a joint committee should explore. Congress wishes to cloak the President and other high officials with all the protection that can be provided by law. Are we doing that? Are there other ways that the incredible burdens of the Secret Service in protecting the President can be eased? These matters are so urgent and so vital to our Nation's interest that they alone justify the formation of a joint committee of the Congress.

Sunday afternoon, before the President's funeral on Monday, I shared the deep apprehensions of other Americans as I heard that President Johnson was going to march in the open streets of Washington from the White House to the church, a distance of seven blocks. I salute President Johnson for his courage. He obviously felt that the world's leaders must know that the President of the United States can still walk safely among a free people in our Nation's Capital. I am not sure the President's decision was wise and in the best long-run interests of our country. Thank God he came through safely.

But what of future decisions of this nature? The law gives the head of the Secret Service the right to overrule the President in such instances. Is this really workable? Can we expect a single individual to overrule the President? Is there another arrangement that either the President or the Congress could devise to meet this kind of circumstance?

The life of President Johnson carries with it an incalculable value to our country today. What would a second assas-

sination do to our country? Any actions that can be taken by the Congress to prevent another disaster should be taken. Let us not neglect our solemn responsibility in this serious situation.

Today there are many proposals for investigating the circumstances surrounding the assassination of President Kennedy. We must not compound confusion with a variety of uncoordinated investigations. This matter deserves the best that Congress can offer. I urge that we move immediately to create a joint committee of the Senate and House.

#### A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE GREATER PROTECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, MEMBERS OF THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET, AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HORTON. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today making it a Federal offense to assault or assassinate the President, the Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, or Members of Congress. The enactment of this measure would add the Nation's highest elective and appointive officers to a long list of Government positions already covered by criminal statutes.

The recent tragedy suffered by our country has revealed the unfortunate absence of Federal law to cover these situations. I found it difficult to believe that there is no statute permitting Federal jurisdiction over cases of assault or assassination of the President, Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, or Members of Congress.

Since the law of Presidential succession provides that the Vice President is followed by the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the members of the President's Cabinet, I think it is essential that they be included in the protection of these Federal criminal provisions.

Presently, we have laws providing Federal investigation, prosecution, trial, and imprisonment or execution of those responsible for the assault or death of a great number of Federal officials. These include U.S. judges, attorneys, and marshals; FBI, Secret Service, Internal Revenue Service, Post Office, and customs agents; and many other Government employees.

My bill would allow the legal processes of the Federal Government to begin immediately in the case of any future attack on our President, Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, or Members of Congress.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, without Federal statutes, attacks on those holding the offices specified in my measure are dealt with solely under the local or State jurisdiction in which they occur.

The text of this bill is brief. I am including it with my remarks in the hope that all Members will read it and pledge their support to its enactment:

H.R. 9255

A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States, members of the President's Cabinet, and Members of Congress

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "Whoever kills" the following: "The President, the Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, Members of Congress,".

#### PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. WYDLER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy is now a part of history. The God that made him has taken him, and God's will be done.

No words can portray the shocking events of the last few days nor set forth the grief of our Nation. Each family in America feels a loss of a loved one, for the President belonged to us all. Let us measure our sorrow, however, by the agony of his brave wife and family who have lost a beloved husband, father, brother, and child. Our prayers should be for them.

President Kennedy was a man of intelligence and charm, a brave man and a dedicated one. His wit, his confidence, and his ability will be missed. We mourn him.

The Presidency, however, never dies. Our strength lies in the fact that we are a nation of laws, not men. The new President has assumed his full responsibilities. Our country is scarred but intact. Our hopes are high. Our faith is secure.

As we pray and mourn together, it is time for us to assume our full responsibility. Let our Nation draw closer together, more united, more dedicated.

The measure of a man is the effect he has on the lives of others. In life and death President Kennedy served us all. He told us we can do better, and I believe that history will show this Nation rose from its sorrow to stand taller than it ever did before.

#### INVESTIGATION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT DEMANDED

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, almost everyone in this House recognizes that an investigation

of the Department of State is long overdue. The tragic events of the past weekend indicate that the Department of State was the vehicle through which the assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, returned to the United States. Just think of this, Mr. Speaker. Here was a man who traveled to the Soviet Union not just to visit, but to live there, and who gave our Government an affidavit renouncing that most precious possession, his U.S. citizenship. After 3 years in this Communist country, he was not only allowed to return to the United States but received a loan of over \$400 to pay his way back here. What happened to him in the Soviet Union? Was he trained by the Soviet espionage butchers? We do know that immediately after his return to America he became a spokesman for a pro-Communist front and he then assassinated the President in Dallas, Tex.

This is but one of scores of examples of the Department of State's policies which show mismanagement, bad judgment, and even subversion. Now is the time to clean up this Department once and for all, and I am introducing the following resolution:

Whereas the State Department which had discretion, paid the way back to the United States of Lee Harvey Oswald who had given an affidavit renouncing U.S. citizenship, surrendered his passport to our Moscow Embassy and then spent 3 years being trained in Communist Russia and after repatriation returned to the United States and killed the President of the United States;

Whereas the dismissal of Otto Otepka signaled the end of effective security in the Department of State;

Whereas personnel of the Department of State have played a major role in engineering a series of miniature Munichs including nuclear agreements, grain deals, over 25 percent unilateral disarmament and a prospective nonaggression pact in evolving a policy of peace through appeasement;

Whereas people sympathetic to the Soviet Union have been put in office, supported or tolerated in nearby and other countries and anti-Communist governments have been destroyed, with the murder of their leaders tolerated;

And whereas the American people have lost confidence in the Department of State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the Department of State, its personnel and its security and other policies be investigated from top to bottom with the purpose of eliminating subversives and questionable personnel; and

That a special joint committee be named for an overall, extensive, and intensive investigation of the Department of State with orders to report back to the Congress not later than March 1, 1964.

#### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. BOLAND. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to redesignate

the Cape Cod National Seashore in Massachusetts as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Seashore.

It is heartwarming to note the number of proposals to perpetuate the name of our late beloved President. John Fitzgerald Kennedy needs no particular memorial to enshrine him in the hearts of our people or to assure him a lofty place in the history of our land. His magnificent leadership and deeds, the quality of his character and personality, have already done this. But, monuments and memorials serve an excellent purpose in constantly reminding us of the present and those of future generations of the activities with which John Fitzgerald Kennedy was so closely identified.

So, Mr. Speaker, I offer this proposal as one of the warmest ways to remember him. He loved Cape Cod and all of its overpowering beauty and enchantment. The cliffs, dunes, meadowlands, heath, marsh, lakes, and ocean were a constant source of enjoyment to him as he sailed, swam, and rambled its unspoiled beaches. At Cape Cod, John F. Kennedy found surcease from the awesome and arduous tasks of the presidency to spend some of his finest hours with his wonderful wife and children.

Mr. Speaker, the Cape Cod National Seashore is a reality today because of President Kennedy. When he was in the Senate, he filed, together with Senator SALTONSTALL, the bill that finally became law. He recognized that time was running out down Cape Cod way and it was essential to set aside, preserve, and protect the last of the "old" cape so that the inspiration of its surpassing beauty be kept intact and handed down to future generations of Americans. When he assumed the Presidency, he continued to press for this legislation. On August 7, 1961, he signed into law the bill that finally established Federal jurisdiction over this splendid seashore area. I was present, together with other Members of the Congress, at that ceremony and am one of the proud possessors of one of the pens with which he affixed his signature. I know that I can truthfully say that no other bill signing ceremony gave him any greater satisfaction than that which brought into being the Cape Cod National Seashore.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I proudly present this bill to this Congress renaming this area as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Seashore.

#### JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. CLARK. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and place in the RECORD an editorial from the News Tribune in Beaver Falls, Pa., in my congressional district by Mr. James March, editor.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts will be heavy for a long, long time in the loss of our

beloved President and friend. This editorial by Mr. March expresses the thoughts and feelings of all of us.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

We are all, like swimmers in the sea,  
Poised on the top of a huge wave of fate,  
Which hangs uncertain to which side to fall;

And whether it will heave us up to land,  
Or whether it will roll us out to sea.

—MATTHEW ARNOLD.

The high and the low, Americans all, with any sense of responsibility at all are saddened by the heinous murder of the President of the United States.

No matter what one's political faith may be, the death of a President is a loss to the Nation and to the world and a personal tragedy to many.

John F. Kennedy along with his ability as an outstanding leader was endowed with great personal charm. On two occasions he visited Beaver County briefly. Everyone who heard him speak here will never forget his personal magnetism.

His New England "Ameriker" and "Cuber" and his stabbing finger to emphasize a point were another kind of charm.

Part of the personal popularity of the President and Mrs. Kennedy was that they brought gaiety and life to the White House. They were young, they were rearing children, they liked the theater, the arts, sports, were devoted to their parents—qualities with which millions of Americans could identify.

The Kennedy clan with all its wealth, prestige, and power knows only too well the anguish of grief in the loss of loved ones as do most families.

It is particularly hard to reconcile the death of a family man in the prime of life and the only salvation for those personally affected is to learn to accept and not to question.

Those who believe the words of Jesus who said that not one sparrow falls to the ground without the Father's notice, do not question the wisdom of God, no matter what the burden, or anguish they may have to bear.

The length of one's life is not the greatest factor. The use made of the time allotted man on earth is of utmost importance. The President did not squander his time or talents and will serve as an inspiration for generations to come.

We join the closely knit Kennedy family in their sorrow.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON ORDERS COMPLETE INVESTIGATION BY DEPARTMENTS OF JUSTICE AND TREASURY

Mr. FASCELL. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Congress has responsibilities to fulfill for itself and on behalf of the people of this country in expressing its interest in the circumstances surrounding the assassination of the late President Kennedy and the killing of the suspected assassin. There are too many unanswered questions, and every effort must be expended to answer those questions for the American people. This issue does not involve only the decisions of local law enforcement officials in Dallas, Tex., but com-

plications are grave for the national security.

The President has properly ordered a complete investigation by the Departments of Justice and Treasury. As chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations which has investigative jurisdiction of the Departments of Justice and Treasury, I concur wholeheartedly in the investigation which has been ordered. The Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs does not, at this time, intend to conduct an investigation duplicating that which has been ordered by the President. I am taking this action to aid in the investigation which has been ordered, since overlapping duplications by the executive branch and by the congressional committees having jurisdiction in the House and the other body, would probably make more difficult the job which has to be done.

However, we not only intend to fully cooperate with the investigation, but to be as fully informed as possible. The results of this investigation should be made available to this committee and others of appropriate jurisdiction for the purpose of review and evaluation to determine whether there is any need for congressional action. Congress shares in the responsibility of doing all that can be done in the future to lessen or eliminate the chain of events which reached such tragic proportions. Some committees will be concerned with the need for new legislation. Some committees will be concerned with the need for additional funds to provide for additional security measures. Some committees will be concerned with the internal operations and efficiencies of each of the departments, and the coordination and cooperation between the Secret Service and the FBI dealing with the security of the President and other high officials of our Government. Some committees will be concerned with the actual and factual determination of every event which took place, the motivation which inspired each act, and all the people who might be involved. While all of these interests are proper and reflect the responsibility which the Congress has, in my judgment, it would serve no useful purpose for each of the committees to conduct an independent investigation of its own. Consequently, speaking for the subcommittee of which I am chairman which does have jurisdiction and responsibility for part of the problem involved, I have made this statement. I have advised the leadership that I expect to contact both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department, expressing the desire of the subcommittee to be fully informed and to receive all of the results of the investigation so that we, the Congress, and the American people, can benefit therefrom.

#### BEAUTIFUL TRIBUTE TO A MAJESTIC LADY

Mr. BONNER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the terrible event of recent days has wantonly deprived this Nation and, indeed, the world, of one of its greatest citizens of all time. The senseless, cold-blooded murder of our young, dedicated, and talented President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, will forever sting in our hearts and minds.

As we dwell upon the loss of his unfulfilled promise, our thoughts turn constantly to his deeply bereaved but magnificently courageous widow.

The majesty, the saintliness, with which she has faced and endured her unspeakable ordeal have set standards to which all should aspire if we would have a better world.

Mr. Speaker, like everyone else here, this monstrous tragedy has affected me deeply, and I have read and listened to the outpoured words of disbelief, sorrow, and condolence that have been so much with us since that day of infamy, Friday, November 22, 1963.

Standing high among the writings inspired by Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's hours of anguish is an editorial in the Washington, N.C., Daily News of November 25, 1963. I ask leave to insert the editorial entitled "True First Lady," in the RECORD at this point.

#### TRUE FIRST LADY

In the hour of great tragedy which has befallen America, we tend to place all the emphasis on the man who has fallen and on the man who has risen to take his place. Somehow we look upon the others involved with a sense of sorrow, but we seem not to pause and recognize the true greatness, courage, and devotion all of which have played such a vital part in the doings of the tragedy.

When Jacqueline Kennedy became America's First Lady, it was generally agreed that she was a woman of beauty, charm, grace, and youth. But somehow the feeling seems to have persisted that in her youth, she did not typify the true American First Lady.

In this tear stained hour of great tragedy, Mrs. Kennedy has lost a husband and the father of her children. Her loss is terrific and in truth she has lost more than any other American. But in her loss, she has gained the admiration of people all over the world. She has shown more courage than any woman of this era that we know about.

Holding the head of her mortally wounded husband and crying "no, no," standing in the emergency room and gently placing the wedding band on the finger of her still husband, walking to the ambulance that carried him to the plane, riding in the back of the ambulance beside the coffin, standing beside President Johnson on the plane as he took the oath of office, riding in the back of the plane that bore the remains back to Washington, D.C., walking off the ramp and opening the door of the ambulance that took the remains to Bethesda Naval Hospital, riding in that ambulance, still wearing the bloodstained clothing she was wearing when the fatal shot was fired, taking little Caroline in her arms to tell her that "Daddy has gone to live with God," and in her every move and action, Jacqueline Kennedy has shown the stuff which truly stamps her as a true First Lady.

It would have been so easy and so understandable had she become hysterical anywhere along the line. She did not. Somehow had her beloved husband have written the script for her to follow, he would

have written it as she lived it through each tragic second. If today there was ever any doubt about her role as America's First Lady, that doubt has been dispelled completely.

In an hour far more trying than most people ever know, she showed a courage and a bearing that shall forever stamp her as having earned the right to be known always as America's typical First Lady.

Our heart goes out to her in deep sympathy and in tremendous admiration for the beautiful demeanor with which she faced the ordeal.

She's a wonderful lady. She's lost something so very precious, but she has won the hearts of all the world.

What a woman.

### THE ARMY ELECTRONICS COMMAND

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, the Army Electronics Command has at long last drastically revised its policies in regard to obtaining procurement data that will allow competitive bidding on future contracts.

I am happy to report today that another battle has been won in the fight to give American industry a chance to work competitive bidding on our staggering defense budget.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to report that the Army has not gone far enough. Those who in the past took advantage of shoddy regulations that have now been corrected, have been allowed to escape without so much as a reprimand. However, the Army has now admitted, and for all to see, that prior to my speech of May 28, 1963, on the floor of the House in regard to the purchase of the AN/ASM 61 test set for a gyro compass, and prior to an investigation that I demanded, faulty procedures were being used daily in securing competitive bidding information.

The Army has also reported to me that corrective action has been taken. I am told by industry that, to a degree, this is true. Performance to date has been far more satisfactory, however.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the Army has reported to me that steps are being taken to get more competitive bidding. I even understand that a new command is being established within the Signal Corps to push the Army's procurement sections into more competitive purchases.

Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1963, I protested the proposed sole-source purchase of the AN/ASM 61 test set. The Army said it could get no competition because it had no drawings. When I saw this certification on a bid set, I shortly picked up my phone and called Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, then commander of the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency at Philadelphia. My information sources had told me in less than an hour that drawings existed for this equipment, and I conveyed this information

to General Stanwix-Hay before coming to the floor to inform Members of the impending atrocity on the tax dollar.

Late that same afternoon, I received a telegram from General Stanwix-Hay informing me he had canceled the procurement until he could study the background of the case. He also said:

Your interest in this matter is appreciated by the Army, and I personally thank you.

He also told me he was requesting a "full and unbiased investigation of the matter by the Army's Inspector General."

Mr. Speaker, although the "urgently needed" test has never been resolicited competitively or bought in any fashion, and while we cannot as yet count the savings that will surely come about, that investigation is complete and the report has been submitted.

In a letter to me dated October 25, 1963, Maj. Gen. Frank Moorman, commander of the U.S. Army Electronics Command, outlined what was found in the investigation. I shall quote only pertinent parts of his report.

To begin with, General Moorman said that he had uncovered an old directive under which drawings received from manufacturers were primarily used for maintenance information, purchase of spare parts and planning purposes.

Neither the Electronics Materiel Agency nor the Electronics Materiel Support Agency adhered to the practice or policy of using drawings received from a manufacturer for procurement purposes.

Mr. Speaker, that is word for word what General Moorman said. Imagine. Manufacturing drawings which could have allowed competition and saved billions each year were not used to get competitive bidding by the Army.

General Moorman also said, in effect, that in the ASM 61 procurement and scores of other cases, sloppy staff work was the order of the day. No attempt was made to determine whether drawings that existed were complete or contained proprietary data.

A complete review of the whole problem of getting adequate data grew out of my charges on the ASM 61. After completing this investigation, General Moorman informed me that at his specific direction:

1. All interested agencies are taking all possible steps to eliminate the problem of getting data insufficient to allow future competitive bidding.

Mr. Speaker, if this directive is prosecuted in procurement agencies around the country, the result will be revolutionary. There will be more procurements that are competitive than ever before, and the rising cost of defense will be cut back.

2. Directives have been issued to everyone concerned with the acceptance of such data to insure receipt of a complete and accurate set of data, together with a contractor's statement that what he submits as drawings are fully accurate.

Mr. Speaker, here is another far-reaching directive. In the past, drawings submitted have sometimes been full of errors, accidental and otherwise.

They have gone unnoticed and unchecked while someone blandly stated, "No drawings available," and sole-source producers continued to mop up. Now, someone is going to check the accuracy of this material. Again, here is another victory for competitive bidding.

3. Invitations to bid (IFB's) and requests for proposals (RFQ's)—the documents which inform industry of proposed purchases—"have been expanded to fully inform prospective bidders as to the extent of all manufacturing data."

Mr. Speaker, here is another victory for full disclosure of information if what General Moorman outlines is implemented at the middle-grade action level. It will also be a victory for industry which in the past has been denied the information necessary to bid intelligently.

4. Formal acceptance of drawings and payment for them is now contingent upon clearance by engineers of the Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, this clearance has been slipshod to say the least. Now, a manufacturer will be paid for the drawings when he delivers a good product, and that is as it should be. This, too, will stimulate healthy competition if properly implemented.

General Moorman's report was one of two reports on this case, Mr. Speaker. Brig. Gen. F. W. Boye, Jr., also reported to me in October. His study dealt with my specific charges on the AN/ASM 61 and the full-scale probe that resulted. He summarized his findings as follows:

In summary, the investigation indicates that faulty procedures were employed. These old procedures have been brought to light and corrective action has been taken. The Army intends to procure the AN/ASM 61's competitively in the future.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no competitive procurement for the AN/ASM 61 test set as yet. When there is, it is my prediction the price will fall as much as 50 percent or more, and the savings will be passed on to the taxpayers.

The old Army policy that just about consigned manufacturing drawings to the scrap heap has now been exposed for what it was and has been scrapped.

It should be a source of satisfaction to every taxpayer that the Army has finally gotten around to modernizing its procedures. This modernization will mean a little lower defense cost if properly implemented. The much abused taxpayer should be elated that he has won another victory in the struggle to keep as much of his paycheck as possible. However, he has not won the war—just another battle—the third I have talked of here this week.

We in Congress, who are the soldiers on the tax front for John Q. Taxpayer, owe it to him to keep a close watch on how these new policies are implemented. If they are just tacked on the wall and forgotten, they will do little good. If they are properly used, they will, like a good razor, become sharper and do a better job for all of us.

That, Mr. Speaker, concludes my third presentation this week on procurement. Report No. 1 detailed GAO's criticism

of Navy waste of up to \$50,000 and a savings of \$108,000 through competition. There was no indication that Navy tried to correct the faults that were pointed out. Report No. 2 detailed waste of up to \$192,000 and savings of 69 percent under competitive bidding. Here, again, the Navy resisted and has failed to correct a messy situation. Report No. 3 concerns the Army and its attempt to get to the bottom of a mess. I ask you, Which service displayed cooperation and which displayed blind obstinacy? Which service showed a regard, to a degree, for good practices and which service shouted, in so many actions, "Dam the Taxpayers, Full Speed Ahead"? The answers are obvious.

The conclusion is just as obvious. There has to be a shakeup in Navy procurement, and it must start at the top. Kenneth E. BeLieu is the Assistant Secretary of Navy who simply gives lip service to efficiency and competency. He is the one man at whose doorstep must be laid most of the blame for Navy procurement shortcomings, since he really is not doing a thing about correcting them.

Mr. Speaker, BeLieu must go. Any other action will be a direct slap at the taxpaying American and an endorsement of wasteful, sloppy, inefficient management of the Government's business.

#### JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. STINSON. 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. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy was born when the world was in a time of heavy crisis. Later in life, in another crisis, he answered the call of his Nation to defend the principles and ideals upon which our Nation is founded. He served with honor.

His country again called upon him to serve when he was elected to represent the people of Massachusetts to the U.S. House of Representatives and later in the U.S. Senate.

The people of our Nation then deemed it right to honor him with the highest office and greatest responsibility of the land. To this challenge he gave his life.

It has been written:

No man is competent to judge in matters of a kingdom until first he has been tried; there are many things to be learned in the depths which we may never know in the heights.

During this time of tragedy we must measure these depths that we, in turn, may travel those heights. From this deep trial, perhaps we, too, shall be declared competent to judge a nation.

No greater love hath a man than to lay down his life for his brother. By this death we are challenged to live—to work for right and justice—to guard our heritage, and to provide continued leadership to a dark and searching world.

#### MUCH EXCESS CAPACITY IS OBSOLETE—SKILL SHORTAGES EXPECTED

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, two recent articles make an important contribution to the debate on the administration's tax cut proposal and the contention that inflation will not result from the expansionary fiscal program because of a large amount of idle plant and manpower in the economy.

A survey by the Wall Street Journal shows that the nearly unanimous consensus of top economists who follow capital investment trends is that a considerable increase in plant and equipment outlays will take place next year even if taxes are not cut at all during 1964. Capital spending is expected to be about 8 percent higher than in 1963 without the tax cut and, with a tax cut, the increase could go as high as 10 or 11 percent.

One of the most important reasons for the anticipated increase in capital spending is the fact that manufacturers are employing more and more of their productive facilities. According to the Federal Reserve Board Index, manufacturing in the third quarter was operating at a rate equal to the first quarter of 1955, just before the 1955-56 capital goods boom began. Government specialists are cited as saying that during the current quarter the operating rate will hit 88-89 percent, which would be larger than the level of any quarter in 7 years.

Aside from the fact that manufacturing has less excess capacity than in many years, it is also relevant that much of the excess capacity which exists is largely obsolete. The average age of the Nation's production equipment is now 9.6 years, up from 8.5 years in 1955. McGraw-Hill estimates that 64 percent of U.S. machine tools are at least 10 years old. At the start of the post-World War II period, the figure was only 38 percent. The current percentage, according to the Journal, is higher than for any other major industrial country.

These facts have led many economists to believe that industry really has far less excess capacity than the record indicates. Almarin Phillips, professor of economics at the University of Pennsylvania, is quoted as saying that a great deal of this productive capacity is obsolete and that for this reason, "an operating rate of 87 percent today is a lot closer to true capacity than was an 87-percent rate 6 or 7 years ago."

The steel industry illustrates the situation. Last year steel producers eliminated nearly 3 million tons of obsolete steelmaking capacity. The elimination rate will accelerate in the years just ahead. The high retirement rate helps to explain why, despite its low operat-

ing level of 63 percent of capacity, the steel industry will spend \$1.3 billion for new facilities next year.

An article from Steel magazine gives the results of an annual survey of 7,500 managers in the metalworking industries. Of the managers surveyed, 29.1 percent expect skilled personnel shortages in 1964. Only 23.3 percent expressed similar concern last year. These figures bear out the contention of many economists that as the economy expands under the stimulus of tax cuts and higher levels of Government spending, skill shortages and bottlenecks will occur that will lead to inflationary pressures in the economy. At the same time, many believe that a general economic expansion will have little effect in reducing hard-core unemployment.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the articles from the Wall Street Journal of November 20 and the Steel magazine of November 18 in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 20, 1963]

**SPENDING SPEEDUP: SHARP RISE IN OUTLAYS FOR PLANTS, EQUIPMENT FORECAST BY ECONOMISTS—SOME EXPECT 10 PERCENT RISE IN 1964 OVER 1963—CITE LESS EXCESS CAPACITY, AGING MACHINERY—BULLISH BUILDERS, TOOL FIRMS**

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Business spending for new plants and machinery, now climbing at a leisurely pace, will mount sharply in coming months.

That's the nearly unanimous consensus of some 2 dozen economists who closely follow capital investment trends. Their view is buttressed by reports from plant builders and makers of machine tools. Because capital spending is such an important spur to overall economic growth, the forecast augurs well for continuing business expansion in 1964 and perhaps beyond.

"The clearest spot in my crystal ball, and the brightest, is capital spending—it should provide a very big plus for next year's economy," declares Albert T. Sommers, director of economic research at the National Industrial Conference Board, New York.

Plant and equipment spending is already on the rise. Government estimates put full-year 1963 outlays at a record \$39.1 billion, nearly 5 percent higher than last year. And a recent survey of businessmen by McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. places capital expenditures next year 4 percent above the estimated 1963 level.

#### SEES 8-PERCENT RISE

Now, however, many analysts forecast much steeper gains. "We're inclined to look for a rise of at least 8 percent in capital outlays in 1964," says Norris Johnson, senior vice president and economist of First National City Bank, New York.

"Business activity has moved up to the point where it can trip off a real acceleration of plant and equipment expenditures," adds Paul McCracken, an economics professor at the University of Michigan. "I don't think a 10-percent increase next year is out of line at all."

A gain of 10 percent would be sharper than any yearly rise since the 1955-56 capital spending boom, when outlays swelled 22 percent.

So sanguine is the mood of most economists that a considerable increase of outlays is anticipated even if taxes aren't cut at all during 1964. Typically, an analyst at the National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, says, "Without any tax cut, 1964 capital spending should still be at least 8 percent

higher than in 1963; with a cut, the rise will probably go as high as 10 or 11 percent."

Talks with companies that build plants and machinery give support to economists' predictions of sharply rising outlays.

#### BUSY BUILDERS

"Our bookings are running some 15 percent higher than a year ago and leave little doubt that 1964 will be a very big year for us," reports F. B. Warren, executive vice president of Turner Construction Co., New York. The company builds commercial structures ranging from factories to office buildings to stores.

E. P. Bullard, president of Bullard Co., a Bridgeport, Conn., machine toolmaker, is no less ebullient. "We've got our biggest order backlog in over 7 years," he says. "Orders already on our books will occupy our full production facilities through June, and new business is still pouring in." Among Bullard's most eager customers are auto and appliance manufacturers.

Generally, analysts who forecast a sharp capital spending rise base their estimates on several broad economic developments, rather than on any survey method of checking businessmen's spending plans. Many economists contend executives are habitually conservative about their spending plans and, in any case, often haven't decided upon their full programs when most polls about the year ahead are conducted.

Perhaps the key development leading many analysts to forecast a capital spending speedup is the fact that most manufacturers are using an increasing portion of their total production capacity. Heretofore, extensive "excess," or unused, capacity has been viewed as a major deterrent to any large increase of capital outlays.

As one Commerce Department economist puts it: "Who's going to rush out to buy a lot of new machines when half his existing equipment is standing around idle?"

#### USING MORE CAPACITY

No exact measure of production capacity exists. The prime guide of many economists, however, is an index issued by the Federal Reserve Board. It measures the percentage of production capacity used each quarter by manufacturers. According to this yardstick, manufacturers employed 87 percent of their full production potential in the third quarter, up from 85 percent at the year's start and from only 77 percent as recently as the first quarter of 1961, at the beginning of the current business expansion.

The latest rate, some analysts note, is equal to the rate in the first quarter of 1955, just before the 1955-56 capital goods boom.

A Government specialist who helps put together the quarterly estimates believes the rate in the current quarter will probably hit 88 or 89 percent. At 89 percent, it would exceed the level of any quarter in 7 years. "And unless companies begin to step up their expansion programs, we can expect 90 percent rates and above next year," he adds. Once their operating rates move much above 90 percent, most manufacturers say, production becomes less efficient and more costly.

Studies indicate that as the operating rate for manufacturers climbs so does the portion of capital outlays devoted to expansion, rather than modernization, of facilities. McGraw-Hill finds that 32 percent of this year's outlays are for expansion, up from 30 percent last year.

Expansion may become an even greater spur to capital spending in 1964, company reports suggest. Example: Some 75 percent of Scott Paper Co.'s increased 1964 capital outlays will be spent to expand plant facilities, up from only 25 percent for expansion this year.

Operations also appear to be gaining on capacity in some major industries not di-

rectly measured by the Federal Reserve's index. The Nation's railroads, in fact, have much more business than they can handle. One analyst recently estimated that shippers need 10,000 more freight cars daily than the railroads can supply.

#### AGING PRODUCTION FACILITIES

The increasing average age of U.S. production facilities is another key consideration of the many economists who believe businessmen are bound to accelerate their plant and equipment expenditures in coming months.

The Machinery and Allied Products Institute, a Washington-based trade group, places the average age of the Nation's production equipment now at 9.6 years, up from 9.4 years in 1962 and from 8.5 in 1955. And McGraw-Hill estimates 64 percent of U.S. machine tools are at least 10 years old, up from 60 percent in 1958 and only 38 percent at the start of the post-World War II period. The current percentage is considerably higher than for any other major industrial country; the Russian rate, for instance, is 50 percent. One of every five U.S. machine tools, in fact, is over 20 years old.

The age of U.S. machinery prompts many economists to believe industry really has far less excess capacity than the record indicates. "A great deal of today's production capacity is obsolete," says Almarin Phillips, a professor of economics at the University of Pennsylvania. "For this reason, an operating rate of 87 percent today is a lot closer to true capacity than was an 87 percent rate 6 or 7 years ago."

Steel probably provides the most dramatic illustration of an industry compelled to step up its capital spending because of obsolete equipment. Last year steel producers eliminated nearly 3 million tons of steelmaking capacity, a postwar record. The elimination rate, moreover, will accelerate in the years just ahead, a steel industry analyst predicts, because of the industry's competitive need for new equipment, such as oxygen-type furnaces.

#### BIG STEEL OUTLAYS

This high retirement rate helps explain why, despite its low operating level of about 63 percent of capacity, the steel industry is sharply increasing its 1964 capital outlays. Steel producers will spend \$1.8 billion for new facilities next year, McGraw-Hill forecasts. That's 50 percent more than the industry's estimated 1963 spending. It's a sharper gain than is predicted for any other U.S. industry.

The record accumulation of cash in corporate coffers is another consideration of analysts who forecast steeply higher business expenditures in 1964. Companies' so-called internal funds—earnings retained after dividend and tax payments, plus amounts set aside from pretax profits for depreciation—exceeded \$37 billion last year, a record, and some \$10 billion higher than a decade before. And, of course, the cash pileup may accelerate if corporate taxes are cut.

"The fact that many companies have a record amount of cash on hand, and therefore aren't faced with costly borrowing problems, certainly weighs on the side of increased capital spending," says the University of Michigan's Mr. McCracken.

Most economists also reason that the prospect of rising profit returns will induce many executives to proceed with projects that were previously in question. Profits of U.S. manufacturers amounted to 5 percent of sales in the second quarter, the latest period available. That's up sharply from 3.5 percent as recently as the start of this expansion.

"If profit margins continue to widen, and that seems quite likely, many projects that have been merely pending will be actually launched," says an economist for a large appliance manufacturer.

[From Steel magazine, Nov. 18, 1963]

#### ARE YOU FACING A SKILLED LABOR SHORTAGE?

"Skilled help is becoming a greater problem every year." While not yet a universal complaint, that comment appears more frequently in Steel's annual survey of metalworking managers this year than in the last 7 years.

Of the 7,500 managers surveyed, 29.1 percent of the respondents expect a skilled personnel shortage in 1964. Only 23.3 percent expressed similar concern last year, the 1962 Steel survey shows.

Machinists and tool and diemakers top metalworking's personnel demand list. More than 7 percent of the respondents say they will need topnotch, experienced machinists next year, while nearly 6 percent are looking for tool and diemakers. In contrast, less than 3 percent cite a shortage of engineering talent. Chief demand for machinists and tool and diemakers will come from the nonelectrical machinery industry, the survey shows.

While large firms (more than 500 employees) expressed greatest concern over lack of skilled labor last year, small companies (less than 100 employees) are crying the loudest this year. More than 31 percent of small firms replying cite skilled labor needs (up from 22.7 percent last year), while 28.5 percent of the large corporations voice similar concern (up from 24.9 percent last year).

Industry breakdown: All seven of the industry groups studied in the survey (S.I.C. 19, 25, and 39 were combined) show greater concern with the problem than last year.

*Do you expect a shortage of employees in any trade or skill in 1964?*

	Yes	
	1964	1963
	Percent	Percent
Primary metals.....	27.1	17.7
Fabricated metal products.....	26.4	24.6
Machinery.....	36.5	29.2
Electrical machinery.....	21.6	17.9
Transportation equipment.....	27.3	17.4
Instruments.....	38.0	26.7
Other metalworking <sup>1</sup> .....	26.5	22.0

<sup>1</sup> Includes manufacturers of furniture and fixtures, ordnance, and miscellaneous metalworking.

"We find we must train 70 percent of all skilled workers," says a Midwest machinery manufacturer. "Men just don't want to develop or improve their skills," adds a metal fabricator.

A particular area skilled labor shortage is cited by an East Moline, Ill., manufacturer. "There is a shortage of skilled factory workers in this area, and we expect the same condition to exist in 1964," he reports.

Investigation: At least two studies are in the works, geared to identifying areas and industries affected by the skilled manpower shortage.

Beginning in January, the U.S. Employment Service (USES) will issue monthly reports on skilled labor shortages in particular industries.

The information will appear in a new Government publication, Employment Service Review, and will include the missile, computer, motor vehicle, appliance, electronic, and steel industries, USES says.

George Rockwood, executive director, Tool & Die Institute (TDI), Chicago, says opinions on the shortage in the Chicago area differ depending on "which shop you talk to."

For that reason, TDI is planning a comprehensive survey of the skilled manpower status to be conducted within the next couple of months. Mr. Rockwood offers one encouraging sign: "We have a record attendance at our night schools this year—

better than 600, which is 27 percent ahead of a year ago. We graduated 63 in May, expect to graduate 80 next May, and 125 by 1966," he enthuses. "Instructors report a better caliber of young men entering, indicating that employers are doing a better job of screening apprentices," he adds.

#### APPRENTICE PROGRAM ENROLLMENTS LAG

Despite increasing demands for skilled labor, Labor Department figures show that apprentice programs can't be expected to offer much help. The Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (BAT) reports the number of registered apprentices in the United States has been steadily declining since 1957.

Currently, about 160,000 apprentices are registered with the Labor Department through State agencies. Another 50,000 are enrolled in unregistered programs, officials estimate. In contrast, registered apprentices at the end of World War II totaled about 260,000.

BAT researchers blame the drop on repeated recessions and rising unemployment. "We are having a tough time selling apprenticeship when people are out of work," says one source.

Approaches: The main force of the Nation's apprenticeship programs is concentrated in what BAT calls area joint programs—those where a union or a number of unions join with a group of employers. Such programs, representing every major trade, now total about 5,500, BAT says. In addition, some firms have their own programs, though "too many of them are limited to only one or two apprentices at a time," a BAT official tells Steel.

Technical institute apprenticeship programs for semiprofessional workers (such as electronic technicians and automatic machinery operators) are also criticized. "You can't duplicate plant facilities in a schoolroom. Of course, you can put a lathe into a school and teach a man how to run it, but the lathe might be 10 years old—surplus from some plant," says the BAT official. He believes industries which need modern skills should look at the possibility of more apprenticeship programs.

Despite an upswing in the number of registered apprentices in Ohio, Oscar Poole, Cleveland BAT representative, admits that there is "still a noticeable skilled labor shortage in the industrial trades." Most of the increased registrations have been in the building trades.

#### CHRYSLER LOCAL WINS U.S. TRAINING GRANT

Your union may be able to help you provide training designed to upgrade workers.

Local 412, a Chrysler Corp. white-collar unit of the United Auto Workers, was recently granted \$16,231 under the Manpower Development and Training Act to train 60 employees.

Plan: Ray Sullivan, president of the local, says that 20 persons will be trained in each of 3 trades—mechanical drafting, graphic illustrating, and clay modeling.

The union petitioned the Labor Department last March after a Detroit Board of Education survey showed increasing demand for these skills.

The UAW, with representatives from the international and the local on the board of administration, will provide the instructors, supervision, and facilities.

Aptitude tests will be given by the Michigan Employment Security Commission. These factors will count heavily in final selection:

1. Is the applicant employed but due to be displaced by automation?
2. Is he employed but in a nonskilled or lower skilled job?
3. Is he unemployed due to a lack of technical skill?

#### ECONOMISTS AGREE ON NEED TO IMPROVE STATISTICS FOR POLICYMAKING PURPOSES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 15 I inserted in the RECORD—pages 19584-19588—an article by Dr. Oskar Morgenstern, of Princeton University, relating to the weaknesses in our economic statistics and the need of improving upon them. The subject is of crucial importance for sound economic policy and, in my view, Dr. Morgenstern has made a major contribution to this end.

As I indicated in my remarks accompanying the article, I sent copies of Dr. Morgenstern's article to a large number of outstanding economists, requesting any comments that they might have. I have now received a number of replies, all of which express general agreement with the major points of Dr. Morgenstern's article, particularly on the need to indicate the margin of error in our statistics whenever that is possible.

Because of the generally favorable character of these replies and my own conviction about the importance of the article, I have urged Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER, in a letter of November 18, to hold hearings by the Joint Economic Committee's Economic Statistics Subcommittee next year on some of the major points in the Morgenstern article. Under unanimous consent, I include a copy of my letter to Senator PROXMIER, who is chairman of the subcommittee, as well as copies of the letters from economists on the Morgenstern article, in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., November 18, 1963.  
Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIER: On October 15 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Dr. Oskar Morgenstern, of Princeton University, relating to the production and use of economic statistics. Attached is a copy of my remarks and the Morgenstern article from the RECORD.

As I said in my comments, I wrote to a large number of outstanding economists asking their opinion on the Morgenstern article. I have now received a number of replies, copies of which are attached for your information. As you will see, there is almost universal agreement about the major points raised in Dr. Morgenstern's article, particularly on the need to indicate the margin of error in our economic statistics whenever that is possible.

I think that the issues raised by Dr. Morgenstern are so important that it would be useful if the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee were to schedule hearings next year to explore some of the major points which he has raised. The general agreement among

economists about the validity of Dr. Morgenstern's main contentions reinforces my opinion that hearings should be held. I hope you will give this suggestion your most careful consideration as you plan the subcommittee's program for next year.

With very best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY,  
SCHOOL OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS,  
East Lansing, October 28, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
New House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: Thank you for your letter of October 21. I was glad to have the opportunity to read the article by Dr. Morgenstern from Fortune magazine.

I find myself in agreement with some of the points that he makes, especially with regard to our unemployment statistics. I am enclosing herewith a copy of a speech which I gave here last week in elaboration of some of the points which I made in my testimony before Senator CLARK's subcommittee last month. You were kind enough to express an interest in my Senate testimony, and it occurred to me that you might also be interested in the further development of some of these points in the enclosed speech.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES C. KILLINGSWORTH,  
University Professor of Labor and Industrial Relations.

THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK,  
New York, N.Y., October 28, 1963.  
The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I found Dr. Morgenstern's article fascinating. The main moral I drew from it was that greater attention needs to be paid to the quality of our statistics. I wonder sometimes if it might not be better to improve existing statistics rather than trying to develop a lot of new sources.

In the very nature of things, however, I doubt if it will ever be possible to achieve the degree of perfection sought by Dr. Morgenstern.

Cordially,

WILLIAM F. BUTLER,  
Vice President.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY,  
Lewisburg, Pa., October 28, 1963.  
Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS,  
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I want to thank you for your thoughtfulness in sending me the copy of your insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Oskar Morgenstern's article on the margins of error present in the currently available statistics of national income and price levels.

I had already read Professor Morgenstern's article in Fortune and was impressed, as were you, with its salutary warning on the misuses of statistics, particularly where they are made the basis for formulating and applying economic, monetary, and fiscal policy.

The balance-of-payments problem of the United States, in particular, seems to be an area in which we have for too long allowed ourselves to be deluded by hopeful prognostications concerning fractional differences in rates of growth and fractional differences in price levels in the United States and in the rest of the world, particularly Europe. A case in point is the recently completed study of the U.S. balance of payments by

the Brookings Institution ("The U.S. Balance of Payments in 1968," by Walter Salant, et al.). This is a book which on the basis not only of existing statistics but statistics projected 5 years ahead argues that the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments will be eliminated by 1968. The highly questionable inference drawn by the authors from these statistical projections and manipulations is that the United States need take no significant internal action now to correct the deficit, since the balance of payments will be automatically in equilibrium in a few years anyhow.

The danger that the do-nothing policies recommended by the Brookings report will become guidelines for the present administration is great because of the almost cabalistic zeal with which the statistical numbers game is played by many and this in spite of the authors' own explicit warnings of the possibility of error in their findings. Unflinchingly, the report warns that its basic assumptions may be wrong, that the effects of assumed relative changes in prices and incomes in the United States and Western Europe may lie outside the range projected, and that numerous important variables, not considered, may seriously modify the hypothetical values of the variables which are considered.

Though the authors of the Brookings report give no numerical value to the margins of error they postulate, the legitimate inference which may be drawn from their repeated cautions on this point is that the margins are wide. Errors may enter not only into the projected trends but into the statistics which are the basis of such projections. As Morgenstern points out, errors of 30 percent and more are not uncommon in the computation of national income statistics. But a margin of only 5 percent may result in wide swings of estimated national income and even wider swings of variables dependent on national income. Assuming a gross national product of \$550 billion, a 5 percent error amounts to a plus or minus variation of roughly \$30 billion, or approximately the value of total U.S. exports (visible and invisible). If, as Morgenstern asserts, a reliable growth rate of two significant digits is "impossible to establish," it would be a foolhardy policymaker who would attach any particular significance to the Brookings report's estimates that U.S. growth will proceed at an annual rate of 4.8 percent a year for the next 6 years, whereas Europe will achieve only a 4.2 percent growth rate. But a major part of the Brookings report's conclusions are based on this fractional difference in growth rates and on its continuance from 1961 through 1968.

Given this indeterminate but probably large band of error in the calculations of the authors of the Brookings report, the so-called basic balance of payments of the United States could be in deficit in 1968 rather than in surplus, and in deficit by a substantially larger amount than the \$600 million yielded by the "pessimistic" assumptions of the authors. The concept of the "basic balance" is itself a source of errors and rests upon what seems to be a questionable methodology. The basic balance comprehends only transactions in goods and services and long-term capital transfers, private and official. Excluded from consideration as "transitory factors" whose movements allegedly do not lend themselves to long-term projection are short-term capital movements and errors and omissions. However, errors and omissions comprehend various unrecorded capital transactions which on occasion, as in the gold crisis of fall 1960, may be of significant size. Moreover, short-term capital tends to move sympathetically with the balance-of-payments position: such capital is likely to flow

out when the basic balance is in deficit and to flow in when the basic balance is in surplus. The "basic balance" is thus clearly an abstraction. What will be decisive in 1968, however, and indeed in all the years intervening to that point, will be the actual total net balance of payments, namely, the algebraic sum of all of the U.S. international credit and debit transactions except transactions in gold and changes in U.S. liquid liabilities abroad. If this total net balance were to continue negative until 1968, only further outflows of U.S. gold and/or additional increases in dollar holdings abroad would provide the necessary offsetting credits.

The authors of the Brookings report, in their preoccupation with the statistical projection of the basic balance of payments in 1968, ignore the psychological effects of further cumulative deficits in the actual balance of payments. If the gold base continues to shrink as it has been doing and the foreign claims on this dwindling reserve continue to increase as they have been doing, the hoped-for swing in the "basic balance" in 1968 may never occur because considerably before that date foreign dollar holders may have decided to cash in their chips, fearing devaluation. The projected statistical turn in the "basic" balance of payments in 1968 will be of little comfort where a worldwide collapse of confidence in the dollar will have destroyed the existing international monetary system.

In summary, I want to enter my strong endorsement of Professor Morgenstern's views and to express the hope that it will indeed be possible to schedule hearings before the Joint Economic Committee on the dangers that result from the excessively casual use or aggregative statistics in deciding issues of the gravest moment to the Nation's future.

"Economics by statistics" has become the modern abracadabra of policy; like magic in general, its aim is very often not to enlighten but to hoodwink. The possibility of manipulating numbers of questionable accuracy in directions which tend to support preconceived positions presents a constant temptation to economists anxious to avoid confrontation with unpleasant economic truths. Professor Morgenstern has performed an important and timely service in reminding us of these facts.

Very sincerely yours,

PATRICK M. BOARMAN,  
Associate Professor of Economics.

YALE UNIVERSITY,  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,  
New Haven, Conn., October 28, 1963.  
The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,  
House of Representatives,  
Congress of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Thank you very much for your interesting letter of October 21. I very much appreciate your sending me that part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains Oskar Morgenstern's warnings concerning the inappropriate use of statistical data. The warning is, I think, justified and I am very glad it got into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With repeated thanks.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FELLNER,  
Sterling Professor of Economics.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE,  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,  
Hanover, N.H., October 28, 1963.  
Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,  
House of Representatives,  
Congress of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Thank you for sending me pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD con-

taining Oskar Morgenstern's article of warning on the use of economic statistics. I am in complete agreement with Morgenstern that both economic concepts and economic data should be improved, and I have for many years deplored the spurious accuracy implied in many official statistics. Greater regard concerning the number of figures that are significant should be observed by compilers and publishers of data.

Furthermore, I also agree that the margin of error should be indicated whenever it is determinable, but this cannot be done for many statistical series. Generally, when the margin of error cannot be determined on a basis of mathematical probability it has little scientific meaning. In short, when error is due to vagaries other than observation and measurement, an estimate of the margin of error is itself subject to an unascertainable margin of error. Professor Kuznets, who is second to none in his mastery of national income concepts and data, has had to resort to estimating the margins of error of national income components in an unscientific manner because they could only be measured subjectively. His subjective estimates of the margins of error are, of course, not necessarily cumulative, nor need they be entirely compensating, but they are probably partially compensating. This still leaves us with the likelihood, as Morgenstern notes, of a subjective margin of error that may be as large as 5 or 10 percent.

Nevertheless there is reason to suspect that such margins of error are apt to change relatively little from one year to the next and, therefore, probably do not seriously affect most comparisons over a relatively short span of years. The reason for this stability is that the basic concepts and the method of data collection itself do not change rapidly. Consequently, I believe Morgenstern tends to exaggerate the effect of such errors, perhaps to dramatize the shortcomings of economic data, when he assumes a shift in the margin of error in making short-run comparisons as he does in his discussion of the table reprinted from his article.

Elsewhere in the article Morgenstern suggests the use of qualitative information. I am not entirely certain what he means by this. There is some value in using business annals but they are fragmentary and usually not available in time for policy determination. In any case such qualitative information is prone to an even greater margin of error than the data previously complained of. However, if Morgenstern is suggesting the desirability of disaggregating composite statistics into smaller components, a procedure which has been vigorously proposed by Prof. Arthur Burns, I am convinced such data could be exceedingly helpful in many policy situations; e.g., statistics concerning structural unemployment and its location.

In conclusion, I feel that economists both inside and outside the Government should improve their concepts and the statistical data they use and furthermore that the margin of error should be measured whenever it is meaningful to do so and the results published along with the data to which the margins are applicable. Budget and time constraints as well as intellectual limitations will still leave us with imperfect statistics. In my view the Government therefore will still be compelled to act on imperfect knowledge, which is what businessmen do every day, or not act at all.

We certainly require far more sophistication on the part of the press, the public, the Government, and academic economists in the use of imperfect data much of which will continue to possess an unknowable margin of error. As a first step, it would perhaps be advisable for the Government to publish only the significant figures in their official

statistics. Didn't Aristotle say something to the effect that the mark of an educated man was not to expect more certainty than the subject permitted? We should strive for greater certainty and we must not be misled by spurious accuracy, but we cannot afford to be paralyzed for lack of certainty.

With best regards, I remain,  
Sincerely yours,

DANIEL MARX, JR.,  
Professor of Economics.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA,  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,  
Athens, Ga., October 23, 1963.

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I greatly appreciate your sending me Dr. Morgenstern's article which I think is eminently sound. It bears out one of my pet theories which is that the public today does not go wrong on esoteric points of economics but on pretty elementary ones.

Morgenstern's points are—or should be—well known within the profession. My "Key to Modern Economics," Macmillan 1954, has long sections on the vagueness of such concepts as unemployment, full employment, price indexes, gross national product, etc. I do not personally think shifts in most economic figures of less than 5 percent can be given any scientifically conclusive weight. In many cases even 5 percent is not enough.

The trouble is that a political lobby comes to have a vested interest in the idea that certain figures are conclusive. Also some macro-economists often do not like to think of the vagueness of their basic data. Thus the defects and unreliability of the data are not stressed. The point is a very serious one.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID MCCORD WRIGHT.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE  
BOARD, INC.,  
New York, N.Y., October 24, 1963.

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS,  
Congress of the United States,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Thank you very much for your letter of October 21, and the enclosed excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Professor Morgenstern's fine article on the use of economic statistics, as well as your own interesting comments, serve an extremely useful function and, in my opinion, deserve wide circulation.

I find myself in general agreement with the warnings and proposals contained in the article and shall therefore limit myself to but a few brief comments.

1. Many of our statistical series are still very imperfect and should be improved over time. As a rule these imperfections are the result of serious conceptual problems, deficiencies and lack of uniformity in the accounts of the private economy and limitations of funds for gathering and digesting statistical information. Improvements are therefore dependent on conceptual refinements, better statistical resources and full cooperation between the agencies and the private economy.

2. An indication of the probable margins of error of statistical series is very desirable whenever such margins can be established with some degree of accuracy. In those instances where this is impossible, a general statement concerning the proper and legitimate uses of the data may be helpful.

3. There is great need for alerting and educating practicing economists as well as government officials, the press, and the general public on the subject of proper use, and the dangers of abuse, of the inexact statistical data that by necessity form the raw material of economic analysis.

On this count Professor Morgenstern's article, as well as your own valuable comments and past work, perform an important and timely service.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL E. LEVY,  
Senior Economist,  
Division of Economic Research.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1963.

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Thank you for your letter of October 21, 1963, in which you enclosed copies of the article by Dr. Morgenstern, from the October issue of Fortune magazine and your own comments inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I do have some comments to make on Dr. Morgenstern's article and I will be happy to forward them to you as soon as they are completed.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND T. BOWMAN,  
Assistant Director for Statistical  
Standards.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY  
OF NEW YORK, DEPARTMENT OF  
ECONOMICS,

New York, N.Y., October 23, 1963.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: It was indeed good of you to send the copy of Prof. Morgenstern's article. Just this week I had one of my seminar students report on it, but I realized that we should give it more time.

After I have myself studied it more carefully, I shall pass along any suggestions that may occur to me.

As a big consumer of statistics, I appreciate efforts, such as those of the Government's Division of the Census, to indicate confidence intervals.

Please be assured of my best wishes.

Your truly

C. LOWELL HARRISS,  
Professor of Economics.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER,  
November 4, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,  
New House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Thanks for sending me the reprint of Oskar Morgenstern's article.

A thesis on which I have expounded from time to time is that our economic policy of the fifties was seriously misled by poor statistics, and that our economic policy of the sixties will be seriously misled by good enough statistics badly interpreted.

For the fifties I am referring to the Consumer Price Index. As the studies in the Stigler volume (prepared by the National Bureau of Economic Research under contract with the Bureau of the Budget and first published by the Joint Economic Committee) show, the Consumer Price Index almost certainly overstated the amount of inflation in the fifties. As a result, the Federal Reserve Board spent a lot of time combating an inflation that wasn't there, and had an inhibiting effect on "growth." The unemployment figures are probably better, statistically, but they are terribly complicated to interpret, and the superficial interpretations given to them make the unemployment problem appear considerably worse than it is. That is why I say that good statistics poorly interpreted are likely to mislead our economic policy in the sixties.

While I was still working at the White House, Bud Fackler and I calculated that if unemployment stays the same in the sixties as it was in the fifties, the numbers published by the BLS will run about 10 percent higher. When I say to suppose that unem-

ployment in the sixties is the same as in the fifties, I mean to suppose that it is the same for each specific subgroup of the labor force, when the labor force is classified by age, sex, education, occupation, marital status, race, and all the other factors that are related to unemployment rates. The mix of the labor force of the sixties will change in a direction that will raise the overall unemployment rate by about 10 percent, even if the rates stay the same for the individual subgroups. For example, a new entrant to the labor force cannot become employed without first being defined as unemployed by the definition in use by the Bureau of the Census. The very fact, therefore, that there will be a great increase in the number of new entrants during the sixties means that the overall statistical figure on unemployment will rise, even if there is no real deterioration in the employment situation.

Another example relates to comparative economic growth of Russia and the United States. If the basic performances of the two economies stay the same in the sixties as they did in the fifties, we can expect to look a whole lot better statistically compared to the Russians in the sixties. The reason is that we will have tremendous additions to the labor force, and therefore additions to our GNP, whereas the Russian labor force will suffer greatly from failing to acquire all of the babies who should have been born during the period 1941-46. (Incidentally, this may have something to do with the Russians' realization that the moon is not in reach for them in this decade.)

Sincerely,

ALLEN.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC  
RESEARCH, INC.,  
New York, N.Y., November 6, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Thanks for your letter and for the copy of Dr. Morgenstern's article.

I certainly agree that official agencies need to give far more attention than they do, first, to estimating or judging the margins of errors surrounding the statistics they compile; second, to informing the public of these margins of error; third, in laying plans before their superiors in the Executive and the Congress for reducing or eliminating statistical errors.

Cordially,

ARTHUR F. BURNS.

NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS CURTIS,  
House of Representatives,  
Congress of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I appreciate your sending me a copy of your speech in which you commented on Oskar Morgenstern's article in Fortune magazine. I had already read Morgenstern's article with great interest. I entirely agree with him that the agency providing statistics should pay more attention to the margin of error implied in the statistics.

I was very much interested when Professor Mehalanobis from India, who is the president of the Institute of Statistics in Calcutta, discussed "margins of error" at the United Nations Conference on Application of Science and Technology in Underdeveloped Countries in Geneva last February. If I remember correctly he proposed that we use besides a statistically and mathematically defined concept of margins of error also an operational criterion for determining tolerable limits of error. For some purposes it is most important to know whether a certain curve is going up or down (for instance sales expectations in various industries) even if

we have no confidence at all in the quantification. In other instances even small margins of error may make the statistics useless for policy or business purposes.

What I'm suggesting is that if the Joint Committee should deal with this topic both these aspects are considered.

With best regards,  
Sincerely yours,

GERHARD COLM.

#### MEMORIAL TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our late President, John F. Kennedy, and Mrs. Kennedy in their 3 short years in the White House enriched the cultural life of our Nation beyond measure. Our appreciation for their vital interest in the arts should be expressed in a living tribute. Plans presently underway for a national center for the performing arts should be stepped up and the product of the encouragement of Mr. Kennedy and the labors of so many citizens should be rededicated as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Center. This will be the most appropriate memorial to a man who firmly believed that the extent of a nation's esteem for the arts is a reflection of the quality of its civilization. I am introducing legislation to this effect and ask that a fine editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post be included at this point in the RECORD:

#### A FITTING MEMORIAL

Of course, the National Cultural Center should be newly consecrated to the memory of John F. Kennedy. There could be few more fitting memorials to a President who enlivened the White House with music, drama and poetry. Mr. Kennedy, moreover, was the embodiment of life and vitality; a conventional monument would be false to his own spirit. Far better a place where people gather to hear and see works of beauty than a marble mausoleum which would seem to embalm rather than evoke his memory.

A John F. Kennedy Memorial Center—the name itself is an improvement over the present self-conscious name—would have an additional merit. It would enable the sponsors of the center to reexamine the design and location in the light of a changed purpose. Perhaps the present setting and architecture would in the end be found adaptable to a memorial function. But the objections raised about inaccessibility and structural limitations could be thoughtfully reconsidered.

No living memorial could catch all the qualities of a gifted President who was equally at home in the library and on the football field. But the best single suggestion so far is a memorial center for the performing arts—potentially, a place of splendor and grace that could be a proud addition to the Capital of the United States.

#### NATION'S GRATITUDE DUE BROADCASTING INDUSTRY

Mr. HARRIS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the atmosphere of shock, disbelief, and sadness many thoughts felt by each of us could not find expression in words. I would like, however, to attempt to put into words the debt of gratitude which this Nation owes to the broadcasting industry—both radio and television—for the magnificent way in which the members of that industry have permitted the American people to participate in their homes in the tragic events of the last few days.

In judging the performance of an industry on an overall basis it is necessary to balance significant contributions with trivial offerings. If a balance sheet were to be made up today, I certainly feel that the performance of the industry during the last few days in the minds of the American people tends to offset much of the criticism which more recently has been levied against the industry.

The achievement of the industry is all the more remarkable because it demonstrates the capacity for voluntary cooperation on the part of networks and stations in serving the American people at times when such service is most needed.

The decision of networks and individual broadcasters to cancel commercial programs and advertising is a clear demonstration that the industry can, if it so desires, live up to the highest standards of public service.

We have some appreciation of the cost to the industry of this unprecedented coverage, and the vast technical achievements which were accomplished in putting together the pieces of the story of one of our Nation's saddest periods. Never before has there been such a documentation of history in the making for the American public.

Having been a frequent critic of particular aspects of the broadcasting industry, I am particularly gratified that I can say to the industry today:

Thanks for a job well done. We can say truthfully today that we Americans have felt fused together as one people largely because of the outstanding contribution made by the broadcasting industry during these last few days in covering the tragic events which none of us will forget in our lifetimes.

Not only for myself, Mr. Speaker, but for the Congress and the American people I want express sincere thanks and appreciation for this tremendous public service rendered so magnificently by this great industry. To the management, the performers, newscasters, commentators, engineers, technicians, and everyone associated with the industry, we owe a debt of gratitude.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE BROADCASTING MEDIA

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend and thank the broadcasting media for the excellent manner in which they undertook to inform the public of the tragic event that was thrust upon us last Friday. Immediately the industry dispensed with all regular programming and voluntarily prohibited commercials in order that the American people and the world could be kept informed of the subsequent events.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to bring this matter to the attention of the House for I am sure that the manner in which the industry performed a public service from Friday last until after the interment of our beloved late President cost the industry untold millions of dollars. This act is of great significance at this time particularly since the Federal Communications Commission has recently proposed strict limitations on commercial time which I believe to be contrary to the intent of Congress at the time of the enactment of the Communications Act of 1934.

On November 7, 1963, Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Communications and Power under the chairmanship of my very good friend and colleague from Texas, the Honorable WALTER ROGERS, held hearings on H.R. 6697, and a companion bill, H.R. 8980, which I had the pleasure of introducing to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from prescribing standards with respect to the length and frequency of advertisements which may be broadcast by all or any class of stations in the broadcast service.

Mr. Speaker, we have been very vividly shown the value of the broadcasting media during the past sorrowful days. This has been accomplished through the desire of the media to provide a public service and, I say again, at considerable operating expense—not to mention the loss of revenue from prohibiting commercials.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will act favorably on H.R. 6697 in order that the House may consider it in the near future, at which time I urge all Members of this body to remember the commendable way in which this great media conducted itself during the events of the past few days.

#### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. STAGGERS. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, a bright and shining figure in the image of Plato's philosopher-rulers has been struck down. It is the essence of the image that the guardian of the state

possess vast disinterestedness, perceptive understanding, swift insight—that “divine madness” which reaches valid conclusions before the premises are fully stated. Power in President Kennedy’s hands was only a means to an end—and that end was the enrichment of human life. Born to privilege, inured to prestige, he was trained for service—to the Nation—to all people. He carried with him the sure knowledge that the blood in his veins was derived from the same almighty parent, and was no better than that of the humblest citizen. His intelligence recognized that simple fact, and he built his life to conform with it.

The President led us to an open window through which he pointed to the dawn of a new day, a day from which the clear light of reason and selflessness had burnt away the clouds of misery and injustice and oppression which have lain heavily over the human race through the centuries. That day could be approached only through a “long twilight” of toil and sacrifice and devotion. To reach it, new and untried paths would have to be hewn through seemingly insuperable difficulties. The bright spark of his unique personality had lit up the prospect, and we were almost persuaded that the end was worth the effort. And then he was cut down.

In our hour of anguish, two thoughts bring some little comfort. The first is that only a half-crazed individual could have perpetrated the foul deed. The act was the venom of a mind so egocentric that it could view the normal operation of economic and social laws as expressing a personal vindictiveness toward itself. Such a mind strikes out blindly, irrationally, with a demoniac futility. Its victim is simply the most conspicuous object in sight.

And yet there is a terrifying and half-expressed, half-suppressed, dread that we are all somehow involved in the act. We instinctively turn a searching eye on our own inner souls, and ask the troubling question: Have I, myself, by word or deed, whether intentionally or unintentionally contributed to the confusion and suspicion in this Nation, confusion and suspicion which seems to prefer contention to orderly progress?

Whence arises the second source of comfort in our distress. In the shock which removed this deed from the realm of the unbelievable to the fact of reality, there is opportunity to pause and think. This Republic was established by men who believed in the platonic tradition. The true questions which divide us today concern the public policies and procedures which are appropriate to the needs of the time. Prejudice and bias and selfishness will not discover the answers, nor will they put them into execution. We have a new opportunity to examine them all in the cold light of reason, and with an acute awareness of the practical potentialities which this age of enlightenment and of technical competence offers us to make what changes we will. Unanimity of agreement to rational examination is not a function of a free society. But, once decisions have been arrived at by rational processes, unanimity of action is. The thing that must

become unbelievable today is that while we loll in the luxury of plenty and power, we should permit “the bounty of heaven to be spilt” by fratricidal emotionalism.

On last Saturday, the heavens wept unrestrainedly as if in attempt to wash away all traces of bitterness and ugliness in our relations with one another. In the late evening, a cooling wind swept back the clouds, and along with them, we hope, the clouds of passion in men’s souls which obstruct their view of a beneficent infinity. Bright stars appeared, and a crescent moon hung in the western firmament. On Sunday morning a new day—a holy day—dawned in glory and brilliance. May it be a symbol.

On a gentle hillside, and in full view of the seats of the mighty on this continent, there flickers a glowing flame. It, too, is a symbol, a symbol of the indomitable spirit of our departed President and leader. May the thoughts and efforts of all of us be dedicated to the determination that the bright spark which our fallen President kindled shall never go out, but that it shall grow stronger and clearer until it leads us through the long twilight to a more perfect day.

It has always been an inspiring thought that out of evil may come good. The Judeo-Christian tradition assures us that sacrifice is never in vain, and that the ways of providence, however inscrutable, are righteous altogether. The last speech prepared by John Kennedy on that fatal November day contained the words:

Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.

If good comes out of his sacrifice, he would bow in humble submission. We trust in God.

#### SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES (THE TRADITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET)—4 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1964 VERSUS 4 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1963, WITH COMPARISONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a tabulation of the budget receipts and expenditures in the first 4 months, to October 31, 1963, for the fiscal year 1964, with pertinent comparisons.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with previous practice, I include for the information of Members and others a tabulation of budget receipts and expenditures in the first 4 months—to October 31—of fiscal year 1964 with pertinent comparisons.

#### BUDGET RECEIPTS

In contrast to budget expenditures which tend to recur more evenly throughout the fiscal year, the normal pattern of budget receipts shows September, December, March, and June as peak months; and receipts in the first half—July–December—of the fiscal year are

usually lower than in the January–June second half.

Budget revenues were officially estimated at \$86,900,000,000 in last January’s budget for the current fiscal year 1964, which, if realized, would exceed actual fiscal 1963 revenues by \$543,000,000. That is the last official budget estimate; the Secretary of the Treasury updated the figure to \$88,800,000,000 in testimony on the last debt limit bill, which, if realized would mean a \$2,443,000,000 increase over actual fiscal 1963 revenues. In any event, in the first 4 months of the fiscal year—a relatively low collection period—actual budget revenues amounted to \$24,331,000,000, some \$593,000,000 higher than the corresponding 4 months of last year.

#### BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures were officially projected in the budget last January at \$98,802,000,000 for fiscal 1964 which, if held to, would represent an increase of \$6,212,000,000 over the fiscal 1963 actual budget expenditure. On a straight monthly basis, it would mean an average of \$8,233,000,000 per month, in contrast to which the expenditures in the first 4 months, July–October, averaged \$8,190,000,000 which in turn compares with \$7,911,000,000 in the corresponding 4 months last year; the national defense monthly average was up \$113,000,000 over a year ago and the monthly average for all other items—nondefense—was \$166,000,000 higher.

But in his recent testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, the Secretary of the Treasury informally presented a revised estimate of \$97,800,000,000 net budget expenditures for fiscal 1964, in contrast to the original estimate of \$98,802,000,000; supporting details are not available. This would represent an increase over fiscal 1963 of \$5,210,000,000; expenditures in the first 4 months, July–October, were \$1,116,000,000 higher than those for the same 4 months last year; both defense and nondefense were up. The revised estimate of \$97,800,000,000 translates into a straight monthly average of \$8,150,000,000, in contrast to which, as noted, the actual average for the first 4 months was \$8,190,000,000.

As in all past budgets, the original January budget expenditure (disbursements) estimate of \$98,802,000,000 for fiscal 1964 represented a composite of, first, estimated disbursements in fiscal 1964 from appropriations made in prior years—\$42,353,000,000, or approximately 43 percent, and therefore not directly affected by current congressional action on the 1964 appropriation bills; second, \$1,202,000,000 estimated first-year expenditure in fiscal 1964 associated with proposals for new legislation; third, roughly \$11,781,000,000 estimated to be expended from permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law and therefore not required to be voted on in the current session; fourth, thus leaving only about \$43,466,000,000 of the total \$98,802,000,000 original spending estimate for 1964 subject to direct action in the appropriation bills of the current session.

## EXPENDITURES FOR DEFENSE, SPACE, AND INTEREST—AND ALL OTHER PROGRAMS

Messages and statements have emphasized that the expenditure estimates and programs for fiscal 1964 were so constructed that total proposed administrative budget expenditures for all programs other than national defense, space, and interest were slightly below the fiscal 1963 level—as originally forecast—for such programs. The original net budget estimate for fiscal 1964 for such other programs was \$29,066,000,000. In the meantime, actual expenditures in fiscal 1963 for comparable purposes did not go as high as forecast in last January's budget, with the result that the \$29,066,000,000 stands as an increase of \$1,747,000,000 over fiscal 1963 rather than being below that year. In the first 4 months—July–October for fiscal 1964—expenditures for such other programs were \$10,578,000,000, about \$94,000,000 below the corresponding expenditure in July–October of last year.

## SURPLUS OR DEFICIT

Whether the budget deficit is the \$11,902,000,000 originally estimated, the \$9,000,000,000 informally projected only recently by the Secretary before the Ways and Means Committee, or some other amount, fiscal 1964 represents the 28th year of budget deficits in the last 34 years. And we were told that the next budget, for fiscal 1965, and probably the one following that, will also be in the red. In summary here are the official administrative budget deficit figures of the last 3 years:

	Administrative budget deficits	
	From July 1, 1961, to date	For 3 fiscal years, 1962–64
Fiscal 1962 (from July 1, 1961).....	\$6,378,000,000	\$6,378,000,000
Fiscal 1963.....	6,233,000,000	6,233,000,000
Fiscal 1964 (4 months to Oct. 31, 1963).....	8,428,000,000	-----
Fiscal 1964 (informal estimate to Ways and Means Committee on the last debt bill).....	-----	9,000,000,000
Total as above.....	21,039,000,000	21,611,000,000

And in total, actual budget expenditures in the fiscal year closed on June 30 last, and those now informally projected by the Secretary for the current fiscal year 1964, compare with certain earlier years as follows:

	Administrative budget spending	
	Over fiscal 1961	Over fiscal 1964
Fiscal 1963 actual:		
National defense.....	+\$5,249,000,000	+\$5,757,000,000
Other than national defense.....	+5,826,000,000	+19,296,000,000
Total, 1963 over.....	+11,075,000,000	+25,053,000,000
Federal 1964 current estimate:		
Total, 1964 current informal estimate over.....	+16,285,000,000	+30,263,000,000

## THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, after 4 months of budget operations in the current fiscal year

1964, the total public debt, both direct and guaranteed, stood at \$307,147,152,- 239.03 and compares with certain earlier dates as shown in the following table:

## Federal public debt—Direct and guaranteed

	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962	Fiscal 1963	Fiscal 1964 (at Oct. 31, 1963)
1. The debt at end of period (in billions of dollars).....	271.3	289.2	298.6	306.5	307.1
2. Amount per capita (in dollars).....	1,670.0	1,575.0	1,600.0	1,619.0	1,614.0
3. Average for a family of 4 (in dollars).....	6,680.0	6,300.0	6,400.0	6,476.0	6,456.0

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the following table elaborates the receipt and expenditure situation more fully:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the traditional administrative budget), 4 months of fiscal 1964 versus 4 months of fiscal 1963, and comparisons with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 4 months (to Oct. 31)			Budget estimates for all of fiscal 1964 compared to actual results for all of fiscal 1963			1964 estimates over 1963	
	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1963	1964 compared to 1963	Budget estimates for 1964 <sup>1</sup>	Informal Treasury revision <sup>2</sup>	Actual, 1963	Original estimates over 1963	Informal Treasury revision over 1963
1. Budget receipts (net).....	24,331	23,738	+593	86,900	88,800	86,357	+543	+2,443
2. Budget expenditures (net):								
(a) National defense (per official budget classification).....	17,496	17,043	+453	55,433	( <sup>3</sup> )	52,743	+2,690	( <sup>3</sup> )
(b) Other than national defense.....	15,264	14,601	+663	43,369	( <sup>3</sup> )	39,847	+3,522	( <sup>3</sup> )
Total expenditures (net).....	32,760	31,644	+1,116	98,802	97,800	92,590	+6,212	+5,210
3. Net surplus (+) or deficit (—).....	-8,429	-7,906	-523	-11,902	-9,000	-6,233	+5,669	+2,767
4. Average monthly expenditure:								
(a) National defense.....	4,374	4,261	+113	4,619	( <sup>3</sup> )	4,395	+224	( <sup>3</sup> )
(b) Other than national defense.....	3,816	3,650	+166	3,614	( <sup>3</sup> )	3,320	+294	( <sup>3</sup> )
Total monthly average.....	8,190	7,911	+279	8,233	8,150	7,715	+518	+435
5. Dividing net budget expenditures on the basis emphasized by the budget message of January 1963:								
(a) National defense.....	17,496	17,043	+453	55,433	( <sup>3</sup> )	52,743	+2,690	( <sup>3</sup> )
(b) Space.....	1,184	650	+534	4,200	( <sup>3</sup> )	2,552	+1,648	( <sup>3</sup> )
(c) Interest.....	3,502	3,279	+223	10,103	( <sup>3</sup> )	9,976	+127	( <sup>3</sup> )
(d) All other expenditures.....	10,578	10,672	-94	29,066	( <sup>3</sup> )	27,319	+1,747	( <sup>3</sup> )
Total expenditures (net).....	32,760	31,644	+1,116	98,802	97,800	92,590	+6,212	+5,210

<sup>1</sup> As per original budget, Jan. 17, 1963.

<sup>2</sup> Given by Secretary of Treasury to Ways and Means Committee in connection with last public debt limit bill (H. Rept. 885, p. 4).

<sup>3</sup> No breakdowns available.

<sup>4</sup> That is to say, these 2 estimates represent a projected deficit in fiscal 1964 higher, by \$5,669,000,000 and \$2,967,000,000, respectively, than the deficit actually experienced in fiscal 1963.

Source: Monthly Treasury statement for Oct. 31, 1963; budget for 1964; and monthly Treasury statement for June 30, 1963.

## INSPIRING MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. VANIK. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the splendid address of President Lyndon B. Johnson at the joint session of the Congress this afternoon was a call for national unity in the solution of the unfinished

business before this Nation in both domestic and international affairs.

It is my hope that Congress will measure up to its share of the responsibility and stay on the job until the charted work has been done. In the spirit of President Johnson's message, it is my hope that the House of Representatives will act on the civil rights bill and complete action on it before Christmas. It is also my hope that the other body will complete its work on the tax bill within the same schedule.

There is indeed no more fitting tribute that could be paid to the memory of our late beloved President.

## FAREWELL, MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. SENNER. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, there is so deep a sense of loss, so great a sense of grief that I cannot yet find the words that will give a full measure of meaning to the tragedy we have suffered.

To what my colleagues are saying here today, and to what the world has already said I can now only add—Farewell, my beloved President, I will miss you.

## A BRAVE STATEMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, our President has spoken for the great majority of American citizens, in both the Democratic and Republican Parties, in calling for an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence.

I am sure that the great body of our citizenry will follow his leadership in rejecting the fanatics of both the left and the right, and seeking a meeting ground of reason on which our Nation's most pressing problems may be solved.

In his decisive call for action on a broad legislative front, President Johnson has outlined a brave program that is faithful in its structure to the principles and policies of our late President.

It remains to be seen whether that brave program will survive the rocks and shoals of congressional action.

Certainly, no one can say our new President has failed to "lay it on the line," both as to his policy and his need for help from his fellow Americans.

## PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, "We will keep our commitments." "I have come here to ask your help." "I believe in the integrity of the legislative branch." "In January 1961, President Kennedy stood in this place and said: 'Let us begin.' I stand here today and say: 'Let us continue.'" "There has been enough of talk; now is the time for action." "Let us put away all talking and preaching of prejudice and hate."

These are some of the striking phrases used by President Johnson in his first official address to the Congress, and

incidentally to the American people and an anxiously listening world. Their import is that the Ship of State is firmly set on the course laid out by his predecessor. The administration has changed, but not the policy.

The atmosphere in which the new President spoke was obviously tinged with the gloom and restraint imposed by the tragedy of the last few days, and Mr. Johnson made no effort to lighten it. Actually, he heightened it by saying that he would give everything he has if it had not been necessary for him to appear in that place on such an occasion. His phrases were reminiscent of, almost identical with, those phrases made so familiar by the late President. "Let the Nation know." "Let all the world know."

The crowd which thronged onto the floor of the House and the galleries was, of course, not unlike those which appear on all important State occasions. The significant thing was the number of foreign representatives, ambassadors, and all the rest, who crowded into the Chamber. The space reserved for them was inadequate, and they were forced to scatter wherever they could. Their presence indicates the enormous importance attached by the whole world to the first statements of the new President.

Mr. Johnson spelled out in some detail the points in the Kennedy program which he endorsed and which he meant to push. This was expected, of course. Each point met with an expression of approval from the audience, none more so than his commitment to strong national defense and his advocacy of an early civil rights bill.

What are the general impressions of the occasion? There stood an immensely strong man, deeply earnest, and positive in his convictions. No glamour, no boasting, no obsession with words. Only determination and inherent strength of character. This is not a man to cross. Both our friends and our foes must have been convinced of this as he spoke. Furthermore, it is evident that he thinks in terms of action.

So a new administration has been set on its way. We may be hopeful that a program outlined and initiated by a man of genius and consecration will be pressed to implementation and conclusion by a successor equally dedicated to the public good and equally equipped with the moral force to carry it through.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHORT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. SHORT.

Mr. GROVER.

Mr. GOODLING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on November 26, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311); and

H.R. 8969. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, November 29, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

## OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 88th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: ALBERT W. JOHNSON, 23d District, Pennsylvania.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1393. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 30th Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration on the work of the cooperative farm credit system (including the report of the Federal Farm Credit Board), covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration; and section 6 of the Farm

Credit Act of 1953 (H. Doc. No. 177); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1394. A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States for public assistance" for the fiscal year 1964, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1395. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the July-September 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1396. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting copies of the Nobel Peace Prize award notice to the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1397. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on possibilities for reducing Federal expenditures under the electric loan program and other matters pertaining to the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1398. A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Dry Creek, Ga.; Fishing Creek, Ga.; Little Cache, Ill.; Bachelor Run, Ind.; Grant-Shanghai Creeks, Kans.; Clam River, Mass.; Crane Creek, Minn.; Briar Creek, Pa.; and Glen Hills, Wis., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1399. A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Big Caney, Kans. and Okla.; Town Creek, Miss.; Rush Creek, Ohio; and North Fork of Powder River, Wyo., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

## 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. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 189. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., to the county of Kern, State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 393. A bill to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.; with amendment (Rept. No. 928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7248. A bill to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the

city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86-194; with amendment (Rept. No. 929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7499. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9252. A bill to authorize an appropriation to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center, authorized to be constructed by such act, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9253. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John F. Kennedy Memorial Center," and to authorize the appropriation of \$25 million to provide matching of amounts contributed by the general public; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 9254. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John F. Kennedy Memorial Center," and to authorize the appropriation of \$25 million to provide matching of amounts contributed by the general public; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 9255. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States, members of the President's Cabinet, and Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9256. A bill to redesignate the Cape Cod National Seashore, Mass., as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 9257. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army pay a fair share of the cost of certain highway improvements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9258. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to assure that adequate sites will be available in Arlington National Cemetery to provide for the interment there of recipients of certain decorations and awards; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9259. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial National Cultural Center"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.R. 9260. A bill to punish the killing, attempted killing, or assaulting of the President of the United States and other high officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9261. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 9262. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to classify as third-class mail certain matter mailed by State motor vehicle authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9263. A bill to designate the Museum of History and Technology of the Smithsonian Institution as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Museum of History and Technology"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 9264. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp as a tribute to the memory of President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9265. A bill to establish a program of awards for academic excellence in memory of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9266. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 9267. A bill to provide that standard silver dollars shall hereafter bear on one side a likeness of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9268. A bill to designate the Peace Corps as the "Kennedy Peace Corps," and to provide for a suitable insignia for volunteers of the Kennedy Peace Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 9269. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$5 million to carry out the purpose of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center, authorized to be constructed by such act, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center of the Performing Arts"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9270. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 9271. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Cultural Center"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9272. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9273. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 9274. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to kill the President or Vice President of the United States, the head of any executive department, or any Member of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9275. A bill to designate the authorized Federal building to be constructed at Detroit, Mich., as the "John F. Kennedy Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 9276. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such

act as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Cultural Center"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 9277. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 9278. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 9279. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 811. Joint resolution to establish the World War I Commemorative Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 812. Joint resolution directing an investigation of the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.J. Res. 813. Joint resolution to redesignate the Cape Cod National Seashore as the "Kennedy Memorial Seashore," and to establish a commission to recommend a simple and fitting memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy within such seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.J. Res. 814. Joint resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct an investigation and study of the recent assassination of the President of the United States and of certain other matters pertinent thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.J. Res. 815. Joint resolution providing for the issuance of quarter dollars bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.J. Res. 816. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 817. Joint resolution establishing the John F. Kennedy National Memorial Conference; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. Res. 574. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7152; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 575. Resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of the document entitled, "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 576. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 73; to the Committee on House Administration.

## 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. 9280. A bill for the relief of Donald J. Kent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 9281. A bill for the relief of Oro and Mayer Yahes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9282. A bill for the relief of CWO Edward R. Kreiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9283. A bill for the relief of Pavlos Agos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9284. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims against the United States with respect to the title to certain real property situated in El Dorado County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 9285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Tippitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9286. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 9287. A bill for the relief of Livia Sernini (Cucciat); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9288. A bill for the relief of Marianna V. Aguiar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9289. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Colella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 9290. A bill for the relief of Danny Hiromi Oyama; 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:

462. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Father Edward B. Geyer, Jr., and others, St. Luke's Church, New Haven, Conn., relative to requesting passage of the civil rights and other legislation for which the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy asked for in his program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

463. Also, petition of Maurice R. Franks, Searcy, Ark., to enable and to require the Attorney General to enforce the Communist control legislation of the United States, and to cease the present policy of domestic co-existence with and toleration of the organized forces of evil, which present policy of non-enforcement has enabled the brutal assassination of our President by a known member of the international Communist conspiracy; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday,  
November 26, 1963)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

O Thou changeless God of the changing years: In these so suddenly saddened days, we are conscious that a new page in the Republic's history is being turned and another form sits in the Presidential chair.

We especially pray the benediction of Thy grace upon Thy servant who, after a notable record of public service in this body, crowned by these past years as its President, faces now as Chief Executive

a maddening maze of problems tragic and thorny.

We beseech Thee to strengthen the heart and mind, the hands and lips of our colleague, Lyndon Johnson, as this day to a listening world he sounds the trumpet of his inaugural hope and purpose. As the ship of state plows on through perilous seas, in spite of rock and tempest roar, in spite of false lights on the shore, bring our national barque to the desired haven of peace with victory for truth and justice. Toward this goal, trusting in Thy mercy and might, we press on to meet the vast issues of this day of destiny as in the name of the Lord, our God, we set up our banners.

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

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 25, and Tuesday, November 26, 1963, was dispensed with.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

## THE SENATE AND ITS LEADERSHIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, minutes before the tragedy last Friday, I asked the Senate for unanimous consent that I might be recognized on the following Monday at the conclusion of the morning hour for the purpose of making a statement on the Senate and its leadership. The remarks which I had already prepared at that time were intended to set forth a few facts on the Congress, in order to set straight some of the generalizations and the illusions about the Senate which had been coming from a variety of informed quarters. It was a statement of what has been achieved, not by any genius of the leadership or by some Senate establishment but by the 100 Members of this body working in cooperation and in mutual respect. The statement is, I repeat, the record of 100 Senators. We all share in the responsibility for its achievements as well as for its shortcomings. There have been both achievements and shortcomings and both are recorded in the statement, I hope, in useful perspective and on the basis of fact. I have recorded on the basis of what is tangible in the legislative record not on the basis of what the Senate looks like at 8 at night or whether the Members are driven or

herded or function at their own collective pace and of their own will. After awhile, what the Senate appears to have been in any given period will be noted, if at all, only by the scholars. What the Senate does in a legislative sense in any given period will be felt for a long, long time by all the people of the Nation. We are not here as actors and actresses to be applauded. We are here as Senators to do the business of the Government. It is not we, but it is that alone, in the end, which counts to the Nation.

So, Mr. President, the remarks which I had intended to deliver on Monday last in the nature of an interim report on the Senate and its leadership, now become, because of this overwhelming tragedy, a final report on the Senate and its leadership during the Presidency of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and an indication of what remains to be done under the administration of President Johnson.

In the light of what has happened, I have no heart to read this report to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the statement, "The Senate and Its Leadership," unchanged from the form in which it was as prepared for delivery in the Senate on Monday, November 25, 1963, be printed as though read at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, some days ago blunt words were said on the floor of the Senate. They dealt in critical fashion with the state of this institution. They dealt in critical fashion with the quality of the majority leadership and the minority opposition. A far more important matter than criticism or praise of the leadership was involved. It is a matter which goes to the fundamental nature of the Senate.

In this light, we have reason to be grateful because if what was stated was being said in the cloakrooms, then it should have been said on the floor. If, as was indicated, the functioning of the Senate itself is in question, the place to air that matter is on the floor of the Senate. We need no cloakroom commands, operating behind the swinging doors of the two rooms at the rear, to spread the tidings. We need no whispered word passed from one to another and on to the press.

We are here to do the public's business. On the floor of the Senate, the public's business is conducted in full sight and hearing of the public. And it is here, not in the cloakrooms, that the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, if you wish, will address himself to the question of the present state of the Senate and its leadership. The Senator from Montana has nothing to conceal. He has nothing which is best whispered in the cloakrooms. What he has to say on this score will be said here. It will be said to all Senators and to all the members of the press who sit above us in more ways than one.

How, Mr. President, do you measure the performance of this Congress—any Congress? How do you measure the performance of a Senate of 100 independent men and women—any Senate? The question rarely arises at least until an election approaches. And, then, our con-

cern may well be with our own individual performance and not necessarily with that of the Senate as a whole.

Yet that performance—the performance of the Senate as a whole—has been judged on the floor. Several Senators, at least, judged it and found it seriously wanting. And with the hue and cry thus raised, they found echoes outside the Senate. I do not criticize Senators for making the judgment, for raising the alarm. Even less do I criticize the press for spreading it. Senators were within their rights. And the press was not only within its rights but was performing a segment of its public duty which is to report what transpires here.

I, too, am within my rights, Mr. President, and I believe I am performing a duty of the leadership when I ask again: How do you judge the performance of this Congress—any Congress? Of this Senate—any Senate? Do you mix a concoction and drink it? And if you feel a sense of well-being thereafter decide it is not so bad a Congress after all? But if you feel somewhat ill or depressed then that, indeed, is proof unequivocal that the Congress is a bad Congress and the Senate is a bad Senate. Or do you shake your head back and forth negatively before a favored columnist when discussing the performance of this Senate? And if he, in turn, nods up and down, then that is proof that the performance is bad?

With all due respect, Mr. President, I searched the remarks of the Senators who have raised the questions. I searched them carefully for I do not make light of the criticism of any Member of this body. I searched them carefully for any insight as to how we might judge accurately the performance of this Senate, in order that we might try to improve it.

There is reference, to be sure, to time-wasting, to laziness, to absenteeism, to standing still, and so forth. But who are the timewasters in the Senate, Mr. President? Who is lazy? Who is an absentee? Each Member can make his own judgment of his individual performance. I make no apologies for mine. Nor will I sit in judgment on any other Member. On that score, each of us will answer to his own conscience, if not to his constituents.

But, Mr. President, insofar as the performance of the Senate as a whole is concerned, with all due respect, these comments in timewasting have little relevance. Indeed, the Congress can, as it has—as it did in declaring World War II in less than a day—pass legislation which has the profoundest meaning for the entire Nation. And by contrast, the Senate floor can look very busy day in and day out, month in and month out, while the Senate is, indeed, dawdling. At one time in the recollection of many of us, we debated a civil rights measure 24 hours a day for many days on end. We debated it shaven and unshaven. We debated it without ties, with hair awry and even in bedroom slippers. In the end, we wound up with compromise legislation. And it was not the fresh and well-rested opponents of the civil rights measure who were compelled to

the compromise. It was, rather, the exhausted, sleep-starved quorum-founded proponents who were only too happy to take it.

No, Mr. President, if we would estimate the performance of this Congress or any other, this Senate or any other, we will have to find a more reliable yardstick than whether, on the floor, we act as timewasters or moonlighters. As every Member of the Senate and press knows, even if the public generally does not, the Senate is neither more nor less effective because the Senate is in session from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. or to 9 a.m. the next day. In fact, such hours would most certainly make it less effective in present circumstances.

Nor does the length of the session indicate a greater or lesser effectiveness. We live in a 12-month nation. It may well be that the times are pushing us in the direction of a 12-months Congress. In short, we cannot measure a Congress or a Senate by the standards of the stretchout or of the speedup. It will be of no avail to install a timeclock at the entrance to the Chamber for Senators to punch when they enter or leave the floor.

There has been a great deal said on this floor about featherbedding in certain industries. But if we want to see a featherbedding to end all featherbedding, we will have the Senate sit here day in and day out from dawn until dawn, whether or not the calendar calls for it, in order to impress the boss—the American people—with our industriousness. We may not shuffle papers as bureaucrats are assumed to do when engaged in this art. What we are likely to shuffle is words—words to the President on how to execute the foreign policy or administer the domestic affairs of the Nation. And when these words pall, we undoubtedly will turn to the court to give that institution the benefit of our advice on its responsibilities. And if we run out of judicial wisdom we can always turn to advising the Governors of the States or the mayors of the cities or the heads of other nations on how to manage their concerns.

Let me make it clear that Senators individually have every right to comment on whatever they wish and to do so on the floor of the Senate. Highly significant initiatives on all manner of public affairs have had their genesis in the remarks of individual Senators on the floor. But there is one clearcut, day-in-and-day-out responsibility of the Senate as a whole. Beyond all others, it is the constitutional responsibility to be here and to consider and to act in concert with the House on the legislative needs of the Nation. And the effectiveness with which that responsibility is discharged cannot be measured by any reference to the clocks on the walls of the Chamber.

Nor can it be measured, really, by the output of legislation. For those who are computer-minded, however, the record shows that 12,656 bills and resolutions were introduced in the 79th Congress—1945-46. And in the 87th Congress—1961-62—20,316 bills and resolutions were introduced, an increase of 60 per-

cent. And the records show further that in the 79th Congress 2,117 bills and resolutions were passed and in the 87th 2,217 were passed.

But what do these figures tell us, Mr. President? Do they tell us that the Congress has been doing poorly because in the face of an 8,000 increase in the bi-annual input of bills and resolutions the output of laws 15 years later had increased by only a hundred? They tell us nothing of the kind.

If these figures tell us anything, they tell us that the pressures on Congress have intensified greatly. They suggest, further, that Congress may be resistant to these pressures. But whether Congress resists rightly or wrongly, to the benefit or detriment of the Nation, these figures tell us nothing at all.

There is a refinement in the statistical approach. It may have more meaning than the gross figures in measuring the effectiveness of a Democratic administration. I refer to the approach which is commonly used these days of totaling the Presidential or executive branch requests for significant legislation and weighing against that total the number of congressional responses in the form of law.

On this basis, if the Congress enacts a small percentage of the executive branch requests it is presumed, somewhat glibly and impertinently, to be an ineffective Congress. But if the percentage is high, it follows that it is classifiable as an effective Congress. I am not so sure that I would agree and I am certain that the distinguished minority leader and his party would not agree that that is a valid test. The opposition might measure in precisely the opposite fashion. The opposition might, indeed, find a Democratic Congress which enacted little if any of a Democratic administration's legislation, a paragon among Congresses. And yet I know that the distinguished minority leader does not reason in that fashion for he has acted time and again not to kill administration measures, but to help to pass them when he was persuaded that the interests of the Nation so required.

In any event, the statistics on this score are not calculated to give aid and comfort to those who are in a hurry to mark off this Congress as a failure at the midway. For here, Mr. President, are the facts:

As of November 15, the Executive had submitted 125 legislative recommendations to the 88th Congress, in the form of messages, letters, and communications. In addition, 15 appropriations bills have come down. Thus, the total is 140. But for three of these measures, the executive branch has yet to suggest draft legislation. The working total of Executive requests, therefore, is 137.

Of these measures, 45 have been enacted into law. Two have had conference reports filed and will shortly be enacted. In conference at the present time are six more. And already passed in the Senate and awaiting House action are 26 additional Executive measures. In sum, Mr. President, 79 of the requested 137 Executive measures, or 58 percent of the program, has, in effect,

cleared the Senate. As a Democratic Senator who needs to make no apology to any Member on this side of the aisle for his voting record in support of the President, I, nevertheless, find nothing to brag about in these figures. But neither do I find any grounds for apology as majority leader. I ask any Member to search the RECORD and find in the postwar years, a basis for deprecating the work of the 88th Congress on a statistical basis of this kind. The 88th Congress has yet to run its course but about 60 percent at the midway is not in any sense an inadequate statistical response to the President's program. And I would point out that the figure of laws enacted pursuant to the President's program in the 87th Congress was 68 percent. And I ask the Senate to search the RECORD and find a basis for deprecating the work of that Congress on a statistical analysis of this kind.

In short, I see no basis for apology on statistical grounds either for this Congress to date or for the last. But at the same time, I do not take umbrage in statistics. I do not think that statistics, however refined, tell much of the story of whether or not a particular Congress or Senate is effective or ineffective.

But there is still another test which persuades me that the previous Congress under this administration was and—before it is done in 1964—this Congress will be more than adequate. This test, admittedly, is a subjective one. Yet it may provide a more accurate insight than statistics into what really matters most in any Congress. I refer to the test of history. I refer to the capacity of a Congress—any Congress—to produce what might be called significant legislation of adjustment, legislation which is in consonance with the forces of change which are at work in the Nation and in the world of its time. I refer to the capacity of a Congress to do its part, to do what it must, to keep the Nation attuned to ever-changing national and international realities. I refer to the ability of a Congress to come to grips with those few specific critical issues which confront it and to act constructively on them.

And before it becomes fashionable to hold up to ridicule this Congress and the last as well, it seems to me appropriate to take a look at the historic record in the light of this criterion. It seems to me sensible to isolate from the appearance of things, from the hundreds of things which any Congress does, those few specific measures which past Congresses have enacted, measures which without too much stretch of the imagination may be regarded as significant legislation of adjustment—the legislation which reveals the vitality of a Congress in meeting the needs of the Nation in its time.

The lists which I am about to set forth are arbitrary, to be sure, but any oversights are inadvertent. I welcome any additions to them from other Members who may feel that I have slighted the achievements of any past Congress.

Let me go back, Mr. President, to the 80th Congress, to the first full Congress after the war. What significant legisla-

tion do we find in those years 1947 and 1948? This, Mr. President, is the list:

First. The Congress adopted the Marshall plan and other urgent foreign aid programs.

Second. It legislated the unification of the Armed Forces.

Third. It ratified the peace treaties with Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

Fourth. It ratified the Inter-American Treaty.

Fifth. It added the peril point concept to reciprocal trade.

Sixth. It adopted a peacetime selective service act.

Seventh. It passed the Taft-Hartley Act.

Eighth. It balanced the budget and passed an income tax reduction bill, the Revenue Act of 1948.

Ninth. It enacted the Presidential Succession Act as well as the presidential term amendment.

That is the record of that Congress, of the significant legislation of the 80th Congress, of a Republican Congress in a Democratic administration. It is not an unimpressive record, Mr. President, especially for a so-called do-nothing Congress.

What of the 81st, of the years 1949–50, Mr. President, of a Democratic Congress in a Democratic administration? This is the list:

First. It expanded social security.

Second. It authorized Federal aid for the construction of housing for middle income families.

Third. It set up the National Science Foundation.

Fourth. It enacted Federal aid to education for impacted areas.

Fifth. It authorized aid to Yugoslavia.

Sixth. It raised taxes.

Seventh. It passed the Internal Security Act.

Eighth. It removed the peril-point concept from reciprocal trade.

Ninth. It continued substantial foreign aid programs.

Tenth. The Senate made cloture more difficult to invoke.

On the basis of this list can we say with certainty that it was better than the 80th Congress—of the so-called “do-nothing Congress”—but the Congress which, nevertheless, enacted the Marshall plan?

Here is the list of the legislation of adjustment for the 82d Congress; for the years 1951–1952:

First. It appropriated \$179.2 billion, more money than any peacetime Congress in history.

Second. It raised taxes to the highest peacetime level.

Third. It passed the first universal military training bill in history.

Fourth. It approved the stationing of troops in Europe.

Fifth. It increased certain social security payments.

Sixth. It passed a GI bill for Korean veterans.

Seventh. It restored the peril point concept to reciprocal trade.

Eighth. It continued substantial foreign aid programs.

And so, Mr. President, we come to the first Eisenhower Congress, the 83d, for

the years 1953 and 1954. Here is the list for these 2 years:

First. Its first order of significant business was to confirm the titles of the States—as against the Federal Government—to submerged tidelands, to the repository of a substantial share of the Nation's resources in petroleum.

Second. It acquiesced in reorganization plans for the executive branch which grew out of the Hoover Commission of the previous Democratic administration.

Third. It overhauled tax laws.

Fourth. It enacted flexible price supports in five basic crops and reduced dairy supports.

Fifth. It made certain extensions in social security coverage and increased the benefits.

Sixth. It authorized construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Seventh. It defeated the Bricker amendment.

Eighth. It terminated Federal rent control.

Ninth. It continued substantial foreign aid programs.

Tenth. The Senate censured Senator McCarthy.

Eleventh. It created a Small Business Administration.

Twelfth. It passed the Communist Control Act of 1954 which outlawed the Communist Party.

In the 84th Congress, a 1955–56 Democratic Congress under a Republican administration here is the list:

First. It authorized the President to defend Formosa and the Pescadores.

Second. It ratified the SEATO Treaty.

Third. It raised minimum wages from 75 cents an hour to \$1.

Fourth. It passed a housing bill.

Fifth. It set up the soil bank.

Sixth. It established under social security a new program for the disabled and reduced the eligibility age for women from 65 to 62.

Seventh. It authorized grants for medical research facilities.

Eighth. It set in motion a 13-year, \$30 billion roadbuilding program.

Ninth. It authorized construction of an atomic merchant ship.

Tenth. It continued substantial foreign aid programs.

For the 85th, 1957–58, here is the list of the legislation of adjustment:

First. It established the Space Agency.

Second. It approved a major military reorganization.

Third. It extended unemployment benefits for 16 weeks.

Fourth. It authorized a national defense education program.

Fifth. It increased social security benefits.

Sixth. It came to the aid of the railroads with a loan-guarantee program.

Seventh. It voted Alaska statehood.

Eighth. It enacted an emergency Housing Act.

Ninth. It legislated a requirement for full disclosure of pension funds.

Tenth. It passed a Mideast resolution.

Eleventh. It approved the first civil rights measure in 82 years.

Twelfth. It approved the atoms-for-peace program under the new International Atomic Energy Agency.

Thirteenth. It continued substantial foreign aid programs.

Then, Mr. President, for the last Eisenhower Congress, the 86th, 1959–60, here is the record:

First. It passed another civil rights bill.

Second. It authorized another housing program with emphasis on low-cost housing.

Third. It authorized funds for the study of mass transit problems.

Fourth. It ratified the Antarctic Treaty.

Fifth. It began a new program of aid for Latin America.

Sixth. It approved Hawaiian statehood.

Seventh. It approved a Labor-Management Disclosure Act.

Eighth. It approved a constitutional amendment giving the vote in presidential elections to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Ninth. It continued foreign aid programs.

Tenth. The Senate restored the cloture rule to what it had been in 1948—to two-thirds present and voting rather than to a constitutional two-thirds.

That is the record, Mr. President, of the Congress from the end of World War II to the inception of the Kennedy administration. When all else recedes into history, when the newspapers of the times yellow on the library shelves, when all years roll into the good old days, these are the measures, beyond the routine, which will count in terms of the shaping of the Nation and of its place in the world. And it is largely on the basis of this legislation of adjustment that the historical judgments will be made. The number of significant measures is not great in these pre-Kennedy Congresses. The range is from 7 or so in the 2 years of the 80th Congress to a high of 13 or so during the 2 years of the exceptional 85th Congress under the leadership of the distinguished Vice President, Mr. Johnson. For the most part, each 2 years witnessed the enactment of a total of eight or nine items and most of them elaborations or variations on themes already set in preceding years.

We come now, Mr. President, to the record of the 87th Congress, the first Congress of the Kennedy administration. Here, then, is the comparable list.

First. It passed the omnibus farm bill to reduce surpluses and to provide for a new land use adjustment program.

Second. It authorized a program of health aid for migrant farm workers.

Third. It extended unemployment benefits an additional 13 weeks.

Fourth. It provided a program of aid to dependent children of the unemployed.

Fifth. It increased minimum wages from \$1 to \$1.25 and extended coverage to several million additional workers.

Sixth. It established the area redevelopment program.

Seventh. It increased old-age insurance benefits and provided for retire-

ment of men at 62 and liberalized disability payments.

Eighth. It authorized almost \$5 billion in new funds under the Omnibus Housing Act.

Ninth. It extended the efforts to control water pollution.

Tenth. It established the manpower training program.

Eleventh. It accelerated the public works program by an authorization of \$900 million.

Twelfth. It made a significant revision in the tax structure.

Thirteenth. It authorized direct loans for housing for the elderly.

Fourteenth. It provided for voluntary pensions plans under the tax laws.

Fifteenth. It enacted the trade expansion program.

Sixteenth. It passed the communications satellite bill.

Seventeenth. It established the Peace Corps.

Eighteenth. It established the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Nineteenth. It created the U.S. Travel Service.

Twentieth. It authorized the purchase of U.N. bonds to save that organization from bankruptcy.

Twenty-first. It initiated a Federal program on juvenile delinquency.

Twenty-second. It provided a program of aid for educational TV in the schools and colleges.

Twenty-third. It ratified the Treaty of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Twenty-fourth. It approved a constitutional amendment abolishing the poll tax.

Twenty-fifth. It passed a substantial aid bill.

Twenty-sixth. The Senate invoked cloture for the first time in several decades.

Mr. President, I will not draw comparisons between the 87th Congress and those which preceded it. Each Congress has its own challenges. Each does the best it can. But I will say to every Member of this body, this is the record that counts most. This is the record which you made.

It is not the record of the majority leader or the minority leader. It is the Senate's record and as the Senator from Montana, I, for one, will not make light of these achievements in the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration. And the achievement is no less because the 87th Congress did not meet at all hours of the night, because it rarely titillated the galleries or because it failed to impress the visiting newsmen and columnists.

And now, Mr. President, we come to the 88th Congress, and particularly to this Senate. We come to this Senate, which some have already consigned to the wasteheaps of history. We come to its leadership, which some find is to be pitied, if, indeed, it is not to be scorned.

Here, Mr. President, I will include in the list—in the list of the significant legislation of adjustment—not only the measures which have cleared the Congress but also items which have at

least cleared the Senate and are awaiting final action. Congress is not for 1 year. It is for 2. What this Congress will in the end produce we cannot say until this Congress comes to an end some time in 1964. But to date in this Congress and in this Senate, here is the list:

First. It has initiated a program which begins to recognize the full dimensions of major health problems of the Nation and to come to grips with them—mental illness and mental retardation.

Second. It has expanded Federal aid for maternal and child health services and for crippled children.

Third. It has acted to forestall what would otherwise have been a crippling railroad shutdown.

Fourth. It has acted to provide for a vast expansion in training and research facilities in medicine, dentistry, and related sciences.

Fifth. It has acted to expand academic facilities in higher education through grants and loans for construction.

Sixth. It has acted to expand vocational education and extended for 3 years the National Defense Education Act and the impacted areas program.

Seventh. It has acted on the problem of mass transit.

Eighth. It has acted to establish a Domestic Peace Corps.

Ninth. It has acted to establish a system of Federal public defenders.

Tenth. It has acted to create a Youth Conservation Corps.

Eleventh. It has acted on a water resources research program.

Twelfth. It has acted to preserve wilderness areas.

Thirteenth. It has acted to expand the area redevelopment program.

Fourteenth. It has acted on the problems of air and water pollution.

Fifteenth. It has authorized a substantial foreign aid program.

Sixteenth. It has given consent to the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty.

That is the record, Mr. President, at the halfway mark in the 88th Congress. And once again I will leave it to others who are so inclined to draw comparisons with past Congresses. But I will say that no Senator need be ashamed of this record. The record is no less a record because it has taken 10 months of work to achieve. It is no less a record because it has been produced by cooperation, because the leadership yields no whip and seeks no whip to wield. And the record is for 1 year not for the 2 to which every Congress is entitled.

However this midway Congress may compare with what has gone before, the leadership would be the first to recognize that there are inadequacies in it. And the most serious, in my judgment, are neither the status of the civil rights bill nor the tax bill. The most serious, in my judgment, have to do with the day-to-day financial housekeeping of the Government. We have got to face the fact that if we are going to have an orderly fiscal administration of this Government we cannot long continue with the practice of raising every few months, as a ritual, the legal debt ceiling. Nor

can we expect a rational administration of the vast and farflung activities of the executive branch of the Government if the basic appropriations bills do not become law until months after the fiscal year begins.

I do not know where the answer to these problems lies. I do not blame the House and I most certainly cannot blame the Senate which must await the completion of House action on legislation of this type before considering it. And how the Senate is going to discharge its constitutional responsibilities on appropriations bills by July 1, the beginning of the fiscal year, when some of the bills do not reach the Senate until long after June 30, I do not know. This year, for example, the District of Columbia appropriations arrived in the Senate committee on July 15. The military construction appropriation has just arrived. And the foreign aid appropriation has not even yet started its journey to the Senate.

I want to say again that I do not place the responsibility for this breakdown on the House and even less do I place it on the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Whatever the causes, and they are varied, the problem is still there. It has been growing worse over the years and if it is not faced soon, it will be a standing invitation to national financial chaos. Perhaps, what the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has suggested on occasion, along the lines of dividing the initiative on appropriations measures between the House and Senate may provide at least a partial solution. Perhaps, what the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has proposed in the way of a division of the congressional year between a legislative and an appropriating session may be helpful. Or perhaps the problem is even more fundamental. Perhaps, it is the persistence of the illusion of a 7 months Congress in a 12 months nation which is at the root of the difficulty and with this illusion, the incongruity of a June 30 fiscal closing in a December 31 government and nation.

Whatever the difficulty, we are and have been for some years, I repeat, on a course of increasing disorderliness in the management of the fundamental fiscal affairs of the Government. I, for one, would welcome an initiative from the administration and the relevant committees looking to the establishment of a special commission to explore this problem and to come up with recommendations for its solution. The job needs to be done and it needs to be done quickly.

If the Senate is not wholly at fault with regard to the appropriations situation, neither is it wholly at fault with regard to such measures as health care and the tax bill. I deeply regret the fact that the tax bill to which the President rightly attaches such great importance has yet to be considered and disposed of. But, again, Mr. President, I will not point the finger of a prejudiced scorn at the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Again, the Constitution and the practice require the

House to complete its work on a measure of this kind before the Senate begins consideration. And the House was 8 long months in completing action on the tax bill. I do not criticize the House. That body has its responsibilities. It may be that it was illusory in the first place to anticipate a rapid consideration of a bill of this complexity.

And if I do not criticize the House, I most certainly will not criticize the Finance Committee of the Senate if it, as it will, in a far shorter time, reports this bill to the Senate. May I say, further, that regardless of his personal attitude on this bill, I have every confidence that the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. BYRD] will report it as quickly as the work of his committee can be completed.

Here again, Mr. President, as in the case of appropriations, we have got to face the fact that the Congress, under the Constitution and its established procedures, is not basically equipped to respond, to reach a decision one way or another on urgent matters which go to the heart of our national economic structure. And in all honesty, we have got to face the fact that in this instance, a failure to respond with some degree of urgency to an urgent Presidential request consigns to the Congress—to the whole Congress—a great responsibility for whatever consequences flow to the Nation from this failure.

I turn next, Mr. President, to the civil rights measure. Here, too, Mr. President, there has been a prolonged delay in coming to grips with an issue which the President placed before us on the basis of urgency. Insofar as this delay is attributable to the Senate, I assume full responsibility. It has been the announced intention of the leadership to await a bill from the House on this measure rather than to seek to proceed independently on a separate Senate bill. The hope was to simplify and to reduce the procedural gamut which—as every Member knows—must be run by any such bill in the Congress and, particularly, in the Senate. The hope was that by awaiting House action we would have been enabled—as a body—to face this issue, as indeed it must be faced, whole and directly, on its merits and resolve it more quickly.

But the House action has been a long time in coming. It may be that, in the end, the leadership will have to suggest alternative approaches to the Senate. However that may be, the issue will be faced and it will be faced whole by this Senate in this Congress. Regardless of political consequences, we cannot ignore, we cannot turn our back on a matter whose long neglect has not only brought us to the edge of and over the edge of street-violence, but an issue which has seared the conscience of the Nation deeply and opened up fundamental questions which we have not heretofore had the courage or the inclination to ask ourselves.

That is the story of the legislative state of the Congress during the Kennedy administration and, particularly, of the Senate, as the majority leader sees

it. It is a barebones story, without embellishment. It is a story written by all the Members and not by the leadership. It is a story of the facts—the significant and enduring facts—as one Senator sees them at the midpoint of the 88th Congress.

Let me turn briefly, now, to another matter, to the matter which is before the Rules Committee, a matter which has cast a shadow of uncertainty over the Senate. I do not presume to look down upon any man from some Olympian height of a superior morality. Most certainly will I not do so when we ourselves are largely to blame for the difficulties which have arisen because it is we who are responsible as a body and we provided little guidance in these matters to staff officials of the Senate. Can we say in good conscience that we made it clear that in the Senate we demanded more of ourselves and, hence, expected more of all those associated with us in the higher interests of this institution and the nation which it serves?

That, Mr. President, is the deeper question which is before the Rules Committee. And the answer which we give to it will affect this institution more deeply and for a long time after the sensationalism of the moment is forgotten.

I turn, finally, to the recent criticism which has been raised as to the quality of the leadership. I do not question the right of anyone to raise this question—certainly not the right of the Senate and the press, to do so. I regard every Member with respect and esteem and every Member in his own way has reciprocated that sentiment, and I am sure that no Member intends to do me ill. As for the press, it has been invariably fair, even kind, in its treatment of me personally. I have never been misquoted on any remarks I have made in the Senate and only on rare occasions have I been misinterpreted and, even then, understandably so.

Of late, Mr. President, the descriptions of the majority leader, of the Senator from Montana, have ranged from a benign Mr. Chips, to glamourless, to tragic mistake. I have not yet seen "wetnurse of the Senate" but that, too, may not be long in coming.

It is true, Mr. President, that I have taught school, although I cannot claim either the tenderness, the understanding, or the perception of Mr. Chips for his charges. I confess freely to a lack of glamour. As for being a tragic mistake, if that means, Mr. President, that I am neither a circus ringmaster, the master of ceremonies of a Senate night club, a tamer of Senate lions, or a wheeler and dealer, then I must accept, too, that title. Indeed, I must accept it, if I am expected as majority leader to be anything other than myself—a Senator from Montana who has had the good fortune to be trusted by his people for over two decades and done the best he knows how to represent them, and to do what he believes to be right for the Nation.

Insofar as I am personally concerned, these or any other labels can be borne. I achieved the height of my political ambitions when I was elected Senator from Montana. When the Senate saw fit to

designate me as majority leader, it was the Senate's choice not mine, and what the Senate has bestowed, it is always at liberty to revoke.

But so long as I have this responsibility, it will be discharged to the best of my ability by me as I am. I would not, even if I could, presume to a tough-mindedness which, with all due respect to those who use this cliché, I have always had difficulty in distinguishing from soft-headedness or simple-mindedness. I shall not don any Mandarin's robes or any skin other than that to which I am accustomed in order that I may look like a majority leader or sound like a majority leader—however a majority leader is supposed to look or sound. I am what I am and no title, political facelifter, or imagemaker can alter it.

I believe that I am, as are most Senators, an ordinary American with a normal complement of vices and, I hope, virtues, of weaknesses and, I hope, strengths. As such, I do my best to be courteous, decent, and understanding of others and sometimes fail at it. But it is for the Senate to decide whether these characteristics are incompatible with the leadership.

I have tried to treat others as I would like to be treated and almost invariably have been. And it is for the Senate to decide, too, whether that characteristic is incompatible with the Senate leadership.

I have done my best to serve the people whom I represent and, at the same time, to exercise such independent judgment as I may have as to what is best for the Nation as a whole, on national and international issues. If that is incompatible with the Senate leadership that, too, is for the Senate to decide.

I have always felt that the President of the United States—whoever he may be—is entitled to the dignity of his office and is worthy of the respect of the Senate. I have always felt that he bears a greater burden of responsibility than any individual Senator for the welfare and security of the Nation, for he, alone, can speak for the Nation abroad; and he alone, at home, stands with the Congress as a whole, as constituted representatives of the entire American people. In the exercise of his grave responsibilities, I believe we have a profound responsibility to give him whatever understanding and support we can, in good conscience and in conformity with our independent duties. I believe we owe it to the Nation of which all our States are a part—particularly in matters of foreign relations—to give to him not only responsible opposition but responsible cooperation. If these concepts, too, are incompatible with the majority leadership, then that, too, is for the Senate to decide.

And, finally, within this body I believe that every Member ought to be equal in fact, no less than in theory, that they have a primary responsibility to the people whom they represent to face the legislative issues of the Nation. And to the extent that the Senate may be inadequate in this connection, the remedy lies not, in the seeking of shortcuts, not in the cracking of nonexistent whips,

not in wheeling and dealing, but in an honest facing of the situation and a resolution of it by the Senate itself, by accommodation, by respect for one another, by mutual restraint and, as necessary, adjustments in the procedures of this body.

I have been charged with lecturing the Senate. And perhaps these remarks will also be interpreted in this fashion. But all I have tried to do is state the facts of this institution as I see them. The constitutional authority and responsibility does not lie with the leadership. It lies with all of us individually, collectively, and equally. And in the last analysis, deviations from that principle must in the end act to the detriment of the institution. And, in the end, that principle cannot be made to prevail by rules. It can prevail only if there is a high degree of accommodation, mutual restraint and a measure of courage—in spite of our weaknesses—in all of us. It can prevail only, if we recognize that, in the end, it is not the Senators as individuals who are of fundamental importance. In the end, it is the institution of the Senate. It is the Senate itself as one of the foundations of the Constitution. It is the Senate as one of the rocks of the Republic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at the end of the statement, a detailed, item-by-item record of the action on President Kennedy's legislative recommendations, as it has been taken either by the Congress as a whole or by the Senate alone. I also ask unanimous consent that the press interview on the state of the Senate and its leadership which I gave on November 13, 1963, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

#### THE SENATE AND ITS LEADERSHIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last week I was interviewed in my office by Mr. Jerry O'Leary, of the Washington Star; Mr. Richard Dudman, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Mr. J. F. Ter Horst, of the Detroit News; and Mr. George R. Kentera, of the Newark News. A condensation of this interview, I assume, appeared in their Sunday papers. The condensation, which was necessitated by space limitations in the papers, was made by the interviewers. It is, in my judgment, faithful to the sense and tone of the interview, and it had my approval. But a condensation can never be the full story. And insofar as the Senate is concerned, it ought to have the full story. The reporters who conducted the interview were aware of and approved my intention of placing the full verbatim text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD subsequent to the publication of the condensation.

I shall do so today. I want the record to be clear and complete as to my attitude on the questions which have been expressed of late on this Senate and its leadership. This interview may not be the last word which I shall have to say on the subject. But because the interview was wholly spontaneous and conducted by highly skilled reporters, it provides an authentic indication of what the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, thinks on subjects which are or ought to be of concern—of very deep concern—to every Member of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the verbatim transcript of the interview to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

"INTERVIEW WITH HON. MIKE MANSFIELD, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA, 2 P.M., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1963, ROOM S-208, THE CAPITOL

*"Proceedings*

"Question. Senator MANSFIELD, there has been a lot said on the Senate floor and in the newspapers about the quality of leadership in the Senate. Since leadership is frequently measured by what is or is not accomplished, can you tell us how you view the record of the Senate under your leadership?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, as far as the analysis of the leadership or a leader is concerned, that is up to each individual to decide as to whether it is good, bad, or indifferent. But I think the final test is what the Senate has done.

"I would say that the Senate, up to this time, has made a very respectable record, and for this the Senate should get credit. As far as the Congress is concerned, we have completed action on 43 pieces of legislation out of 128, including appropriations, asked for by the President this year.

"In addition to that, 24 other measures, which have been recommended by the President, have passed the Senate. One measure has a conference report filed and will be brought up some time after the aid bill is out of the way.

"There are four measures in conference between the two Houses. That brings us to a total of 72 items passed either by the Congress as a whole or by the Senate, or in conference. Out of a total of 128 Presidential recommendations this year, and that is the total of the Presidential recommendations, that would give us an average of 58 percent up to this moment.

"Question. Senator, could you break those down as to whether they are major pieces or minor pieces, and what are some of the measures that have been passed by the Senate?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, there have been a number of important measures passed. For example, the Defense Appropriations Act is one. That amounted to about \$47 to \$48 billion. Equal pay for women, the feed grains bill, housing for the elderly, medical education aid, a mental health bill of tremendous importance; maternal and child health services, military construction, military pay, the nuclear test ban treaty, the public debt ceiling has been attended to twice, the difficult railroad labor dispute has been settled at least on a temporary basis until next March 1.

"We have repealed the Silver Purchase Act; passed six treaties in addition to the nuclear test ban treaty. In conference we have the Pacific Northwest power bill, the vocational education bill, which is quite important. Out of conference and ready to come up we have the higher education bill, which is also of major significance.

"All those bills, of course, are not major, but I would point out that in all the Presidential recommendations, as I see the picture now, there remain only three bills which could be considered of really major significance. They are, of course, the tax bill, the civil rights bill, and the health care for the aged bill.

"Question. Senator, do you think it will be possible in the time that is left before Christmas to get action on either of those two big ones, the tax or civil rights?

"Senator MANSFIELD. The best I can say at this time is that I am hopeful that one or the other will be brought up before Christmas.

"Question. In the Senate?

"Senator MANSFIELD. In the Senate.

"Question. As the priority determines, Senator, the civil rights bill will probably have to be first?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Whichever one is ready first we will take up.

"Question. Senator DIRKSEN estimated yesterday it would be March 15 before the Finance Committee gets the tax bill out on the floor. Does it look that far away to you?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Maybe Senator DIRKSEN is being a little too pessimistic. It is my understanding that the hearings will conclude on the tax bill on December 13.

"I would assume they would take several weeks to mark up that bill, which would indicate that it might be available sometime after the first of the year for action on the Senate floor.

"So I would hope that if we do not get a civil rights bill in between, that we would be ready to take up the tax bill shortly after New Year's.

"Question. Senator, it has been generally said and understood that the Congress will probably adjourn on December 20. Do you anticipate the civil rights bill could come up before then? If so, wouldn't that prolong the session due to lengthy debate?

"Senator MANSFIELD. No. If the civil rights bill does come up before then, we will take it up, but we will go out at the conclusion of business on December 20 and we will not come back until the day after New Year's.

"I see no reason to keep the Senate in during the Christmas and New Year's holidays. After all, this is only the 1st session of the 88th Congress. We have another session. There is no breakoff. There is no final adjournment. We have the time to do the work which will have to be done.

"Question. Senator, do you think from now on Congress, because of the growth of the country and so on, is going to be in session all year, or do you think they might do something that would shorten the sessions in the future?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I would hope that they could shorten sessions or prepare themselves to operate on a year-round basis. But if they are going to shorten the sessions, they are going to have to bring about some reforms in the rules of the Senate pertaining to germaneness. They will have to do something about the fact that the Finance Committee in the Senate cannot take up a measure such as the tax bill, for example, until the House Ways and Means Committee is through with it and it has passed that body.

"I believe the time taken on that bill in the other House was approximately 9 months this year. That applies to other bills out of the House Ways and Means Committee, too.

"Question. The custom applies that to appropriations also, does it not?

"Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. Some people say that the House has a constitutional right. I think that is a debatable question. But I would think that a formula based on what Senator RUSSELL proposed some months ago, to the effect that consideration be given to half the bills originating in each House, is worthy of consideration, or at least that we could start hearings at the same time the other body does.

"The same reasoning applies to bills out of the Ways and Means Committee because, unfortunately, the Senate is blamed all too often for delays when, as a matter of fact, we are unable to act in our committees until the opposite committees in the House have acted on the legislation under consideration.

"Question. Except for those difficulties you have mentioned, are you generally satisfied with the pace of business in the Senate this year?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Yes; I am satisfied. I think that the Senate as a whole has done a very creditable job. I think you only have to look at the calendar to find out that we are pretty well caught up.

"If you will check with the individual committees, except for the Finance and the Appropriations Committees, and for reasons beyond their control, you will find that they have been on the ball pretty much all year. Contrary to popular reports, a good deal of really responsible legislation has been reported out of the committees, has been considered by the Senate, and has been passed.

"Question. Senator, in view of that, you would think that most of the Members of the Senate would share your pride in what has been accomplished and wouldn't be indulging in some of the criticisms of other Members of the Senate that we had last week?

"To what would you attribute this restlessness or backbiting, or whatever it can be described as?

"Senator MANSFIELD. I think the Members are getting a little restless, a little edgy. It has been a long session. It hasn't been a dramatic or glamorous session. There are other responsibilities which impinge upon the activities of the Members of this body. But I would say that by and large, there are very few Members who would be willing to stand up and state that they are dissatisfied with the progress of the Senate.

"I have heard a lot about these cloakroom rumors. I am afraid that most of these cloakroom rumors come out of the imaginations and the speculations of members of the press. I have yet to see one of these cloakroom commandos that they talk about, and if there are any I wish they would come to me and make their views known, and, as far as I am concerned, would get up on the Senate floor and do the same thing.

"Question. Senator, it is frequently said that you believe in dealing with other Senators as one adult to another and that not all Members of the Senate are prepared for that treatment and really would like to have their arms twisted now and then.

"Senator MANSFIELD. I would disagree completely. I think this is a body of mature men and women. They want to be treated as equals. They are. I expect to be treated by them as I treat them, and I am.

"Question. Senator MANSFIELD, what are your feelings about the resolution introduced the other day by Senator PROXMIER, of Wisconsin, that the leadership of both Houses should get together and try to expedite the business of the second session of this Congress?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think that psychologically it may have some effect, but practically it would have none. After all, what power do the leaders have to force these committees, to twist their arms, to wheel and deal, and so forth and so on, to get them to rush things up or to speed their procedure?

"The leaders in the Senate, at least, have no power delegated to them except on the basis of courtesy, accommodation, and a sense of responsibility. I see nothing to be gained by it. I see nothing to be lost by the introduction of that particular resolution.

"Question. Sir, did I understand you to say that it wouldn't help if the committees decided not to go along? You did say there is nothing you can do about the committee pace; is that right?

"Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. We can ask the committees, and I have had four or five meetings this year with committee chairmen, for reports on their work. I have asked them to speed up their procedures on certain pieces of legislation.

"They have been most cooperative. There has been no dilatoriness that I am aware of, and despite reports to the contrary I have seen no evidence of any delaying action on the part of the southerners; nor have I seen any evidence of delay on the part of Senator BYRD, whose committee is considering the

tax bill at the moment. As a matter of fact, on at least three or four occasions over the past 5 or 6 months Senator BYRD has come to me and asked me to see if there wasn't some way the House could speed up the tax bill so that his committee could get started on it.

"He also stated that he thought that they could finish their consideration of the bill in the vicinity of 6 weeks. That has been extended, but I would be the last one in the world to question HARRY BYRD's good faith as some have.

"Question. That 6 or 8 weeks would be measured against 8 or 9 months in the House, wouldn't it?

"Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. A lot of people do not take that comparison into consideration.

"Question. Senator, do you think the Magnuson plan would help in the future, of having two sessions a year?

"Senator MANSFIELD. I certainly do. I have advocated it for a long time because what Senator MAGNUSON's proposal would do would be to have a legislative session and an appropriation session.

"At the present time, what we do is to sandwich the appropriation bills, some of them, way up in the tens of billions of dollars between other legislative proposals. We do not give them the attention they deserve. Consequently, I think we are subject to the charge of hasty and ill-considered legislation, although I must admit in all honesty that we do depend upon committees to a large extent, and we are fairly certain that the committees go into the necessary details and we can take their reports and their recommendations with good heart.

"Question. Senator, what would be necessary to bring this about?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Just the passage of the Magnuson proposal, which I understand is in the Rules Committee, if it has been introduced this year. I am not certain.

"Question. He told me the other day he was going to ask the Rules Committee to look into it in the coming session.

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I would like to see it reported out. I would like to see it passed, because while tradition is a great thing in the Senate and I believe in it, I think that as times change the Senate has to change, too. This is one way that we could change.

"I think we also ought to reduce the number necessary to invoke cloture from two-thirds of those present and voting to three-fifths. I think we ought to follow Senator PASTORE's idea of a rule of germaneness for the first 4 or 5 hours each day, and I think we ought to do something about the authority which each individual Senator has to object to unanimous-consent requests.

"The times call for a change. Changes must be made without undermining the foundations of the Senate as an institution. But with the questions coming before us in this day and age I think that changes are mandatory, though I would not go as far as some of our Members would recommend.

"Question. When you spoke of unanimous consent a while ago, did you mean to a committee meeting or unanimous consent on anything?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think we have to be a little selective. To committee meetings, for example. There is no reason why committee meetings cannot meet on many occasions while the Senate is in session. In that way, committee work could be speeded up and legislation could be brought to the floor that much more quickly and possibly as a result in the overall picture the Congress could adjourn that much sooner. But any Senator has the right to object to any kind of a unanimous-consent request, and I think that that gives too much power to any one Senator in a 100-Member body.

"Question. Senator, do you think a majority of the Senators feel this way about it, as you do, and that such a thing could be passed?

"Senator MANSFIELD. I think at times they feel that way, depending on the circumstances. But I think it would be worth a test on the Senate floor and then we would see what the Senate would feel. No one could tell at the moment.

"Question. In connection with the pace of the Senate and the matter of getting work done, in the last session, in the 87th, there was considerable criticism that the White House had been too heavyhanded on the Hill. This session some of us have heard comments from Members indicating that the President and his advisers have not been there when their help was needed.

"How do you feel about this question of pressure or lack of it or coordination between the Senate and the White House?

"Senator MANSFIELD. I have had nothing but the utmost in cooperation insofar as Senate-White House relations are concerned. They have never been heavyhanded. They have been understanding and they have realized that we have our responsibilities.

"As far as I am concerned personally, I have nothing but words of praise for the relationship which exists between the White House and this body.

"Question. One complaint we hear sometimes is that the scheduling of votes is so uncertain that Senators can't tell when it is safe to be out of town and miss a rollcall vote.

"Do you consider that the responsibility of the leadership, to try to group these votes and make the schedule known in advance?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Insofar as possible. I must say I have been at fault many times in that respect. But when you have people, colleagues, come to you two or three times a week and say, 'Please don't bring up this bill on that day,' 'Please don't vote at this hour,' 'I have an engagement out home and I can't be here,' it places the leadership in a very difficult position, because the leadership cannot tell a Member to stay on the floor. He can ask the Members to stay on the floor, but they can thumb their noses at him and they do it quite often.

"As I said before, the leadership has no real power, none at all. He has to operate on the basis of persuasion, accommodation, understanding, but he has to expect something like that in return. But all too often Members have come to me, and on occasion some have even threatened me, that they didn't want votes at a certain time or on a certain day, that they had engagements back home or they wanted to go some place for some reason, and—very rarely—if I did not accommodate them, well, they would see that there was a lot of talk and no action would be taken on the floor and so forth and so on.

"So the result is we have to try and get along with our colleagues on the best possible basis and do the best we can to keep the wheels of legislation running. Keep in mind the fact that there is always other legislation to be considered and that you need this vote, that vote and all these votes. It isn't easy. You are subject to criticism.

"I have bent perhaps too often to extend favors of this nature to my colleagues. I have been criticized. The criticism is justified. But I do not know how else to operate if the Members themselves do not show a sense of maturity and recognize the fact that their job is here, to represent the people and their States, and that their engagements are of secondary importance.

"Question. Is there too much absenteeism in the Senate?

"Senator MANSFIELD. There is.

"Question. Sir, it seems inevitable that if and when the civil rights bill comes up in

the Senate there is going to be a filibuster of some kind. I think you are aware that in the past there has been some criticism of you on the grounds you haven't held people's feet to the fire, so to speak, and kept them up all night.

"Senator MANSFIELD. I don't intend to. This is not a circus or a sideshow. We are not operating in a pit with spectators coming into the galleries late at night to see Senators of the Republic come out in bedroom slippers, without neckties, with hair uncombed, and pajama tops sticking out of their necks.

"I believe there is a certain amount of dignity and decorum attached to this institution and to the position that each of us hold. Regardless of the consequences, as far as I am concerned, that dignity will be upheld and the best interests of this institution will be looked after as long as I happen to be the leader.

"Question. You would rather see the rules modernized than go to an endurance contest?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Of course. Who wins in an endurance contest? Not the older members, not those who may be under medical treatment. But the minority wins, because they are well disciplined; they know what they are doing. They operate on a 4-hour-shift basis. Some of those who are always spouting off and talking about how much they are for civil rights, this, that, or the other thing, where are they when you want them? When you want a quorum call? They are not around.

"So as far as being a whipcracker or a coordinator for a Roman holiday, count me out.

"Question. Senator, it sounds as though you are making a good case for the proposition that being a Senator is a full-time job.

"Senator MANSFIELD. It is, and it is getting to be more and more of a full-time job. I wish my colleagues would all realize it. Most of them do, fortunately, but not all of them.

"Question. Do you think, sir, that in light of the fact that you think it is a full-time job that the Senate should undertake, or the Congress should undertake, to establish some kind of code of ethics which it expects of the executive branch, so that Members will not have outside financial and business interests which might interfere with their duties here?

"Senator MANSFIELD. That is a question which I do not feel that I am qualified to answer for the Senate. But I do feel I am qualified to answer personally. As far as I personally am concerned, yes.

"Question. What would be the nature of such a code of ethics?

"Senator MANSFIELD. As far as I am concerned, speaking personally, not for the Senate, I think it should list outside stockholdings and other business interests, as has been done by Senators CLARK, YOUNG of Ohio, SCOTT of Pennsylvania, and perhaps others.

"I recall several years ago when Senator CLARK listed his outside interests. I listed mine. It was very easy. I had none.

"Question. How difficult would it be to get Congress as a whole to require disclosure of that sort?

"Senator MANSFIELD. That is something that the Congress, itself, should consider, and I personally would not want to talk on it except as it affects me personally.

"Question. Sir, do you think personally that this would increase the confidence of the voters of this country in their elected representatives?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Not necessarily, because I think that there are those who, if their holdings were common knowledge, would be looked upon with suspicion every time they voted on a certain kind of measure.

"As far as I am concerned, I think that the Senate is a very honest body. I think the individual Members of the Senate are honest representatives of the people. I would not want suspicion to be cast upon them, because after having observed them for several decades now I have nothing but the highest admiration for the membership of this body, not only today but as it existed down through the years that I have been here, and that applies to both Republicans and Democrats.

"Question. But the Congress seems to point this suspicion toward people who are selected for executive jobs in the administration by its actions.

"Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. I have felt for a long time that the Congress has carried this idea of conflict of interest entirely too far as regards Presidential appointees. A nominee should not be considered dishonest because a particular administration wants him to undertake a particular job.

"The result is we cast guilt on these people who appear before our committees in the process of nomination, unwittingly, of course. We make them strip themselves of their stocks which might come in conflict. I think it is very unfair. I think if a man is brought into Government he should be considered honest until proven otherwise. He should be looked into thoroughly before they are appointed, as I am sure they are, and I do not think they should get rid of their stocks nor do I think they should be subjected to the inquisition which many of them have to suffer on the basis of this conflict-of-interest proposal.

"Question. At any rate, you would say what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander?

"Senator MANSFIELD. As far as I am concerned personally, yes.

"Question. Senator, in light of that, do you think that the Senate's decision to investigate the outside activities of its staff employees should be limited to those employees or should the investigation proceed to wherever the evidence leads it?

"Senator MANSFIELD. It should be limited to those employees who are employees of the Senate as a whole. As far as the employees in a Senator's office are concerned, that is that particular Senator's direct responsibility.

"As far as the Senators themselves are concerned, that is something which they themselves must face up to.

"I would point out that there have been bills in the Rules Committee for well over a decade—I think the longest in time is Senator MORSE's and there have been bills introduced by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, CASE, NEUBERGER, and others—seeking to bring about this disclosure on the part of Senators.

"These bills are lying fallow in the Rules Committee. I would hope that the Rules Committee in good time would take them up and report them out and bring them to the Senate floor for consideration and debate.

"But getting back to your original question, I think the Williams resolution should be adhered to strictly, and that applies only to employees of the Senate. There are bills to take care of the Senators themselves. They should be taken up in due time by the Rules Committee.

"Question. Not as a legal matter, but as a psychological matter, something that might affect the country, isn't there some weight to the argument of a Senate employee who might say, 'Well, what is wrong if I have outside business interests, because my bosses do?'

"Senator MANSFIELD. There is an argument there and a good one. I must say that as far as the outside interests of Senate em-

ployees are concerned, the fault primarily lies with the Senate, itself, because we have laid down no rules, regulations, or guidelines. Therefore, the employees of this body are free to do what they want to, within the limits of the law, and it is not up to us to point the finger at them because we haven't said nay nor have we laid out guidelines which they should follow.

"There again I would say that basically the fault is the Senate's for not meeting its obligations and laying out rules and regulations.

"Question. Do you think that the Senate will do that now, that is, issue such guidelines?

"Senator MANSFIELD. I think that they will. As far as Senate employees who are directly or indirectly subject to the Democratic conference, that is being done at the present time.

"Question. Do you think the disclosures about Robert Baker, the former majority secretary, have hurt the reputation of the Senate in the country?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, all I can say is this, that as far as Bobby Baker's work in the Senate was concerned, it was excellent and efficient. He did his job well. As for the rest of the question, yes.

"Question. Senator MANSFIELD, do you ever find it frustrating to be leader of a group of 66 other men who range from Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey to Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio?

"Senator MANSFIELD. I find it frustrating, exhilarating, and depressing.

"Question. That is a good note to finish on.

"Question. Sir, I just have one other question, Senator, if I may ask it.

"You come from Montana and the West supposedly is beginning to look like Goldwater territory to a lot of Republicans and perhaps to many Democrats. How do you feel about your own chances for reelection next year and the chances of the Democratic Party doing a better job of picking up Western States they missed in 1960?

"Senator MANSFIELD. First, I wouldn't give the Rocky Mountain West to GOLDWATER. I think it is just as much Kennedy country as it is Goldwater territory.

"Second, as far as my own future is concerned, it is little early for me to say anything. Montana is a two-party State. No one is invincible in this profession. No matter who runs for the Senate next year, he is going to have an extremely difficult job. Campaigns in Montana are tough, but I have been a pretty lucky man. I have been back here for 21 years, which is a long time. I have had the breaks, I have had the benefit of the doubt in the minds of lots of my people.

"When we go into next year's campaign, I will either win or I will lose, and whichever way it comes out I will have no apologies and no regrets.

"Question. You will have no regrets or no inhibitions about campaigning on the Kennedy ticket?

"Senator MANSFIELD. None in the least. I am delighted to campaign on the Kennedy ticket and in behalf of President Kennedy and all the way.

"The PRESS. Thank you very much, Senator."

#### SENATE ACTION STATUS OF PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS (LEGISLATIVE, 122<sup>1</sup>; APPROPRIATIONS, 15), SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Recap: Action completed (45); conference reports filed (2); in conference (6); passed Senate (26); Senate Calendar (2); committee action (28); no action (28); no legislation (3).

<sup>1</sup> Excluded from totals—awaiting submission of specific proposals.

#### ACTION COMPLETED (45)

1. AEC authorization. Public Law 88-72.
2. Agriculture supplemental for 1963. Public Law 88-1.
3. Supplemental, 1963. Public Law 88-25.

#### Appropriations

4. Defense. Public Law 88-149.
5. Interior. Public Law 88-79.
6. Labor-HEW. Public Law 88-136.
7. Treasury-Post Office. Public Law 88-39.
8. Civil Rights Commission extension. Public Law 88-152.

#### Fiscal Year 1964

9. Corporate-excite tax extension. Public Law 88-52.
10. District of Columbia fiscal affairs. Public Law 88-104.
11. District of Columbia National Cultural Center. Public Law 88-100.
12. Disarmament Agency—increased authorization. Public Law 88-.
13. Equal pay for women. Public Law 88-38.
14. Equal time suspension. Public Law 88-.

15. Export-Import Bank extension. Public Law 88-101.
16. Feed grains. Public Law 88-26.
17. Foreign Service buildings. Public Law 88-94.

18. Housing for elderly—increased authorization. Public Law 88-158.
19. Medical education aid. Public Law 88-129.
20. Mental health. Public Law 88-129.
21. Mental retardation—Child health. Public Law 88-156.

22. Military construction authorization. Public Law 88-174.
23. Military pay. Public Law 88-132.
24. Military procurement authorization. Public Law 88-28.

25. Outdoor recreation. Public Law 88-29.
- 26-28. Public debt—increase ceiling: To August 30, 1963, Public Law 88-30; to November 30, 1963, Public Law 88-106; to June 29, 1964, Public Law 88-.

29. Railroad labor dispute. Public Law 88-108.
30. Railroad retirement amendments. Public Law 88-133.

31. Reorganization Plan I—Roosevelt Library. Effective July 26.
32. Silver policy repeal. Public Law 88-36.

33. Space authorization. Public Law 88-113.
34. Tax on air passenger transportation—extend at 5 percent. Public Law 88-52.

#### Treaties ratified

35. Nuclear test ban.
36. Coffee agreement.
37. Consular convention with Korea.
38. Consular convention with Japan.
39. Extradition Treaty With Brazil—amend.

40. Extradition Treaty With Israel.
41. Extradition Treaty With Sweden.
42. Protocol to International Civil Aviation Convention.

43. UMT extension—4 years. Public Law 88-2.
44. Veterans' family benefits. Public Law 88-21.

45. World Bank—increase capital stock. Public Law 88-178.

#### CONFERENCE REPORTS FILED (2)

1. Higher education. House adopted November 6.
2. Legislative. House adopted November 13.

#### IN CONFERENCE (6)

- 1-3. Appropriations. Agriculture, District of Columbia, independent offices.
4. Foreign aid authorization.
5. Pacific Northwest power.

6. Vocational education—National Defense Education Act—impacted areas.

#### PASSED SENATE (26)

1. AEC supplemental authorization of \$17 million for nuclear weapons program. (November 21.)
2. Air pollution control. (November 19.)
3. Airport construction extension. (August 26.)
4. Area redevelopment. (June 26.)
5. Dairy program. (October 10.)
6. Juvenile Delinquency Act extension. (September 25.)
7. Land-use adjustments. (October 11.)
- 8-9. Manpower Training Act amendments (two bills).
10. Mass transit. (April 4.)
- 11-14. Migratory labor: four bills—S. 521, S. 523, S. 524, S. 525.
15. National Defense Education Act—extend loan forgiveness provision. S. 569. (October 24.)
16. National Service Corps. (August 14.)
17. President's Transition Act. Passed Senate amended October 17.
18. Public defenders. (August 6.)
19. SEC amendments. (July 30.)
- 20-22. Shorelines: Lake Mead; Canyonlands; Ozark National Rivers.
23. Water pollution control. (October 16.)
24. Water resources research program. (April 23.)
25. Wilderness. (April 9.)
26. Youth employment. (April 10.)

#### SENATE CALENDAR (2)

1. International air rates, S. 1540.
2. Library services construction, S. 2267.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE ACTION (28)

##### Appropriations

- 1-4. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary, markup week of December 3.
- Public works hearings concluded November 20.
- Military construction hearings underway.
- Foreign aid hearings underway.
5. Civil Rights Act of 1963. Senate Judiciary, intermittent hearings since July 16.
6. Civil service retirement financing, S. 1562. Senate Post Office and Civil Service hearings, concluded August 14.
7. Cotton program. Senate Agriculture hearings, May 20-27.

##### Education

- 8-12. (Senate labor hearings, ended June 30). Adult basic education, cooperative research, elementary and secondary school construction, teacher quality, teacher training of exceptional children.
13. Equal employment opportunity, Senate Labor Subcommittee, approved September 16.
14. Foreign Affairs Academy: S. 865. Senate Foreign Relations, markup July 10.
15. Housing for elderly—make single persons eligible for moderate income housing: S. 1170. Senate Banking hearings, October 2-4.
16. Inter-American Bank—increase contribution: H.R. 7406. Senate Foreign Relations hearings, November 15.
17. International Development Association—Increase resources S. 2214. Senate Foreign Relations hearings November 15.
18. Land conservation fund, including user fees. Senate Interior hearings concluded March 8. Executive August 26.
19. National Forest Roads and Trails. S. 1147. Senate Public Works Subcommittee, concluded hearings July 31; Executive August 15.
20. Pay bill. Senate Post Office and Civil Service—one hearing September 3.
21. Presidential Commission on Automation. Senate Joint Resolution 105. Senate Labor hearings started November 15.
22. River basin planning. S. 1111. Senate Interior ordered reported November 22.

23. Shorelines: Oregon dunes. S. 1137. Senate Interior ordered reported November 22.

24. Stockpile disposal. S. 2272. Hearings March 7, 1962; January 30, 1963.

25. Tax reform-cut. Senate Finance hearings started October 15.

26-27. Transportation policy (two bills) S. 1061, S. 1062. Senate Commerce hearings concluded October 24.

28. Watershed Act Amendments—multiple use. S. 566. Senate Agriculture hearings June 3.

#### NO ACTION IN SENATE (28)

1. Air carriers—limit subsidy payments. S. 1884: Senate Commerce.
2. Airports—Dulles and National—management. Senate Commerce.
3. Bank accounts—savings and loans—increase insurance coverage. S. 1799: Senate Banking will wait for House.
4. Bureaus of Community Health and Environmental in NIH—create. Senate Labor.
5. Civil defense—foodstuff stockpile. S. 1711. Senate Armed Services.
6. Coffee Agreement—implement. Senate Finance.
7. District of Columbia home rule—Senate District of Columbia.
8. District of Columbia transit system. Senate District of Columbia.
9. Fallout shelter. Senate Armed Services.
10. Food and drug amendments. Senate Labor.
11. Food stamp plan. Senate Agricultural.
12. FPC—Gas industry. S. 1463: Senate Commerce.
13. Group practice facilities, mortgage insurance. S. 1426: Senate Labor.
14. Hill-Burton Act—extension and expansion. S. 894: Senate Labor.
15. Immigration amendments. S. 1932: Senate Judiciary.
16. Interest equalization tax.
17. Medicare. S. 880: Senate Finance.
18. Mental health—Vocational rehabilitation. S. 968: Senate Labor.
19. Minimum wage coverage expansion. Senate Labor.
20. Patient fee increase. Senate Judiciary.
21. Peace Corps—expansion. Senate Foreign Relations.
22. Political campaign tax incentives. Senate Finance.
23. Public welfare work-training. S. 1803: Senate Finance.
23. Reorganization Act Extension (amended). Senate Government Operations.
- 25-26. Social Security amendments. S. 1357, 1358. Senate Finance.
27. Unemployment compensation—Permanent program. S. 1542: Senate Finance.
28. U.N. Participation Act. Senate Foreign Relations.

#### NO LEGISLATION (3<sup>1</sup>)

1. Narcotics control. President reviewing Advisory Commission report.
2. User charges—fuels—air freight.
3. Urban Affairs Department.

#### STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, FISCAL YEAR 1964 AND SUPPLEMENTS 1963

##### Enacted into law: (6)

- Defense.
- Interior.
- Labor-HEW.
- Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office.
- Agriculture supplemental, 1963.
- Supplemental, 1963.

##### Conference report ready: (1)

- Legislative—adopted in House November 13.

<sup>1</sup>Not included in totals for Presidential recommendations.

#### In conference: (3)

- Agriculture.
- D.C.
- Independent offices.

#### In Senate committee: (4)

- Military construction.
- Public works.
- State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary. Markup week of December 3.
- Foreign aid—hearings started November 18.

#### No action: (1)

- Supplemental, 1964.

#### PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. It was within the right for anyone yesterday, out of loyalty to the President of the United States—if that is their conception of loyalty—to vote to lay the Mundt bill on the table. But I resent the imputation that any Senator who voted in favor of the Mundt bill or against laying it on the table is disloyal to the President. Those that have that conception of loyalty should speak for themselves, but not for those of us in favor of the Mundt bill.

When the White House called my office yesterday morning, through its aid, Mr. Manatos, he notified me that the President would like to have me vote against the Mundt bill. I notified the President, through Mr. Manatos, that I would vote for the Mundt bill because in my judgment it was in the public interest.

The people of Oregon elected me to sit in the Senate and vote in accordance with the facts as I find them, testing those facts against the question of what I believe is in the public interest. I happen to believe it is in the public interest to pass the Mundt bill. When I left my pair to be voted in accordance with the facts as I saw them, I did not cast a vote of disloyalty to the President of the United States. I did not cast my vote on the basis of instructions that came to me from the White House, for in my opinion the President was dead wrong in the position he took on the Mundt bill. I do not sit in the Senate as a Senator of the President of the United States. I sit in the Senate as a Senator of the people of the State of Oregon and it is to them that I owe my trust of following where the facts lead. I owe them and not the President the duty of voting in the Senate in accordance with what I think the best public interest is in connection with any issue and not in accordance with the wish of the President if I consider him to be wrong on any issue. I consider the President to be wrong in his position of opposition to the Mundt bill.

That is a matter of judgment. I am sure it will not be the last time that I will find myself in disagreement with the President of the United States on the merits of some issue.

I yield to no Senator in respect to my personal loyalty to the President of the United States. I have the highest regard for him. My job is to sit in the Senate and vote in accordance with the facts as I find them. I regret very much that, even temporarily, any Member of

this body would have cause from the printed mistake in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to believe that I had walked out on my word in connection with the Mundt bill. My word happens to be my bond in this body. From the beginning I have always supported the Mundt bill.

I make this brief further statement as to the merits because in my judgment we cannot justify, as a matter of public policy, subsidizing the grain dealers of America who wish to sell wheat to Russia—which is their privilege—by assuring them that the taxpayers of the United States will stand by them and guarantee them against any loss.

Our experience with Russian leaders is perfectly clear. We have no assurance that Russian leaders will not find some reason for refusing full payment for the wheat on the basis of many of their rationalizations and their alibis.

I can hear them. They may say that they have found that the wheat is wormy. Or they have found it dirty. Or they have found this and that wrong with the wheat but they have found some excuse for welching on their purchase.

I see no reason why taxpayers' money from the Export-Import Bank should be set up as a subsidy guarantee to the grain dealers of the United States, assuring them that they can go ahead and trade, without loss, because the American taxpayer will guarantee their payments.

That was the reason, and the basic reason, why I was for the Mundt bill. I wish the RECORD to show that I am still for the Mundt bill.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

##### PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN VARIOUS STATES

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Dry Creek, Ga., Fishing Creek, Ga., Little Cache Creek, Ill., Bachelor Run, Ind., Grant-Shanghai Creeks, Kans., Clam River, Mass., Crane Creek, Minn., Briar Creek, Pa., and Glen Hills, Wis. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

##### REPORT ON POSSIBILITIES FOR REDUCING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES UNDER THE ELECTRIC LOAN PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the possibilities for reducing Federal expenditures under the electric loan program and other matters pertaining to the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, dated November 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

##### PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN VARIOUS STATES

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Big Caney, Kans. and Okla., Town Creek, Miss., Rush Creek, Ohio, and North Fork of Powder River, Wyo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1931. A bill to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians (Rept. No. 669).

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

S. 536. A bill to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land (Rept. No. 670).

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

S. 2279. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Plegan unit of the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project, Montana, to the landowners within the unit (Rept. No. 671).

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

S. 1565. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857; 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber (Rept. No. 672).

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

S. 711. A bill to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak. (Rept. No. 673).

#### OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE, OREG.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL AND MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 674)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1137) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators ALLOTT, MECHEM, SIMPSON, and JORDAN of Idaho, and the individual views of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2342. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Toros Torosian; and

S. 2343. A bill for the relief of Josefina B. Sepagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2344. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tippitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2345. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to further restrict the use of instrumentalities of interstate or foreign commerce for the acquisition of firearms for unlawful purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 2346. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 2347. A bill to provide for the establishment of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2348. A bill to quiet title and possession of certain lands in St. Clair County, Ala.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 2349. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John C. Alford, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 2350. A bill to provide for judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

#### MRS. MARIE TIPPITT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tippitt. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2344) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tippitt, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Marie Tippitt of Dallas, Texas, the sum of \$10,000, for services rendered the United States by her late husband, J. D. Tippitt, who gave his life in the line of duty searching for the assassin of the late President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FIRE- ARMS ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to

amend the Federal Firearms Act to further restrict the use of interstate or foreign commerce for the acquisition of firearms for unlawful purposes.

The bill will make it unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to ship, transport, or cause to be shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce any firearms to any person, other than a person excepted by section 4 from the provisions of this act, unless such person has delivered to such manufacturer or dealer a written certificate by a duly designated law enforcement officer of the State or political subdivision thereof within which such person resides. Each such certificate executed by any law enforcement officer with respect to any person shall contain the following information:

First. The purpose for which such person is seeking to acquire such firearm, as declared by such person.

Second. A description of each indictment or conviction of such person, if any, for any crime punishable by imprisonment for a term of 1 year or more, as disclosed by records available to such law enforcement officer.

Third. Any information available to such law enforcement officer indicating whether such person is a fugitive from justice.

Fourth. Any information available to such law enforcement officer as to the probable mental competence and stability of such person, and his reputation for observance of law.

In the bill it is provided that these certificates shall be kept available for 10 years.

To those who fear that the bill would unduly interfere with hunters or farmers, I point out that the bill simply provides a prohibition which will be effective unless there is filed a certificate of the nature described in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2345) to amend the Federal Firearms Act to further restrict the use of instrumentalities of interstate or foreign commerce for the acquisition of firearms for unlawful purposes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### JUDICIAL REVIEW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the 87th Congress, I joined with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] in the introduction of S. 1482. In conference this year on H.R. 6143, in connection with the Ervin amendment to the Senate version of that bill, I agreed with my distinguished colleague from the Third Congressional District in Oregon, Representative GREEN, that each of us would introduce in this session of the Congress legislation incorporating a judicial review provision.

The legislation which I am introducing today for myself and for the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] honors that commitment. It offers, in my judgment, an avenue of legislative approach for settling the ex-

ceedingly difficult constitutional problems which are of such deep concern to those of us who seek to pass the broadest possible educational legislation within the constitutional confines. The bill which is now being introduced I hope will have early hearings and favorable action on the part of the Senate. It meets the criteria of sound legislation in that it will help to resolve differences, which by their nature, are divisive.

Mr. President, I send this bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2350) to provide for judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NOS. 332 AND 333)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

#### ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASINS—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 334)

Mr. SIMPSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 335)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, to the bill (S. 1975) to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

Mr. President, from the tragedy of Dallas, we have been made aware of the inadequacy in this Nation's control over lethal weapons. The Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has long been a voice in the wilderness warning of the dangers of the indiscriminate availability of weapons to juveniles, criminals, and narcotic addicts. Throughout two and one-half years of investigation, we have found that the secrecy which shrouds the mail-order gun business has allowed those with the capabilities of committing monstrous crimes against society to clandestinely avail themselves of the means to do so.

On August 2, 1963, I introduced a bill that would help to prevent the tragedy that occurred on November 22, 1963.

My bill would insure that the purchaser of a mail-order weapon could not use the privilege of the mails to disguise his identity and eventually his evil deed.

My bill would insure that, as a minimum, a person provide his correct age, name, address, whether or not he has a criminal record, and that he is complying with the laws of the State in which he resides.

Lee Harvey Oswald purchased his terrible weapon by concealing his true name and address.

On the introduction of this bill, the subcommittee had the complete support of the National Rifle Association, the domestic arms manufacturers, and the major gun clubs of this Nation.

In view of the tragic events we have just been through, I feel that my bill should now be reevaluated and strengthened where feasible.

This I have done.

I have decided to amend S. 1975 to include all firearms regardless of size, shape, or description.

I have amended my bill to require that not only must a person provide an affidavit attesting to his age, name, address, and criminal record, if he has one, and his compliance with State gun laws, but, in addition, the affidavit must be authenticated by the highest local law enforcement authority in his community.

The other provisions of my bill stand as is.

Briefly, they put responsibility on both the mail-order seller and the common carrier to determine that they are not delivering a murderous weapon into the hands of a juvenile or a criminal.

I am certain that the responsible, law-abiding sportsmen and gun owners in the United States will be willing to tolerate what I feel is only a slight inconvenience at worst. Certainly my bill will be a step forward to get some measure of control over the intolerable situation that prevails today with respect to the sale of firearms.

What more do we need than the death of a beloved President to arouse us to place some regulation on this traffic in guns used for crime.

Mr. President, I urge that my bill be given swift consideration by the Commerce Committee, the urgent attention of every Member of the Senate, and the quick passage by the Congress of the United States.

I am sure our new President would want the Senate to take these steps.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 2, strike out lines 11 through 14.

On page 2, line 15, strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)".

On page 2, line 20, strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)".

On page 3, line 4, strike out "(7)" and insert "(6)".

On page 3, line 10, strike out "(8)" and insert "(7)".

On page 3, line 14, strike out "(9)" and insert "(8)".

On page 3, line 16, strike out "(10)" and insert "(9)".

On page 3, line 21, strike out "(11)" and insert "(10)".

On page 5, line 5, beginning with "handgun" strike out all through "1954" in line 7 and insert "firearm".

On page 5, line 8, strike out "handguns or such firearms are" and insert "a firearm is".

On page 5, line 11, beginning with "handgun" strike out all through "1954" in line 13 and insert "firearm".

On page 5, beginning with line 16, strike out all through line 14 on page 6 and insert the following:

"( ) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to ship any firearm in interstate or foreign commerce to any person other than a licensed manufacturer or licensed dealer or person exhibiting a license as prescribed in subsection (c) of this section, unless the person to whom such firearm is to be shipped has submitted to such manufacturer or dealer—

"(1) a sworn statement in such form and manner as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe, attested to by a notary public, to the effect that (A) such person is eighteen years or more of age, (B) he is not a person prohibited by this Act from receiving a firearm in interstate or foreign commerce, and (C) there are no provisions of law, regulations, or ordinances applicable to the locality to which the firearm will be shipped which would be violated by such person's receipt or possession of the firearm; and

"(2) a certificate by the chief law enforcement officer of the locality in which such person resides, as prescribed by the Secretary by regulations, to the effect that, to the best of his knowledge and belief, the statements made by such person in his sworn statement are true.

It shall be unlawful for any person to cause to be transmitted by United States mail, or to cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, a sworn statement described in paragraph (1) which contains any false statement as to any material fact for the purpose of obtaining a firearm."

On page 8, line 14, strike out "Sec. 904. EXEMPTIONS.—" and insert "Sec. 4."

On page 10, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3 and insert the following:

"Sec. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act; except that the amendments made by section 3 of this Act to section 3(a) of the Federal Firearms Act shall not apply to any manufacturer or dealer licensed under the Federal Firearms Act on the date of the enactment of this Act until the expiration of the license held by such manufacturer or dealer on such date."

#### RENAMING OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK FOR COSPONSORS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced S. 2341 to rename the National Cultural Center in honor of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I asked and received unanimous consent for the bill to remain at the desk for possible additional cosponsors until Friday, November 29.

In view of the fact that we are entering a period of the Thanksgiving holidays and many Senators will be away from the

Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for an additional period until Friday, December 6.

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

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, pursuant to the rules for committee procedure of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the standing Subcommittee on Contested Nominations will hold a hearing in room 6202, New Senate Office Building on Wednesday, December 4, 1963, at 10:30 a.m. on the following postmaster nominations for:

First. Garland, Tex.  
Second. Port Arthur, Tex.  
Third. Belvidere, N.J.  
Fourth. Elmer, N.J.  
Fifth. Jackson, N.J.  
Sixth. Newton, N.J.  
Seventh. White House Station, N.J.  
Eighth. Morenci, Ariz.  
Ninth. Maysville, Ky.

#### GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES OF CREDIT TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate considered at length and took action on S. 2310, Senator MUNDT's bill to prohibit guarantees by the Export-Import Bank of obligations of Communist countries. This was a major bill; it received the prompt and thorough consideration which it deserved.

Yesterday I expressed my thanks briefly to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], for his handling of the matter. My remarks were all too brief, and I should like to call the attention of the Senate again to the help it has received from the chairman and the members of that committee.

Less than 2 weeks ago, on Friday, November 15, and late in the day at that, the bill was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee with instructions to hold hearings and report back to the Senate by November 25.

The chairman carried out these instructions to the letter. Hearings were held on Wednesday, Thursday and Fri-

day, November 20, 21 and 22, at which both sides had full opportunity to present their case and both sides took full advantage to do so. Senator MUNDT and Senator FULBRIGHT made full and strong presentations of their sides of the argument; the administration presented its views fully and ably; and many public witnesses also were heard. The transcript of the hearings was available in printed form in a volume of 275 pages by Monday morning, and the frequent references to the printed hearings on the floor demonstrate the value of the hearings and the transcripts of them.

The committee met Monday, November 25, at my request, under very trying circumstances. I was distressed, and the chairman of the committee was distressed, to hold the meeting under these circumstances, but it seemed necessary and it seemed appropriate.

I think the Senate should take notice of the way in which this difficult and important task has been carried out by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Virginia, and also by the ranking Members, the Senators from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Finance, the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. They have demonstrated that the Senate is able to carry on its functions under the most difficult and distressing of circumstances in keeping with its tradition.

I should like at this point also to thank the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and the committee's members for their record this year. Among the major bills which this committee has considered and acted on are the SEC legislation, S. 1642, the mass transportation bill, S. 6, the extension of the Area Redevelopment Act, S. 1163, the repeal of the Silver Purchase Acts, H.R. 5389—and I see that the first \$1 Federal Reserve notes under that act are being issued today, the authorization for a new mint building in Philadelphia and many other bills.

I ask unanimous consent to print at this point in the RECORD a list of the bills reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, indicating the status of each.

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

Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

No.	Description	Senate Report No.	Final action (Nov. 27, 1963)
S. 6	Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963.....	82	Passed Senate Apr. 4, 1963.
S. 874	Additional mint facilities.....	163	Public Law 88-102.
H.R. 5389	Repealing certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver.....	175	Public Law 88-36.
S. 1163	Area Redevelopment Act Amendments, 1963.....	250	Passed Senate June 26, 1963.
H.R. 3872	Export-Import Bank Act extension.....	262	Public Law 88-101.
S. 1125	Nevada 100th anniversary medal.....	290	Public Law 88-147.
S. 743	Padre Junipero Serra 250th anniversary medal.....	291	Public Law 88-143.
H.J. Res. 467	2-year extension of FHA sec. 221 mortgage insurance authority.....	304	Public Law 88-54.
S. 879	Battle of Lake Erie 150th anniversary medal.....	314	Passed Senate June 27, 1963.
S. 1642	Securities and Exchange Commission legislation, 1963.....	379	Passed Senate July 30, 1963.
S. 1952	Extension of authority to insure mortgages under secs. 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act.....	487	Public Law 88-127.
H.R. 772	Transfer of certain property purchased for low-rent housing project in Detroit, Mich.....	508	Public Law 88-141.
H.R. 4842	Amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act.....	509	Public Law 88-150.
H.J. Res. 724	Housing for the elderly.....	561	Public Law 88-158.

## Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 88th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

No.	Description	Senate Report No.	Final action (Nov. 27, 1963)
S. 2228	Annual meetings of national banks.....	622	Passed Senate Nov. 5, 1963.
S. 1241	Annual reports under the RFC Liquidation Act.....	628	Do.
H.R. 3488	Indiana statehood commemorative medals.....	630	Passed Senate Nov. 7, 1963.
H.R. 7193	ILGWU Health Center 50th anniversary medals.....	631	Do.
S. 2079	New York Historic Shrine medals.....	633	Passed Senate Nov. 8, 1963.
S. 2032	Study of Federal financial assistance to victims of flood disasters.....	634	Do.
S. 298	Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1963.....	639	Passed Senate Nov. 21, 1963.
S. 1309	Small Business Act Amendments.....	640	Do.
S.J. Res. 129	Additional funds for sec. 702 programs—reserve of planned public works.....	643	Passed Senate Nov. 19, 1963.
S. 2310	Government guarantees of credit.....	659	Tabled by Senate Nov. 28, 1963.

## AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Senate on yesterday a bill providing for the extension and expansion of the provisions of the Library Services Act, passed the Senate. Although the timing is incidental, it is certainly fitting that consideration of this support for such an important American institution should coincide with the granting of the national Book-of-the-Month Club awards to outstanding small-community libraries.

In all, the Book-of-the-Month Club chose 45 libraries in as many States to receive the awards. Thirty-five institutions will receive State awards of \$1,000, and the remaining 10 will receive national prizes of \$1,500.

I am very pleased to note that one of the national winners was the Lincoln County Free Library of Libby, Mont. This library, small in size, perhaps, but playing a large role in that northwestern Montana community, typifies the efforts being made across the Nation by smaller libraries to alert the public to their accomplishments and needs. It is in recognition of this effort that the national award was made.

Presentation of the cash awards will be made on April 12 of next year, the first Sunday in National Library Week. I would like to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to the community of Libby, Mont., and to Librarian Mrs. Inez Herrig and the staff of the Lincoln County Free Library, for winning this outstanding honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the National and State winners of the Book-of-the-Month Club library awards, as well as a news release from the club.

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

## LIBRARY AWARDS IN 45 STATES ANNOUNCED BY BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB

New York, N.Y., November 25, 1963.—Harry Scherman, chairman of the Book-of-the-Month Club, today announced the annual winners of the 1964 Book-of-the-Month Club Library Awards given in memory of Dorothy Canfield Fisher. This national awards program, open to libraries in towns of 25,000 or less, in every State of the Union as well as Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, was first established in 1959 to encourage interest in and support of small-community libraries.

The Public Library Association, a division of the American Library Association, set up

the criteria for the awards, and selected the 45 winning libraries from among applications screened by the State library agencies. Thirty-five of these libraries will receive \$1,000 awards, nine will receive \$1,500 awards, and one will receive the main award of \$5,000. The 35 State winners and the 10 national winners are announced today and the main award winner will be announced by the Book-of-the-Month Club in January.

According to Mr. Scherman, the 5-year history of these awards has shown that they mean far more to the libraries than the winning of a cash prize. This is because they represent an opportunity to review their activities, and to achieve public recognition by national leaders in the library field—an honor that focuses the attention of the State and the Nation upon them. The records show that there is widened public support for each library that applies, whether it receives an award or not.

The year 1964 will mark the sixth year of the Book-of-the-Month Club Library Awards. Including 1964, a total of \$157,000 will have been distributed among 124 libraries, bringing dividends of public pride and community financial support in the form of new buildings and expanded service.

An official presentation ceremony will take place in each of the 45 award-winning communities on April 12, the first Sunday of National Library Week. This simultaneous across-the-Nation event is designed to dramatize one of the most pressing problems of the American library system, the universal need of small libraries for more private and public financial support. At each of the ceremonies a distinguished American author or an eminent figure will appear as guest speaker.

## BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB LIBRARY AWARD WINNERS, 1964

NATIONAL AWARD,<sup>1</sup> \$1,500

Arkansas, Arkansas River Valley Regional Library, Dardanelle, Ark.  
Connecticut, Cheshire Public Library, Cheshire, Conn.  
Hawaii, Maui County Library, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.  
Indiana, Plymouth Public Library, Plymouth, Ind.  
Kentucky, Cynthia Public Library, Cynthia, Ky.  
Massachusetts, Avon Public Library, Avon, Mass.  
Minnesota, East Central Regional Library, Cambridge, Minn.  
Montana, Lincoln County Free Library, Libby, Mont.  
Oregon, Deschutes County Library, Bend, Oreg.  
Virginia, Martinsville Memorial Public Library, Martinsville, Va.

## STATE AWARD, \$1,000

Alaska, Seward Community Library, Seward, Alaska.

<sup>1</sup> One of these 10 will be chosen in January to receive the main award of \$5,000.

Arizona, Gilbert Public Library, Gilbert, Ariz.  
California, Plumas County Free Library, Quincy, Calif.  
Colorado, Montrose Public Library, Montrose, Colo.  
Delaware, Seaford District Library, Seaford, Del.  
Florida, Indian River County Library, Vero Beach, Fla.  
Georgia, Colquitt-Thomas Regional Library, Moultrie, Ga.  
Idaho, Nez Perce County Free Library, Lewiston, Idaho.  
Illinois, Woodstock Public Library, Woodstock, Ill.  
Iowa, Fairfield Public Library, Fairfield, Iowa.  
Kansas, Colby Public Library, Colby, Kans.  
Maine, Falmouth Memorial Library, Falmouth, Maine.  
Maryland, Kent-Caroline Public Libraries Association, Ridgely, Md.  
Michigan, Walled Lake City Library, Walled Lake, Mich.  
Missouri, Maryville Public Library, Maryville, Mo.  
Nebraska, Sidney Public Library, Sidney, Nebr.  
Nevada, Elko-Lander-Eureka County Library System, Elko, Nev.  
New Hampshire, Franklin Public Library, Franklin, N.H.  
New Jersey, Manasquan Public Library, Manasquan, N.J.  
New Mexico, the Public Library, Silver City, N. Mex.  
New York, Highland Falls Library, Highland Falls, N.Y.  
North Carolina, Southport Public Library, Southport, N.C.  
North Dakota, Adams County Library, Hettinger, N. Dak.  
Ohio, Ross County District Library, Chillicothe, Ohio.  
Oklahoma, Ardmore Public Libraries, Ardmore, Okla.  
Pennsylvania, the Hoyt Library, Kingston, Pa.  
Rhode Island, North Kingstown Free Library, Wickford-North Kingstown, R.I.  
South Carolina, Colleton County Memorial Library, Walterboro, S.C.  
South Dakota, Alexander Mitchell Library, Aberdeen, S. Dak.  
Tennessee, Bolivar-Hardeman County Library, Bolivar, Tenn.  
Texas, Bailey H. Dunlap Memorial Library, La Feria, Tex.  
Washington, Mid-Columbia Regional Library, Kennewick, Wash.  
West Virginia, Charles W. Gibson Public Library, Buckhannon, W.Va.  
Wisconsin, Shawano City-County Library, Shawano, Wisc.  
Wyoming, Washakie County, Worland, Wyo.

## EXPRESSIONS OF REGRET ON TRAGIC DEATH OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the past few days a great number of telegrams and letters have reached me. They are expressions of regret on the tragic death of President Kennedy. Some came to me in my capacity as majority leader. Others in my capacity as a Senator from Montana and still others as a friend to turn to in order to give voice to a profound grief.

The telegrams came from Canada and from many countries in Latin America. They came from France, Denmark, Germany. They came from "just simple Montana people," from Indian tribes and from an association of sergeants at the San Antonio Air Base and from student

associations in my State. They have one characteristic in common—an outpouring of a deep grief at the terrible loss. It is a grief which cannot be comforted by words. It can only be made to recede by a rededication to the purposes for which President Kennedy strove—a more decent nation in a more decent world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a selection of telegrams and letters be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

HELENA, MONT.,  
November 22, 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Although we are just simple Montana people we wish to extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. John F. Kennedy and family, the greatest President since Franklin Delano Roosevelt. May God be good to us as we will need all of His grace in the months to come.

Mr. EDWARD J. WORDAL.

BILLINGS, MONT.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I am extremely proud of your actions in this time of tragedy.

Express our support for you and President Johnson in the future.

BILL SPEARE.

BOZEMAN, MONT.,  
November 22, 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Mannix Electric, Inc., and each employee requests you to extend every condolence to the Kennedy family. Also, we want you to know we have the utmost confidence that you will see, after proper and full investigation is conducted, that the responsible people will be made sorry they executed this plot.

CON MANNIX,

President.

OTTO ZEIER,  
DAVID R. BRUCK,  
DAVID ANDERSON,  
FRANK A. HAYS,  
FLORENCE A. WILLIAMSON,  
CARL NUBER,

Employees.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,  
November 22, 1963.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
U.S. Senator, State of Montana,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: The assassination of our President John F. Kennedy has shocked the citizens of our city. We feel a very personal loss since he visited here with you in September. Knowing that you already are carrying a heavy load, we want you to know that we join the mourning Nation and extend sincere sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and the children.

MARIAN S. ERDMANN,  
Mayor, City of Great Falls, Mont.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,  
November 22, 1963.

MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate Majority Leader,  
Washington, D.C.:

The deepest sympathy and the prayers of the sisters of the College of Great Falls are

with you and Congress. May the memory of the great man gone to God be a beacon of inspiration in your effort to preserve and extend the blessings of justice and liberty for all.

SISTER RITA,  
Sacred Heart President,  
College of Great Falls.

MONTREAL, QUE.,  
November 22, 1963.

SPEAKER OF THE SENATE,  
Washington, D.C.:

The council, mayor, and all the citizens of the city of Westmount share your loss of a tremendous leader.

C. H. DRURY,  
Mayor, City of Westmount.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,  
November 22, 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

The student body of the College of Great Falls shares your grief at the passing of our President. Please convey our sincere sympathy to the President's family and friends. May God bless and guide you in the difficult days ahead.

Sincerely,

ARLEN D. STUBES,  
Body President,  
College of Great Falls.

WESTFIELD, N.J.,  
November 22, 1963.

MICHAEL MANSFIELD,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Huguette in France but know she joins Anthony, Peter, myself in wanting to tell you and Maureen how deeply grieved we are at this monstrous act and we pray the President, with God's help, will continue to work with your help like his predecessor for the peace on earth and good will of mankind.

RUPERT.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,  
November 23, 1963.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
The Senate, Washington, D.C.:

My prayers for your strength at this time of deep sorrow and new responsibility are with you and Maureen. May God be with you.

MAXINE B. SCOTT,  
Hotel Caremont.

NOVEMBER 22, 1963.

SENADO ESTADOS UNIDOS,  
Capitolio, Washington, D.C.:

Konrome Transcribir ustedes siguiente resolucion aprobada unanimidad Senado Nacional Bolivia bipuntos articulo primero rendir su homenaje postumo al gran Presidente John F. Kennedy lider de la hermandad en el mundo muerto alevosamente por mano criminal por defender los derechos de igualdad libertad y mejores condiciones de vida del ser humano. Articulo segundo izar el pabellon nacional en el parlamento durante tres dias como dolorosa expresion del sentimiento del pueblo Boliviano. Articulo tercero hacer llegar al senado Norteamer cano el texto de esta resolucion camara.

Atentamente,  
FEDERICO FORTUN SANJINES,  
Presidente Senado Nacional.

MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY,  
November 22, 1963.

Etat al Senado de los Estados Unidos de America, Washington, D.C.:

El Senado de la Republica Oriental Del Uruguay presenta a esa alta corporacion sus mas sentidas condolencias por la muerte del ilustre Presidente John F. Kennedy, que

priva a esa eiginisima nacion y al mundo, de una de las mas altas expresiones de la democracia y del derecho. Y de un celoso cultor de las supremas lealidades del hombre y de los pueblos.

MARTIN R. ECHEGOYEN,  
Presidente Senado.  
JOSE PASTOR SALVANACH,  
Secretario.

BUTTE, MONT.,  
November 23, 1963.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate Majority Leader,  
Washington, D.C.:

Express our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy—Kennedy family and members of the administration.

Dr. and Mrs. HARRY G. FARRELL.

BUTTE, MONT.,  
November 23, 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Washington, D.C.:

Please convey our sincere sympathy to the Kennedy family on their tragic loss and the Nation's loss.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS X. DOLAN,  
DENNIS F. DOLAN.

CORAL CABLES, FLA.,  
November 23, 1963.

MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senator from Montana,  
U.S. Senate, Capitol Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the Cuban Medical Association in Exile I express to you our deepest condolence for the death of President Kennedy, victim of a treacherous crime.

Dr. ENRIQUE HUERTAS,  
President, Cuban Medical Association in Exile.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,  
November 23, 1963.

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

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: We, the airmen of the U.S. Air Force, join with you and the Nation in mourning the loss of our Commander in Chief, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States. That this Nation, under God, should suffer indignity and shame of this nature when we strive so hard with all our sources to create peace and nonaggression in all the world. It is incomprehensible. May our combined prayers provide solace for the bereaved families of our great leader.

BENNY W. MCGHEE,  
President of the Air Force Sergeant's Association.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,  
November 22, 1963.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Please convey Cascade County's deepest sympathy to the Kennedy family for you and for our new President Johnson go our prayers for strength and wisdom in the days ahead.

DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL  
COMMITTEE, CASCADE COUNTY,  
JOHN McLAUGHLIN,  
Mrs. P. J. GILFEATHER.

KOEENHAVN,  
November 23, 1963.

The CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

The Parliament of Denmark wishes to express its heartfelt condolences on the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy.

GUSTAV PEDERSEN,  
President of the Folketing.

CAPITOL,  
Washington, D.C.:

Our whole sympathy belongs to the greatest President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. May God bless him always.

FAMILY PATAN,  
FAMILY KNOBLOCK,  
Western Germany.

TOKYO, November 23, 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Wish to present my profound condolence to the President Kennedy's death.

YANG IL-DONG.

MEXICO CITY, MEX.,

November 24, 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senado de Los Estados Unidos,  
Washington, D.C.:

A la profunda consternacion causada por el innoble crimen cometido en la persona senior Presidente Kennedy seguira luto mundial para quienes admiramos portentosa magnitud del estadista que habiendo sido el mas insigne abanderado de las causas nobles y justas coma sera por siempre para digna del bien y la paz universales punto sirvase aceptar mis.

As sentidas condolencias por la perdida irreparable ha sufrido pueblo y gobierno Northe Americanos.

Punto respetuosamente,  
DPUTADO LIC ROMULO SANCHEZ MIRELES,  
Presidente Gran Comision.  
H. CAMARA, Diputados.

PARIS,

November 22, 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Our deepest sorrow and condolences.

ROBERT AND SUZANNE LOUPPE.

GUANAJUATO, MEXICO,

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senador de Los Estados Unidos,  
Washington, D.C.:

Unome profunda pena pueblo Noteamerica y sentimentt mundial por muerte excelentissimo Senior Presidente esa nacion punto atentamente gobernador constitucional del estado.

LIC JUAN JOSE TORRES LANDA.

GUADALAJARA, MEX.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Edificio Del Capitolio,  
Washington, D.C.:

Unome duelo General Perdida Gran Ciudadano America Presidente Kennedy abrazolo sentidamente.

Senador GUILLERMO RAMIREZ VALADEZ.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,

November 24, 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Former MSU History and Political Science  
President, Senate Democratic Leader,  
Washington, D.C.:

What happened in Dallas, Tex., yesterday is not only a national tragedy; it is a national disgrace. We hang our heads not only in mourning but in shame. So another fragment of the American dream is ripped away before our eyes by ignorance, hate, and murder. Is mankind forever to be ignorant, hateful, and capable of such heinous acts? Oh, Lord, are we Americans to destroy our magnificent testimonial of what free and democratic people can do.

JIM BEAKEY,  
MSU Graduate Teacher.

GUANAJUATO, MEX.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senado de Los Estados Unidos,  
Washington, D.C.:

Reuegole aceptar mis sentimientos por muerte excelentissimo Senior Presidente Esta-

dos Unidos punto atentamente Secretario Privado C. Gobernador Guanajuato.  
MARCOS AGUAYO DURAN.

HAVRE, MONT.,

November 23, 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Old Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Extend our deepest sympathy for the Kennedy family. The loss of our great President is felt by the tribe for his untiring efforts for the Indian people.

EDWARD EAGLEMAN,  
Secretary, Business Committee.

MEXICO CITY, MEX.,

November 23, 1963.

Senador MIKE MANSFIELD,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Con profunda consternacion he recibido la noticia del asesinato del Señor Presidente Kennedy su gran amigopunto acompanolo en su pena y por su conducto expreso mi stendida condolencia a todos su colegas del senado puto un abrazo fraternal.

Senador MANUEL MORENO SANCHEZ.

NOVEMBER 25, 1963.

Sympathy as we have all lost a great leader and friend. If and when you see Lyndon please also convey to him our sympathy and warm wishes for the great task that lies ahead of him.

Affectionately,

JANE and CHARLIE.

MEXICO, November 23, 1963.

Mr. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Juego a usted aceptar mis mas sentidas condolencias por la muerte de su gran Presidente y muy querido amigo mio John F. Kennedy punto lo saludo afectuosamente punto Secretario Agricultura.

JULIAN RODRIGUEZ ADAME.

NOVEMBER 22, 1963.

DEAR MIKE: Our hearts are heavy with grief and our minds refuse to believe that our President has been killed.

A first reaction is one of desire for vengeance—an agonized cry against persons or factions which could have been responsible.

Mr. Kennedy has been a good President, and one can only hope that our Nation will give sober thought to our future.

We send our message to you, expressing our sorrow, since you knew him as a friend and since you may let the family know how we Montanans feel.

One can hope that through or because of this tragedy, our people will draw closer to the American hearth in unity of action and peace.

Sincerely,

P.S.—Please be careful, MIKE. We don't want to lose you.

LEON, GTO.,

22 de Noviembre de 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
U.S. Senate,  
Office of the Majority Leader,  
Washington, D.C.

QUERIDO Y FINO AMIGO: No habiendo podido comunicarme en estos momentos telefónicamente con usted, séame permitido—usar este medio para presentar por su conducto al Senado de su País mi más profunda condolencia por la pérdida irreparable que acaban de sufrir no sólo los Estados Unidos y México, sino el mundo entero, del más preclaro paladin de la libertad y de la democracia, Señor Presidente John F. Kennedy.

Guardo en mi corazón y mi memoria las deferencias y atenciones que para mí tuvo el Señor Presidente tano en Washington como en México, y siempre pediré al Todo Poderoso por su alma.

Reciban sus compañeros de Gámara y usted, repito, mis mas respetuosas y carifiosas condolencias.

#### MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

We, the Missoula County, Mont., Democratic Central Committee, gathered in special memorial meeting on this day, November 23, 1963, at 10 a.m., do hereby express our shock over the assassination of President Kennedy. We are stunned and bewildered by this harvest of hate and political immaturity.

For comfort we turn to his courage in seeking peace and justice for a troubled world. We ask, in his words, what we can do for our country. Our answer is a call upon men of good will everywhere to put down their hates, to seek a resolution of differences in a fashion consistent with the dignity of man.

For hope we turn to his successor and pray that God will give him wisdom and courage as he assumes his new burden of Government.

We do, hereby, pledge to President Lyndon B. Johnson our full and energetic support in the days ahead.

We offer our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Kennedy, her children, and the Kennedy families. We offer our assurance that in President Kennedy's memory we will continue to find inspiration.

THOMAS F. MURRAY,

Chairman, Missoula County Democratic Central Committee.

Attest:

ADELINE BARTON,

Secretary.

#### MISSOULA COUNTY

DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE,

Missoula, Mont., November 23, 1963.

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

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am enclosing a copy of the memorial resolution adopted this morning by the Missoula County Democratic Central Committee.

The original has been forwarded to Mrs. Kennedy.

Sincerely,

THOMAS F. MURRAY,

Chairman.

RABAT,

November 23, 1963.

Senator MANSFIELD,

U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Presentons condoleances les plus emues suite decès du President Kennedy heros de is paix heros de la liberte et grand ami du peuple Marocain.

LE COMIT PROVISOIRE DE LA CHAMBRE  
DES CONSEILLERS,  
DU MAROC.

RIO DE JANEIRO,

November 25, 1963.

Senator MANSFIELD,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

Still under the impact of Friday's tragic event. We wish to convey, dear friend, our deepest sympathy.

ELIZINHA and WALTER MOREIRA SALLES.

CUTBACK, MONT.,

November 25, 1963.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate Majority Leader,  
Washington, D.C.:

To see and hear you give the eulogy in the Capitol for our great and beloved friend most touching in my sorrow. We have lost him but have President Johnson and you. In this hour of darkness and challenge God bless both of you.

WALTER WETZEL,  
Chairman, Blackfoot Tribe.

MISSOULA, MONT.,  
November 25, 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
U.S. Senate,  
Office of the Majority Leader,  
Washington, D.C.:

The Associated Students of Montana State University do hereby express our regret over one of the gravest tragedies that has befallen our Nation in the lifetime of many students at Montana State University, the death of John F. Kennedy. We only hope that former President John F. Kennedy, who served during his time of Presidency as an inspiration for the youth of America, because he himself was a young man and because of his ability to work unceasingly for the United States of America, will continue to serve in history as a man with ideas that will inspire students toward building lives of promise.

RICK JONES,  
President, Associated Students of Montana State University.

POPLAR, MONT.,  
November 26, 1963.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Washington, D.C.:

A humble tribute to President Kennedy, the greatest white father of the vanishing race, shall always be remembered for his New Frontier pace, he has joined the great chiefs at their happy hunting ground, leaving us a cultural transition that may never be found, his love and understanding devotion to all mankind shall never be forgotten throughout the ages of time, divine hopes in a redeemer of his integrity, will enlighten the spirit of preservation in perpetuity. The American Indians shall forever cherish his virtue, especially those of the Assiniboin and Sioux.

AUSTIN BUCKLES.

WOLFPOINT, MONT.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We have no words to tell of our grief for the passing of our martial President but only to know that in spite of his physical absence from us the ideals and examples he set shall not die and cannot be taken from us. Please convey this message to the Kennedy family. Letter follows.

CHIEF FIRST TO FLY,  
JOSEPH WEFIT,  
Representing Indian People of the Fort Peck Reservation, Wolfpoint, Mont.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
November 21, 1963.

DEAR MIKE: I write at once to share our grief on this tragic day. God rest the soul of John Kennedy and comfort his widow and the family. This loss is profoundly distressing to us all; and I pray that we may learn yet again to value properly what he dedicated himself to do and consider how best to carry out the unfinished task. May God bless our country and guide its people and their representatives and comfort us in our sorrow.

Devotedly your friend,

ANDREW.

MONTREAL, QUEBEC,  
November 23, 1963.

SPEAKER,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

The IUE Canadian General Electric Conference Board, meeting in Montreal, learned with indescribable shock and mortification of the untimely and unwarranted passing of the President of the United States. We share the mourning of his passing with all people the world over who have come to admire his unmatched capabilities and capacity to promote peace and the well being and equality of mankind everywhere. As we pray

for the happy repose of his soul, our prayers and deep condolences go out to his widow and the President's entire family in this hour of monumental grief. You may be sure that all Canadians feel the same sense of immense loss for this great man and good neighbor to the south of us.

HAROLD DAVEY,  
Chairman.  
ROBERT ORR,  
Secretary.

MEXICO CITY, MEXICO.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Senate of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.:

I beg you to accept my most sincere condolence on the death of President Kennedy, great guardian of the world's peace, and defender of the human rights in the United States.

Sincerely,

MANUEL J. SIERRA.

### THE FLAG AS A SYMBOL IN COMMEMORATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the family of Dr. Stanley B. Covert of Kingfield, Maine, has taken action which I believe should be an inspiration for other Americans and which I would hope they would follow. I commend their example to all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter that I have received from Dr. Covert be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

KINGFIELD, MAINE,  
November 25, 1963.

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: The events of the past few days have caused several outstanding reactions, namely:

1. All people everywhere are shocked and grieved.
2. Most Americans are keeping very close contact with news media.
3. There is widespread desire on the part of a great many individuals to show their respect for and to provide a tribute to President Kennedy.

I am also impressed by the fact that the Nation as a whole exhibits a considerable lack of patriotism and knowledge of our national heroes.

To commemorate President Kennedy and the significance of his passing in the eyes of our children, our family went into the woods and selected a straight spruce tree, shaped it into a flagpole and flew the American flag on our lawn for the first time in 11 years today.

Mrs. Covert and I feel that many families everywhere would be grateful if this means of commemoration were suggested, for it is not difficult to get a flag and fly it. This would provide each family, regardless of financial ability, the means to show that it grieves, and wishes to honor a dedicated President. It seems possible that such a program could result in a considerable increase in patriotic spirit and respect for our leaders, for the flag is a symbol of those things dear to a nation, and the presence of many more flags along our streets could recall sentiments that would live on. And if this came to be, it is suggested that, even in death, President Kennedy would be responsible for a significant achievement in strengthening our Nation.

Our family cannot convey this message, but we believe that if you and others think the

idea worthy, it could receive adequate guidance and publication.

Very truly yours,

STANLEY B. COVERT, M.D.

### RESOLUTION OF WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at the 1963 annual meeting of the Western Association of Attorneys General in opposition to so-called quality stabilization legislation.

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

#### PROPOSED QUALITY STABILIZATION ACT, 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States proposed legislation styled S. 774 and H.R. 3669, bearing the title "Quality Stabilization Act." Although so titled, it is in fact another price maintenance bill of the type which has had the so-called fair trade label for many years.

Whereas S. 774 and H.R. 3669 would authorize the owner of a brand name or trademark to establish the resale prices of goods bearing his identifying mark. The Western Association of Attorneys General, at the 1963 annual meeting, opposes enactment of this legislation or similar legislation which, it is submitted, would result in the following undesirable consequences:

1. Establish price fixing by private individuals as a substitute for free and open competition, the keystone of the American economy;
2. Undermine existing antitrust laws and the free competition system which the antitrust laws are designed to protect;
3. Weaken statutes and principles governing public competitive bidding;
4. Raise prices paid by consumers and thereby encourage inflation;
5. Foster a climate favorable to price fixing agreements among competitors;
6. Increase disrespect for the law because the public and business will attempt to evade what is against their economic interests; and
7. Add the heavy cost of enforcing private price fixing agreements to the cost borne by the consumer.

The Western Association of Attorneys General as an organization and each of its members pledge resistance to the enactment of S. 774 and H.R. 3669. This organization requests its chairman to take immediate steps to make known to Congress its opposition to such legislation, despite the fact that the proposed legislation provides exemption for sales to or by Federal, State, or municipal governments or their political subdivisions or agencies. This exemption clause, in the opinion of the Western Association of Attorneys General, based on previous experience with similar legislation, fails to provide the protection sought for public agencies because it does not permit adequate enforcement or penalties for violation thereof.

"Quality Stabilization Acts" proposed to the last Congress and to the current Congress are opposed by the U.S. Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the U.S. Department of Commerce, Council of State Governments, the American Bar Association, the National Association of State Purchasing Officials, and many other public and nonpublic bodies and organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of Attorneys General opposes enactment of S. 774 and H.R. 3669 and directs the secretariat to send copies of this resolution to members of the Rules Committee, the House

of Representatives, the Senate Commerce Committee, the Attorney General of the United States, and to all Governors and State attorneys general.

### CONSERVATISM TODAY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to be interviewed by editors of the New York Times. Specifically I was asked to define "conservatism" and to explain my application of conservatism to the issues of today. This article was handled in such a manner that it fairly represents my views on a number of subjects, and so I ask unanimous consent that the article "GOLDWATER Defines 'Conservatism'" from the November 24, 1963, edition of the New York Times magazine be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From The New York Times magazine, Nov. 24, 1963]

**GOLDWATER DEFINES CONSERVATISM—THE REPUBLICAN FRONT RUNNER FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION NEXT YEAR ANSWERS SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT HIS PHILOSOPHY AND THE NATURE OF THE MOVEMENT WHICH SUPPORTS HIM**

(Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, currently front runner for the Republican presidential nomination, was recently interviewed by two members of the New York Times staff. In the course of the talk, the Senator set out his concept of conservatism and discussed elements of the present conservative movement which supports him. Salient parts of the conversation follow.)

Question. Senator GOLDWATER, let me ask you first: Are you surprised by all of this?

Answer. Frankly, I am. This draft thing started without my knowledge and I felt, "Well, let it go. It can't last. At best, it'll go through the summer." I expected it to start losing steam about Labor Day. But it has not, and I do not know where it is going to go from here.

Question. Well, why were you surprised?

Answer. For a number of reasons. First, I never sought this position. I do not seek it now. And yet I am suddenly confronted with a decision of whether to go after it or not.

Then we have the matter of coming from the West, and particularly from a small State. Just looking at it in a practical, realistic way, no man in his right mind would ever chase after this thing if he came from a small State, whether East or West, unless it might be from one of the New England tier.

Question. But you are talking about ordinary circumstances. These are extraordinary circumstances. This whole movement, in a way, is extraordinary.

Answer. It has turned out to be. One of the problems with this movement is that you cannot find anything to parallel it in modern times so as to make some judgments about it. We do not know—is it moving too fast? Is it moving too slowly? Is it too big? Is it too small? What do we do here? We do not have anything to measure by.

Question. Someone has said that this is a protest movement rather than a program movement. What do you think are the elements of the protest?

Answer. Well, first, most political decisions in this country are negative decisions. In my own State, I know of no one's being elected because he presented a better program or was a better guy. It has always been the result of some kind of "against" vote.

You read some of Kennedy's speeches from 1960—about the missile gap, or the lack of international prestige. The appeal he made was to negative feelings of the electorate.

Question. Do you think this was true of Eisenhower?

Answer. In a way. But Eisenhower's victory could have been a victory for Taft, or almost any top Republican, because of the negative feeling against the Truman administration.

Eisenhower himself was a political phenomenon you cannot expect to see repeated in our lifetime. This was a national hero. He could have run on either ticket and he could have run on any kind of platform. He would have been elected. I think he could be reelected today.

Question. Now that you find yourself in this position, do you feel a sense of obligation?

Answer. I—well, you have a very definite feeling of responsibility. You feel a responsibility first to your country—what you might be able to do for it. And you feel a responsibility to your party. Then, in my particular case, I feel a responsibility to the young people who seem to be moving toward conservatism. They are probably my greatest concern as of the moment.

Question. You talked about the negative aspects of an election. Is the youth movement you describe a negative movement? What are the other negative forces that in your opinion have contributed to this boom?

Answer. I think you can separate the young ideas from the older ideas. The older ideas, the older negativism, would be, typically, resistance to high taxes, resistance to an economy that is not moving, resistance to continuing unemployment in the domestic fields. There are others. And there is a growing awareness of union power versus management and government and public power.

Then, in the international field, there is the growing doubt—I will not say fear, but the growing doubt—as to whether or not we are pursuing the right course vis-a-vis communism. The strength of this doubt can only be measured at the polls. But it is a definite factor.

Question. You said you felt that young people are moving toward a conservative viewpoint. To what do you attribute that?

Answer. Nature. Young minds resist the established order. They always have.

I happen to have gone to college for 1 year—in 1928, when my age was swinging away from conservatism. I have often said that if I had finished 4 years in college I probably would have been a liberal along with most of my classmates. Because at the University of Arizona we had very conservative professors. Our parents were conservative. The political philosophy of the day was conservative. But the natural inquisitiveness of the young mind said there must be something else.

In the elections of 1932, my classmates were all backing Roosevelt. They did not know why—it was just something new. Then, when Roosevelt succumbed to the left, they declared themselves liberals and most of them have been so ever since.

Now their children have reached the age where they are beginning to say, "Isn't there something besides the liberal concept?" They are beginning to ask questions just as my generation did. And I just happened to come along at the right time to watch this develop.

Question. So it is almost a rebellion against parents and the established order?

Answer. You cannot really say rebellion. It is a resistance to the established order. But it is perfectly natural among kids. And it can happen in a conservative mind; it can happen in a liberal one.

Question. But you are getting other protests, too. In fact, this is almost the first

time when different groups all over the country have focused on one man for such totally different reasons. Some seem to act out of frustration, but they are not even all the same frustrations. Doesn't this disturb you?

Answer. Oh, naturally, you get groups that demand you take a position like opposing the income tax, or that say, "Let's invade Cuba tomorrow." But they are really few in number and, frankly, I do not pay any great attention to them. I think that the press, the country—and many people in the Republican Party—have become unduly exercised about the extreme minority. I was reading an unpublished paper of Madison's the other day and it is very interesting to note that he observed these groups. He called them "accidents." We have always had them in our country.

Question. Eliminating these fringe groups, then, what are the others that go to make up your movement?

Answer. Well, we have talked about youth. We have talked about the older people. Otherwise, I think these people are just generally across the country, at all age levels. They do not belong to any one group, but you will find them through the whole spectrum of American life. And they are worried. They have been worried for some time. Question. What do you think their philosophy is? What do they stand for?

Answer. That is a tough question. If I were certain of what they were for I could very easily write a platform. I do not think anybody can say what they are for.

Take one area: the trend toward centralized government. Nobody can say that you can do away with the Federal Government, and nobody can say that you can diminish its size to a great extent, but you can diminish its power over local government. Now here is where you begin to run into the varying shades of opinion. There are those people who say, "Get the Federal Government completely out of State and local government." And there are others who say, "Let the Federal Government resume—assume—its constitutional limitations." Some place between those two you have the answer.

Question. Then you are not certain what positive view this element has?

Answer. Let us clear up this positive negative attitude. I think it is a positive attitude to want to stay with the Constitution. I think it is a positive attitude to want to stay with the free enterprise system.

If you approach it from that position then you can say that the negative becomes the other side, those who want to circumvent the Constitution, to misinterpret it, and to replace the free-enterprise system. I would say that the Republican Party in 1964 will present a positive program as opposed to the negativism of the New Frontier.

Question. Did you not say, Senator, that you would find it difficult to write a program to satisfy this large group you are now describing?

Answer. If we sit down and try to be specific, yes. But if you want a statement of principles, such as Eisenhower has proposed and Nixon has proposed and I have proposed, then it is not difficult to be positive and be positive in a way that everybody can understand.

Question. You think you could agree with Messrs. Eisenhower and Nixon on such a statement?

Answer. I think so.

Question. If I were suddenly to say to you, "How do you classify yourself philosophically?" what would be your quick answer?

Answer. I would call myself a conservative although I think history will refer to me as a liberal.

Question. How do you define conservative?

Answer. A conservative, briefly, has a philosophy based upon the proven values of the past. When we seek answers for the problems of today we look to the past to see if those problems existed. Generally, they have. So we ask, What was the answer? Did it work? If it did, let us try it again.

Question. Speaking of the past, there is another question. You have taken certain positions in the past but today apparently, upon looking at things anew, you feel these positions do not apply any more.

Answer. I do not think any man living can say that he does not change his mind once in a while. In fact, I would not want a man in office who was so inflexible that he could not budge. And when I am wrong I am going to say I am wrong. I am not going to develop some new theory to prove that I was right the first time and that I am still right.

I have changed my mind, for example—and I have said this for over a year—about the Attorney General's having the power to move in in the case of a school district not integrating upon the complaint, the specific complaint, of a resident of that school district. I would not buy the idea—and I never have—that the Attorney General should be given the power to move in of his own will.

If a Federal court gives an edict, then the Federal Government, I think, has the duty to enforce that edict. If the Attorney General feels today that he does not have the right to move in on the complaint of a resident, let us write a tightly drawn law aiming at the righting of that one particular problem and give it to him.

Question. How does the States rights position come into this picture?

Answer. Once a Federal court has acted, or once a citizen has complained to the Attorney General based upon the Supreme Court's decision, I do not think the States have a right. But I would like to see this thing thrashed out through the courts again.

Question. Have you not said that you did not believe the Supreme Court's order on school integration was necessarily the law of the land?

Answer. I do not think any decision of the Supreme Court is necessarily the law of the land. The Constitution says that the laws of the legislature and treaties are the law of the land.

Now this is a great argument: Is a Supreme Court decision a law of the land or is it merely an interpretation of the Constitution? I think some decisions, given in the form of edicts, certainly would be the law of the land. But the one on school desegregation was not in the form of an edict.

Question. Senator, you have had a lot to say about centralized government, about the need to return powers to the States. When you talk about decentralization, what exactly would you decentralize?

Answer. It is not an easy process. I think if any person of a mind like mine became President it would not be a matter of immediately reversing the field. It would be looking at every new program and saying, "Can this be done better at the State level? If so, that's where it shall be done."

Question. Would you spell out three or four elements which you think are most important, and what you would do to change them?

Answer. First, there is the tax power. The taxing power of the Federal Government is the greatest source of centralized power.

You cannot do much about taxes, of course, until you can reduce expenditures. I think that you can reduce expenditures now maybe in the magnitude of \$10 billion. I do not think more than that, and it might not be more than \$7 billion. I think you can balance the budget. And once that has been done, then I think you can talk about

relieving the load of Federal taxation so that the local governments can tax more.

Question. In social security, what would you do?

Answer. I think that social security should be voluntary. This is the only definite position I have on it. If a man wants it, fine. If he does not want it, he can provide his own.

Question. What other elements of centralization are there?

Answer. Agriculture, for one. Thirty percent of our agriculture is not free. It is not only a terribly expensive approach, but the farmer is deprived of freedom of choice: what he is going to plant, how much he is going to plant, and what his price is going to be.

Or take the Department of the Interior. We in the West have to live with it. The uses of land are much more restricted than they've ever been before. Uncalled-for restrictions have been imposed. Decisions that used to be made at the State level now have to be made here in Washington.

Question. How about labor? Would you propose a right-to-work law now?

Answer. No. I do not think that solves the problem. I am in favor of voluntary unionism. "Right to work" is a misnomer. There is no right to work. You do not have the right to work. Neither do I. We have the right—the privilege—to take a job only if we can. I like to call it voluntary unionism.

I think we should start out on the premise that all States have voluntary unionism and then allow each to enact union-shop laws if it wants.

Question. What about foreign affairs? You have said in effect that it is almost impossible to reach any lasting agreement with the Russians. Then how do you propose to deal with them? What would you do specifically?

Answer. Well, again I would go to history. When have we been successful with—I dislike using the word "Russians," but I guess you have to—with the Communists? Whenever we have been firm, they have backed down. So my answer is let us keep it up. I am convinced that Russia will stand almost anything but an invasion of her own soil before she will go to war.

Question. Have we not been doing this? We did it in Cuba, did we not?

Answer. Yes. Wonderfully. Everybody in the country backed Kennedy to the hilt, and then one day he just pulled off. No more demand for on-site inspections and the thing fell through. So we still have a Communist problem down there. I am convinced that had Kennedy pushed, pushed, pushed, it could have been solved right there.

Question. What could he have done? Would you have invaded Cuba?

Answer. No. I do not think we would ever have had to. I think there were many alternatives open to Kennedy at the time. I think his first boner was the Bay of Pigs—although whether you can blame it entirely on him or not I do not know. Had he continued what he started and augmented it by encouragement of forces other than ours—Cubans, mercenaries—I think the thing would have been stopped.

Question. On the matter of our alliances. You have backed up the alliance with the more powerful countries. But what concession, if any, will you make if the inter-American system, for example, will not go along with our policy of blockade of Cuba?

Answer. I think that whatever we do, in an alliance or not, we have to be prepared to do it ourselves if necessary. I have never been convinced that the Latins would not back us. In fact, the only time I have ever seen real strong unanimity all across Latin America was at the time of Cuba, when they said, "Thank God, the United States is finally acting like a power."

Now, with our Allies, we do not have to go to war to prove to them that we are strong. We do not have to go to war to prove Kennedy's word that the defense of European cities is tantamount to the defense of our cities. But we have to show by consistently strong action that we mean what we say. I think this essentially is the weakness of our foreign policy today.

The Eisenhower-Dulles brinkmanship policy to me was the policy that we should maintain. There was nothing new about it. It has been used successfully since the beginning of history to keep peace.

Question. What do you do when you are a party to an alliance and the commanders agree that a certain number of divisions are necessary for the defense of the area from the Elbe to the North Sea, but they do not come forward with their troops to help defend it. Do you keep a quarter of a million Americans there indefinitely?

Answer. No. I think this is one of the great arguments for a decision on the use of nuclear weapons. I think we could probably return a third—maybe half—of our forces if we gave the NATO command the right to use nuclear weapons—tactical weapons—when they were attacked. If we had the immediate capacity of retaliating and the Communists knew it—and this is the important thing: if they knew it—I doubt that they would ever initiate an attack.

Question. Senator, could we conclude this with a high, wide and not so handsome question? What do you see as the job of the President today?

Answer. Well, it is a very tough job.

Question. Does it frighten you—the prospect that you might be in it?

Answer. Certainly. It scares the living daylight out of me—out of any man.

Question. What about Kennedy?

Answer. It scares the daylight out of him. As for your question: I think it is a job of leadership, a job of decisionmaking. I think this is why Truman is becoming more and more in the minds of Americans a better President, not so much for what he did, but because he made decisions. Eisenhower's greatest days were his days of decision. Kennedy is the same way. When Kennedy makes up his mind, everybody buys it.

Question. How do you direct this leadership?

Answer. How do you exert leadership over a business organization? You do not do it by sitting up on a top floor behind a desk. Nor can you be expected to know everybody. But you understand the problems, and when you are confronted with one that requires a decision it is not put off and put off and put off. A decision is reached.

My experience in business has been that and my experience here in the Senate has been that. One of Taft's great attributes was that he made decisions. You never had to say, "Well, what are we going to do tomorrow?" He told you. That, to me, is leadership.

#### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced the bill, S. 2341, to redesignate the National Cultural Center the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center as a tribute to our late President.

Today I received a letter from Col. Waldron E. Leonard, president of the Metropolitan Area Council of Veterans' Organizations. This council numbers among its members in the District of Columbia, nearby Virginia and Maryland the following organizations: the American Legion, the AMVETS, Army and Navy Union, Catholic War Veterans,

Disabled War Veterans, Irish War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, Legion of Valor, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Military Order of the World Wars, United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Veterans of World War I, World War Memorial and May Day Corp.

President Leonard has polled the members of the council and they are unanimous in the endorsement of S. 2341, which would rename the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center. I am appreciative of the support of the council and felt that my colleagues in the Senate would wish to know of the unanimous endorsement given by this organization and its member groups. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, to which I have referred, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

METROPOLITAN AREA COUNCIL OF  
VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS,  
Washington, D.C., November 27, 1963.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,  
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Wash-  
ington, D.C.  
(Attention: Mr. Lee Williams).

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I have just polled the members of this council and they are unanimous in the endorsement of S. 2341 redesignating the name from the National Cultural Center to that of John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

Sincerely,

WALDRON E. LEONARD,  
President.

#### FOUNDATION OF NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE, BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, an important development of great significance to Indian peoples in Canada and the United States is now taking place.

I refer to the organization of the Foundation of North American Indian Culture, a private, nonprofit, education corporation, which will hold its first annual meeting in Bismarck, N. Dak., on December 6 and 7. The Indian Culture Foundation is an outgrowth of the 1963 convention of the National Congress of American Indians held last September in Bismarck.

The importance of this foundation, it seems to me, is the broad scope of its organizers, who have recognized that something must be done in this generation to preserve past and present Indian culture on the North American Continent for our future generations. The foundation has a most comprehensive program—one which deserves support of all persons interested in perpetuating knowledge and works of our Indian people.

The Foundation of North American Indian Culture is the first organization of its kind dealing in Indian matters on an international basis. It seems to preserve this marvelous Indian heritage of Indian people in both Canada and the United States. Its board of directors includes some of the most respected Indian leaders of these two countries. An effort is being made to gain added repre-

sentation on the foundation board from Mexico, so that the rich Indian culture of our friends to the south may be brought into the overall program of preservation of Indian culture in North America. It is indeed a noble effort in international cooperation.

To cite some of the background of the Foundation of North American Indian Culture, I point out that it was organized during NCAI convention in Bismarck on September 12, 1963. A resolution calling for cooperation between NCAI and the foundation was adopted at this convention and the NCAI executive council suggested 11 names from among its leadership for consideration as foundation board members.

The foundation's organizers established headquarters in Bismarck because of the city's central location in the heart of the North American continent and because of the Indian heritage in this region. Preceding the NCAI convention were several months of careful organizational planning by the organizers, a group of public-spirited North Dakota citizens who were working on the annual convention of the National Indian Congress.

Since its establishment, the foundation has begun a membership drive, has completed plans for its annual meeting in early December and has clearly enunciated its goals and objectives.

These goals and objectives are as follows:

##### A. LONG RANGE GOALS

First. Provide a clearing house of information in one central location for all persons interested in Indian culture on the North American continent and throughout the world.

Second. To preserve all knowledge, history, artifacts, art work and handicrafts of the North American Indians.

Third. Provide a means of communication between persons interested in Indian culture.

Fourth. Tell the story of the North American Indian, through publication, tapes, filmstrips, films, speakers bureau and the news media. This story of the Indian and his culture, honestly told, will be done on an international basis.

Fifth. Help raise the prestige of North American Indians—among themselves and non-Indians—by displaying what the Indian can do and what talents he possesses.

Sixth. Help increase the economic possibilities for North American Indians by dramatizing this talent in the fields of entertainment, art, music, literature, and so forth.

Seventh. Encourage colleges and universities throughout the North American continent to offer courses in Indian history, art, anthropology and other fields.

Eighth. Help bring people from throughout the world to see firsthand existing Indian culture in its own surroundings.

##### B. SHORT-RANGE OBJECTIVES

First. Establish permanent headquarters in Bismarck, N. Dak., with office facilities, staff, and other arrangements; November 1963.

Second. Hold an annual meeting for persons in the United States and Canada

interested in program of the foundation; December 1963.

Third. Carry on national membership drive—following a Bismarck-Mandan and State drive this fall. Winter and spring 1964.

Fourth. Hold an annual Indian culture exposition in Bismarck; summer 1964.

Fifth. Begin a finance drive nationwide for a permanent headquarters building in Bismarck; fall 1964, winter 1965.

Sixth. Assemble best available Indian entertainment talent, art works, and handicrafts, for international tour; spring 1965.

Seventh. Take traveling entertainment-art show on the road to Europe and major United States, Canadian cities, winding up at second annual exposition; summer 1965.

The foundation will be financed through memberships and by a concerted finance drive throughout the United States and Canada. Finances from endowed foundations, private corporations, and individuals will be secured for office facilities of the foundation, which include construction of a headquarters and information center. An international Indian culture museum is planned for the late 1960's.

The cost of maintaining these headquarters facilities will be met through memberships and through proceeds of an annual North American Indian exposition to be held in Bismarck. This international attraction will include such features as an international Indian art show, a Canadian-United States rodeo, a trade fair of Indian handicraft and other manufactured products, an Indian parade, an Indian entertainment show and pageant, pow-wow dances, and stage shows starring show business celebrities. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police will be invited to participate in this colorful week-long attraction and other events will be included in the first annual exposition. Planning is now underway, and dates will be announced by the foundation at its annual meeting in early December.

In the space of a few short months the Foundation of North American Indian Culture has had tremendous growth. It has won the respect of Indian leaders in Canada and the United States. It has captured the imagination of citizens all over my State of North Dakota and gained backing of our public officials, chambers of commerce, city governments, and others.

I am pleased to report some of the comments on the foundation.

North Dakota Gov. William L. Guy had this to say in a letter to the Foundation:

I would like to commend all of you for your initiative and vision in establishing this foundation to take note of the impact of Indian culture on our way of life. We in North Dakota are proud of the heritage given us by Indian culture, but it takes such leadership as this foundation will provide to explain this heritage to others throughout the Nation. . . . I know this first annual meeting will be a rewarding experience and I think your plan for an annual exposition on Indian culture to be initiated next summer is a particularly noteworthy idea. I am pleased to note the progress you have already made.

The Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune editorialized this summary of Indian Culture Foundation accomplishments:

The projected Foundation of North American Indian Culture, which will be headquartered in Bismarck, has interesting possibilities. \* \* \* But like anything that is worthwhile, to bring it to maximum attainment of its far-reaching objectives will take a lot of hard work. It will need the stout support not only of Bismarck-Mandan but of all North Dakota. \* \* \* Basically, these objectives are to preserve and display the culture of the American Indian, past and present, and improve the economic opportunities of the Indian in the process. \* \* \* It would be difficult to find a better location than Bismarck, in the heart of the North American Continent and the center of so much Indian-related history itself, for this Indian cultural center. \* \* \* Here, on the banks of the Missouri, one of the most advanced Indian cultures thrived long before the white man came to disturb it. \* \* \* Here, also, the primitive Indian and the white man came into sharpest conflict in the long battle that was the winning of the West. \* \* \* The Missouri was the highway up which the white man advanced his civilization even as the Indian retreated before him. In this Great Plains area, the Indian actually made his last stand. Here he still makes his home, seeking now to preserve his ethnic heritage in a white man's cultural environment. \* \* \* From the standpoint of the Bismarck-Mandan area, and of North Dakota as a whole, the possibilities for gain from this endeavor are great. \* \* \* We have only to look around to see how successful are other activities in which the Indian is the central figure to know what a great attraction to visitors the planned annual Indian culture exposition here would be. The huge crowds attracted to this fall's convention of the National Congress of American Indians was but a hint. \* \* \* The Foundation naturally must seek and gain support here before it can expect to achieve much elsewhere. It is now in the process of a membership drive. Those who can see the possibilities in what it is trying to do, and want to give it their support, can do so by accepting this opportunity to become a part of it. It could be a tremendous thing for the community, area, State, and region.

In conclusion, I would like to report on the very excellent plans made for the foundation's annual meeting, December 6-7.

The annual meeting sessions will take place in the Grand Pacific Hotel, opening at 9 a.m. on December 6 and closing at 4 p.m. on December 7. The December 6 sessions will include an official welcome, reports on organization, membership and finance, formal incorporation ceremonies of the foundation, six simultaneous panel discussions and a review of each before a general assembly and an awareness program by a group of Indian students, a luncheon meeting and a banquet and program of Indian entertainment in the evening. The December 7 sessions will cover the board of directors meeting and planning sessions of the annual exposition committees.

Dr. Sol Tax, noted anthropologist and dean of the University of Chicago Extension Division, will deliver the meeting's main address at a December 6 luncheon. Dr. Tax is an authority on Indian culture.

Two well known Indian entertainers—Anita de Frey and Hot'e Casella, both of New York City—will be among fea-

tured performers on the December 6 evening program of banquet and Indian entertainment. Dance teams, drummers, and chanters from nearby reservations also will take part in this program. Will Rogers, Jr., Beverly Hills, Calif., has been invited to M.C. the program.

Chairmen have been secured for the six panel discussions on the afternoon of December 6. They are:

Entertainment potential in Indian Culture: Robert Burnette, Washington, D.C., executive director, National Congress of American Indians.

Employment possibilities in Indian culture: George Schmidt, Aberdeen, S. Dak., Area Resources and Industrial Development Officer, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Tourism outlook in Indian culture: John H. Sticher, Washington, D.C., Tourism Development Specialist, BIA.

Historical aspects of Indian culture: Miss Lyla Hoffine, Minot, N. Dak., English Department, Minot State College.

Technical and financial possibilities: Harold Schunk, Rosebud, S. Dak., Rosebud Agency Superintendent.

Arts and crafts marketing potential: Miss Alice Lighthall, Montreal, Quebec, vice president, Canadian Handicraft Guild.

The six panel discussions will begin at 1:30 and last until 3:30 p.m., followed by a 1½-hour period devoted to 15-minute reviews of each panel. Transcripts will be made of each recorder's summary and will be made available to the public upon request.

Plans for the December 6-7 annual meeting are being coordinated by seven committees under the general chairmanship of Bismarck businessman Chester Perry. The next meeting of the annual meeting committees is set for 10 a.m., November 22, in the Arikara Room of the Grand Pacific Hotel. Committees appointed for the annual meeting are: Banquet and ticket sales, reception and registration, program planning, hospitality, membership, annual exposition planning, and publicity.

The Indian American Folk Club of the Wahpeton Indian School, under the direction of Mrs. Robert Horne, will perform at the morning session on December 6, with an awareness program.

#### INTEREST RATE ON REA LOANS TO COOPERATIVES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, about 2 months ago the Senate considered and passed the agricultural appropriations bill for the fiscal year of 1964. During the Senate consideration of this bill, as the Senate may recall, the 2-percent interest rate on REA loans to rural electric cooperatives was the subject of a full afternoon's debate.

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] argued that the rate should be raised from the present 2 percent to 3 percent, and he moved to amend the bill to write such a provision into the law.

Much of the debate on that day concerned the interest cost to the Government for the money it borrows and the comparative amount of taxes paid by power companies and by rural electric

cooperatives. Senator LAUSCHE maintained that the cooperatives should pay the same rate of interest for their funds that the Government pays for its long-term borrowings and that the cooperatives should be taxed in exactly the same manner as the private power companies.

At the close of the debate, in which I took part along with several other Senators in support of the 2-percent rate, the Senate refused to suspend the rules to consider the Lausche amendment. The vote was 16 yeas to 57 nays.

I have high respect for the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and I frequently vote and work with him to cut or to prevent unwarranted subsidies. He is a conspicuously consistent and honest man. He has, as he has every right to do, spoken further in the Senate in defense of his criticism of the 2-percent interest rate on REA loans. I know he will not misunderstand my position and feelings if I now reply to certain arguments which he has made.

On November 13, the Senator referred to a \$125 million electric generating plant which is being built in his State. The project is a joint venture. The partners are a subsidiary of the American electric power system and a group of 30 rural electric cooperatives known as the Buckeye Electric Power Co.

As the Senator pointed out, the financing of this project is most interesting. The 30 rural electrics are not borrowing their share of the capital cost from the Rural Electrification Administration. Instead, the cooperatives are borrowing their share from general lenders in the open money market.

My good friend from Ohio says:

The ability of rural cooperatives to borrow in the open market rather than from the Federal Government is clearly demonstrated by this Ohio experience. It constitutes substantial proof that the Federal laws on rural electrics need modification.

Mr. President, I feel this alleged "proof" is insufficient and the conclusion much too hasty. I have inquired into this matter, and I find that the joint venture in Ohio is, in fact, a special case made possible only by a happy and enviable set of circumstances, which, so far as I can determine, does not exist in any other State.

Further, I believe that very few of the nearly 1,000 electric cooperatives now operating in 46 of the 50 States can go into the open money market today and borrow at the market rate of interest—and still remain solvent enough to perform the difficult job which has been assigned to them by the Congress.

We must remember that the cooperatives are required by law to provide electric service at the lowest possible cost to all who want such service in even the most remote rural areas, and I want to emphasize the word "all." The cooperatives are also nonprofit corporations. They operate in thinly populated areas. They are owned by the people they serve.

To assist the cooperatives in overcoming built-in impediments, the Congress set the interest rate on REA loans at 2 percent in 1944. Since then, the rural electric cooperatives have made remarkable progress. Many of them are well on

the way to the day when they will in fact be able to stand alone and be able to pay the open money market rate.

But I do not believe that this day is already here for all of the rural electric co-ops. A sudden change in the REA interest rate, made too soon and in too sweeping terms, could make many of these cooperatives dependent upon the Government and the Congress for an even longer period of time.

Now let us look at the uniquely favorable circumstances in Ohio. The 30 rural electrics associated in Buckeye Electric Power Co. are among the oldest and best established in the Nation. They were formed in the middle 1930's, right after the Rural Electrification Act was passed. Moreover, the areas served by these Ohio rural electrics have a high density of users of electricity and are a concentrated market contrary to the usual situation.

I think it can be agreed that these cooperatives are serving farmers in prosperous and growing rural areas. They are keeping in step with this prosperity and growth. Their equity in their systems amounts to more than 39 percent, a figure that is nearly double the national average for the rural electrics.

The generating plant that is being jointly built is located among the coal-fields from which fuel for the plant will be mined. A tremendous saving in the cost of transporting fuel to the new plant will benefit both the power company and the cooperatives.

But perhaps the most favorable circumstances result from good relations which exist between the power company and the group of cooperatives. These good relations have helped to bring about three agreements vital to the project and to the cooperatives' place in the power industry of Ohio.

First, the company has agreed to stay out of rural areas served by the cooperatives.

Second, the company has agreed to dispose of the cooperatives' surplus power during the early years of the new plant's operation.

Third, the company has agreed to transmit cooperative power from the plant to the 30 rural electric systems at a reasonable rate.

All of these agreements mean savings to the rural electrics. By their terms, the cooperative areas are protected from power company attempts to serve the larger and more lucrative loads. The cooperatives are not forced to build an expensive extra plant to provide standby power. The cooperatives are not forced to build their own transmission system.

In return for these agreements, the 30 rural electrics made a concession of their own. They agreed to borrow their share of the financing for the generating plant in the open money market, at the going rate of interest of about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  percent. I am told the power company insisted upon this point.

Thus the unique circumstances of this project permit significant savings, in the transporting of fuel, in construction, generation, and transmissions costs, and in protecting the present areas served

by the cooperatives. Because of these savings, the total cost of the power delivered to substations will be about 6.1 mills per kilowatt-hour or 1 mill less per kilowatt-hour than the present cost of wholesale power to these cooperatives. About 135,000 member-consumers in 74 of Ohio's 88 counties will substantially benefit. If REA financing had been used—and it should be noted that present REA policy restricts generation and transmission loans to 10-year future capacity and this project has capacity for from 15 or 20 years—the reduction in the cost of wholesale power would have been about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  mills per kilowatt-hour. So it is clear that only the unique combination of circumstances in this case justifies and provides compensation for the higher interest rate.

I emphasize, that the only alternatives open to rural electric cooperatives in other States are the 2 percent interest rate on REA loans and the REA Administrator's authority to make loans for the construction of generating plants and transmission lines. For in these other States, the private utilities are insisting on poaching on the more profitable areas which the REA serves and refusing to share with cooperatives the generating and transmission facilities and costs.

Incidentally, I understand that the Ohio rural electric cooperatives plan to continue to finance further additions to their distribution systems by borrowing from REA, because they, too, have found that when they are deprived of the specific advantages which are involved in the current arrangement they cannot yet bear the increased cost of private financing for these facilities which may be needed in the future.

This is true because the electric power business is different from most businesses in several respects. It requires, for example, a high ratio of capital to revenue from the sales of power. In other words, investment in the electric power business turns over slowly.

The rural electric cooperatives, because they operate in thinly populated areas and serve relatively light loads, sell about \$1 worth of energy annually for every \$5 invested in plant. This means it takes about 5 years for gross revenues to equal the capital value of the cooperatives' plant and other fixed assets. It should never be forgotten that for the Nation as a whole, there are only about three customers for every mile of REA distribution line whereas in the case of the private utilities there are approximately 33 or 11 times as many. May I give an example of what these facts mean to a rural electric cooperative? Suppose the co-op had a turnover rate of plant to revenues of 5 to 1. This would mean that the co-op received every year \$200,000 of revenues for every \$1 million invested in plant.

At a 2 percent rate of interest, the interest charges would amount to \$20,000 or 10 percent of the revenues received by the cooperative. But if the co-op were forced to borrow in the open market at 4 percent, as the Senator from Ohio maintains all rural electrics should borrow, the interest charges would eat up \$40,000 or 20 percent of the revenues. At 3 percent the interest costs would

consume \$30,000 or 15 percent of the revenues. At 6 percent, which might be the interest rate for cooperatives in the private money market, the interest charges would take a full \$60,000 or 30 percent of the revenues.

Mr. President, the overwhelming majority of the rural electric cooperatives in this country are not ready for such a tremendous increase in their capital costs. The favorable circumstances which attend the current Ohio project exist today only in Ohio. The 2 percent interest rate on REA loans and the REA Administrator's authority to make generation and transmission loans should be preserved intact by the Congress. It would be a serious mistake to force the cooperatives as a whole into the open market; many of them would become wards of the Congress for many more years to come. In return for area coverage and compelling the cooperatives to provide service in sparsely settled farm districts, the Nation has granted the REA's favorable credit terms. This does involve a small subsidy, but it is one subsidy which to my mind is justified. For it has helped to lift a terrific burden of toil from the shoulders of farm men and women. It has brought electric lights, refrigeration, and warm baths to farm homes. It has helped to banish lanterns from the barn and the scrubbingboard from the washroom. Food is being cooked, cows milked, and water pumped by electricity. By television and radio, the news of the outside world has been brought into the farmers' families just as the subsidized rural free delivery systems has helped to bring to them letters and printed matter. The sister service of cooperative telephone systems has also helped to make communications between the relatively isolated farmers and the outside world more immediate and direct. All this and many other benefits as well have helped the farmers both socially and economically. In fact, the REA's were one of the great constructive achievements of the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt. We should not permit them to be strangled in the full flower of their usefulness.

#### RAMPART DAM ON THE YUKON RIVER IN ALASKA CAN BE A MONUMENT TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, recently two important organizations have passed resolutions urging construction of the great Rampart Dam on the Yukon River in Alaska.

At the recent convention of the AFL-CIO, held November 14-20, the great Alaska project was endorsed by this powerful organization in its resolution recommending action on various projects of significance in the conservation and development of American natural resources.

Meanwhile, at an important meeting at Seward, Alaska, the Alaska Municipal League, an organization established to encourage the civic betterment of all communities in Alaska, adopted a resolution calling attention to the importance

of constructing the Rampart project. This organization—whose membership includes most Alaska towns and cities, from tiny Anaktuvuk, with an isolated population of 103 to our largest city, Anchorage, with its 50,000 population; the farthest north city of the United States, Barrow; the farthest southeastern Alaska city of Ketchikan; Nome on the far western shores of the Bering Sea; Juneau, the State's capital, in southeastern Alaska and many others—has demonstrated Alaskans are united in an effort to make the dream of Rampart on the Yukon River, 100 miles northwest of Fairbanks, a reality.

The Rampart site is, unquestionably, the greatest hydroelectric power resource in the free world. At Rampart could produce nearly five million kilowatts of electric energy—more than  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times the power produced at Grand Coulee and more than at all the installations of the TVA. Rampart is the only site now known on the North American continent where could be produced the same quantities of power now made available in the Soviet Union at two giant dams the Russians have developed, at Bratsk and Krasnyarsk in Siberia—one of which is now producing and the other of which is close to production. Rampart power will cost less than any other in America—2 to 3 mills per kilowatt at tidewater locations.

The meaning of this to America is clear. The great power that Rampart will produce will be needed for the defense of our Nation, as will all the natural resources this Nation possesses.

Not only for bolstering our industrial base for the protection of the Nation, but for its immense potential contribution to the economic welfare of the country, Rampart must be built.

Studies completed for the Corps of Engineers by the Development and Resources Corp. of New York, by highly reputable economists and engineers led by the distinguished David Lillenthal, chairman of the board, and the late Gordon Clapp, who was president of the corporation, have demonstrated that, without doubt, there will be a substantial market for the power that will be produced at Rampart. Indeed their report indicates that all of Rampart's power will be spoken for as soon as generated; that more will be needed and that an entire river basin development, on the mighty Yukon, will be in order.

The great electroprocess industries that use energy as a raw material, and not simply as a means of moving equipment, to produce such commodities as aluminum, magnesium, titanium, zirconium, hafnium, electric steel, electric pig iron, electrolytic copper, zinc and nickel, ferro alloys, chlorine and caustic soda, calcium carbide, elemental phosphorus, artificial abrasives, and many others will shortly find there is a shortage of the essential cheap electricity required for operation. At Rampart there will be exactly the resource needed.

There is no question that the demands of our growing population will increase enormously for the rest of this century. The need for all the goods and commodities necessary to sustain our standard

of living will inevitably require increased supplies of low-cost power.

It does not take a sophisticated economic analysis of this to come to the conclusion the demand for more goods, accompanied by the demand for greater supplies of power means, at the same time, employment of ever increasing numbers of our citizens at productive jobs. The existence of an inexcusably high rate of unemployment in the United States leads to the inescapable conclusion people who want to work should have remunerative employment producing the goods others want to buy.

Thus, construction of Rampart will, without question, lead to desirable improvements in our economy everywhere, since our country grows and prospers as a whole.

Of course, the effect of Rampart construction in Alaska will be most dramatic. This one project can do more to develop the economy of the 49th State than any other measure that can be taken. No one project can add more to U.S. power and prestige in the realm of resource development.

Beyond the economic boost it will give the State of Alaska, Rampart will provide an unparalleled opportunity to enhance the environment of the area for residents now living there, for wild creatures now indigenous to the area, and for new species of fish and fowl that could be introduced.

The reservoir at Rampart will be larger than Lake Erie—a manmade lake of more than 10,000 square miles in area. Here will be a new paradise for sportsmen. Here can be a great inland fresh water commercial fishery. The traversable waterway will make available wilderness areas of Alaska now completely inaccessible for lack of transportation. It will permit introduction of new species of fish to Alaska that will be a great attraction to fishermen, both sport and commercial.

Those who are most dedicated to preservation of wilderness beauty of the great forests of southeastern Alaska, the towering mountains and glaciers and the lovely rivers and lakes that make our State incomparably beautiful will, I believe, find only gain and no loss resulting from construction of Rampart Dam. In fact, the location of the damsite in the Yukon Flats is one of its major advantages. The barren and desolate wastes, the vast swamplands that would be flooded by the Rampart reservoir could only be improved by the creation of a manmade lake providing generous opportunity for recreation as well as economic development now impossible in the area. There are, at the Rampart location, at present, no scenic wonders, no recreational resources, no natural beauty that would be affected by construction of the dam.

The people who would be first and most dramatically affected by the construction of Rampart and the creation of the reservoir are the some 2,000 native residents of the villages of Circle, Fort Yukon, Venetie, Beaver, Stevens Village, Rampart, and Chalkyitsik whose villages will, over a period of 18 years, be flooded by the waters of the reservoir. Last August I toured all of these villages

with the exception of Chalkyitsik, which is so isolated as to be virtually inaccessible, to talk with the residents about Rampart Dam and discuss their views on this new development in their lives. I found almost no opposition to construction of Rampart. On the contrary, the native citizens of the area are as well aware of the great economic benefits this project can bring to them as any other residents of Alaska. Living as they do now, in grim deprivation of the most elementary comforts of modern life in the rest of America, nothing but good can come to the natives of the Yukon from the construction of Rampart. For the first time in their history there will be an opportunity for useful employment bringing stable incomes, in the beginning, at jobs necessary to preparation of the site and construction of the dam, later in industries using Rampart's 5 million kilowatts of energy. With employment and economic stability will come opportunities for education and a standard of living providing such ordinarily accepted necessities as plumbing, electric lights, and appliances, to say nothing of roads giving access to the world outside the isolated limits of the villages.

For these reasons, I commend to our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, the strong endorsement of his administration of Rampart Dam. As Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and TVA are enduring reminders of the vigorous achievements of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, so Rampart can be a monument to the vitality of the Lyndon Johnson administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions of the Alaska Municipal League and the AFL-CIO be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### RESOLUTION OF ALASKA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

Whereas the population of the United States is expected to almost double in the next 50 years; and

Whereas roughly 2 million new jobs must be created each year; and

Whereas gross national product is expected to quadruple in the next 50 years; and

Whereas Alaska, one-fifth as large as the 48 States, can and must supply many of the resources needed for this economic explosion; and

Whereas the use of electric power in the United States in the next 40 years is predicted to increase 10 to 12 times; and

Whereas the development of the last remaining large hydroelectric power site in the United States capable of producing the cheapest electrical power is located on the Yukon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alaska Municipal League, recognizing the urgent need of large quantities of low cost power for the proper development and economic well-being of Alaska and the Nation, hereby urges the early submission to Congress and passage of an authorization bill allowing immediate construction of the Rampart Dam.

#### RESOLUTION 221

##### CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

The unfinished business that lies before this Nation is the conservation, development, and wise use of its natural resources is one of high urgency.

Population growth, urbanization, expended industrialization and technological change have not only accentuated the draft upon available natural resources, but have brought with them serious problems associated with man's assault on his environment—on the water he uses, the air he breathes, on the lands he needs for his out-of-doors recreation.

Our natural resources dilemma is compounded of these factors, and does not yield readily to stop-gap approaches, half-measures or compartmentalized jurisdictions.

The present administration has from time to time appeared to sense the urgency of our resources situation, and proposed a number of measures to meet some of its more serious aspects. Yet our hope for a firm decisive modern Federal resources policy has not been realized.

Labor regards such a policy as indispensable to the attainment of full employment, economic stability and growth called for in the Employment Act of 1946.

We set forth these principles as guidelines for such a policy and for the programs which must give it life and meaning to the people: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That—*

1. The Federal Government is and must continue to be the principal steward of the natural resources of the American people. Resources problems, like river systems, geographical regions, and flow of air, are no respectors of man-made boundaries. They have become national in scope and can be successfully attached, only if the massed resources and the national leadership of the United States is brought to bear upon them.

2. To eliminate the years of duplication, waste, jurisdictional, and policy conflicts among Federal resources agencies, the Federal Government must undertake to reorganize and coordinate its resources policies and structure. Such unified policies will facilitate carrying out comprehensive land, water, and energy resources programs to contribute their fullest measure to achievement of overall national goals of economic growth and stability and strengthening of democratic institutions.

3. Within a reinvigorated policy framework, there would be undertaken comprehensive river basin development programs based on the approach so magnificently demonstrated by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

4. We call for reservation of and strengthening historical Federal safeguards against monopolization of America's resources heritage, including preference in the sale of federally generated power, excess land ownership provisions, and the safeguards and regulatory programs under the Federal Power Natural Gas and Public Utilities Holding Company Act.

5. America is now moving into the age of giant power technology which must be harnessed to benefit all consumers and the general public.

The Nation's future power supply will require joint ownership of the power supply and transmission facilities by private, cooperative and publicly owned utilities, including the Federal Government, with Federal leadership in planning the most economic and feasible regional and interregional power interconnections, and laying down the rules for their operation in the public interest.

Existing utilities, privately, cooperatively, and publicly owned would be allowed to pool their resources into regional power supply agencies and required to meet the requirements of all electric distributing systems without discrimination and at uniform low wholesale rates. Regional systems would be allowed to finance their operations through issuance of revenue bonds under Federal legislation.

A prerequisite for success of such a giant power program would be provision in legislation that all major transmission lines be

designated as common carriers, just as are railroads, steamship lines, airlines, and bus lines.

6. We regard the so-called public versus private power controversy, as a contrived irrelevancy which continues to block needed resources development programs. The Federal, State, and local governments, and the electric utility industry all have a proper and necessary place in America's energy future—each within its own area of responsibilities.

We urge legislation adopted by the various States enabling all utility workers, whether employed by publicly, cooperatively or privately owned utilities, to achieve the same collective bargaining rights as are accorded to workers in industry generally.

Within the framework of the broad policies we have proposed, the principle of comprehensive, multiple-purpose development must be the guideline for land, water and energy development programs, including harnessing the great Passamaquoddy tidal resource, and building the Rampart Dam in Alaska.

We call special attention to the Nation's water supply situation, which is not only limited by natural conditions, which require further storage and control as an answer, but is facing serious curtailment at the hands of man through pollution of rivers, lakes, and streams throughout the Nation and by impending regional shortages. Progress is being made through amendments to Federal water pollution control legislation. Further efforts will be required, particularly in strengthened Federal enforcement authority, expanded research, State and local action, Federal desalination programs, and national standards to determine presence of water pollution.

Labor urges equivalent efforts at all levels of Government be made to abate increasingly serious threat to the Nation's health and economy from air pollution. We support legislation calling for similar programs in this field and in the field of pesticides control as have been established by the Congress to abate pollution of water.

We support legislation to establish a national wilderness system. Progress is being made toward a national outdoor recreational policy, together with programs of outdoor land acquisition and development for expansion of Federal, State, and local recreational facilities, taking into particular consideration growing urban requirements.

We urge expansion of scientific research programs in the field of natural resources and environmental health, air and water pollution, pesticides and manmade radiation.

#### SENATOR CHURCH'S TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address delivered by myself, in tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy, at memorial services held at the River Road Unitarian Church, in Bethesda, Md., on November 24, 1963.

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

#### IN MEMORIAM—A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH, at memorial services held at the River Road Unitarian Church in Bethesda, Md., November 24, 1963)

It is not my purpose or place to deliver the sermon this morning. That is properly a service for your own pastor to perform. It is, rather, my purpose to say a few words in tribute to our fallen President.

I hope you will understand if I speak of him in somewhat personal terms, for this is the way I shall remember him.

He was my friend. I loved and honored him. I was proud for my country that he was our President.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was one of those rare human beings about whom it could be truly said " \* \* \* the elements so mix'd in him that Nature might stand up and say to all the world 'This was a man.' "

He was as handsome as a storied prince; his wife, Jacqueline, as fair as any princess of song or legend. With his encouragement, she made the White House a place of impeccable beauty, where occasions of state were conducted in the style, and with a graciousness and gaiety that befits a great nation. Whenever I was present on these occasions, I never failed to marvel at the President's composure. His dignity was natural to him, and his friendliness always set his guests at ease. How unprepared they were to discover in him that endearing quality of self-effacement, which he often revealed through some lighthearted witicism, but which invariably disclosed his underlying humility. Once, in a toast to the King of Afghanistan, I recall how he explained why the Constitution limited the President to 8 years in office. The amendment had been adopted, he said, partly out of consideration for the well-being of the President, but mainly, he added with a smile, out of consideration for the well-being of the country.

Many of you will remember the celebrated comment he made to that illustrious company of Noble Prize winners who came to dine with him at the White House. Never, he remarked, has so much talent been gathered at one time under this roof, since Thomas Jefferson used to dine here alone.

Such was the brilliance of the social life which John and Jacqueline Kennedy brought to the Presidential Mansion. But more important was the kind of family life they implanted there. Somehow they managed to make that big house a home. Along with other playmates, their daughter, Caroline, and their little son, whom the President liked to call "John-John," used to gather in the play yard, within easy view of their daddy's office. He was seldom too busy to be interrupted by them; he refused to permit the heavy burdens of his office to usurp his family function as a loving father. The personal attention he gave to his children, and to the needs of his grief-stricken wife, when their infant son, Patrick, died soon after birth a few months ago; the tender pictures of John-John on the south lawn awaiting his father's arrival by helicopter, or crawling through the trapdoor in his father's desk, while the President was sitting there absorbed with his evening's work; the familiar sight of Caroline clutching her father's hand as he led the family into church on a Sunday morning—all combined to present to the country the finest example of a devout and affectionate family, setting a moral standard of the highest order.

The many attributes that made John F. Kennedy such an exceptional person cannot be compressed into the short tribute I pay him this morning. Well known was his bravery in battle; his literary talents which won for him the Pulitzer Prize; the fortitude with which he bore the pain in his injured back; the ceaseless energy with which he pursued his quest for self-fulfillment through 17 years of honorable service in the House of Representatives, the Senate, and, finally, the White House itself.

History will judge his greatness as a President, but already it is clear that he will be remembered for the strength of his statesmanship which saw us through the dread missile crisis in Cuba a year ago, when the world trembled on the brink of thermonuclear war. And he will be remembered too

for the initiative he brought to the search for peace—for the first step along that road he made possible through the nuclear test ban treaty. Not since Lincoln has any President been so deeply committed to the cause of equal treatment for all Americans.

The tragedy of his death is heightened because it came so cruelly at the prime of his extraordinary life. It came as he was grappling with the gigantic problems of our times with the skill and courage of a young David—only to be struck down by an assassin in his own country, in a foul and cowardly murder which crosses us all with shame.

Once, when he faced a crucial primary test, in that long, arduous trek he made toward the Presidency, I ask him whether he believed in prayer. He said he did, and he seemed genuinely moved when I told him I would pray for him. Now, I think, he would want us all to pray for our new President, in faith that a national revulsion against every kind of fanaticism will wash the land clean, so that the hand of Lyndon B. Johnson may be upheld by the councils of reason and decency against the councils of ignorance, bigotry, and hate.

May God preserve this Republic and keep her sensible, strong, and free. Amen.

### RECLAMATION PROGRAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, for many years I have used the adage "You can outwit the bureaus but you cannot outwait them." The more experience I receive in Government the more I realize the truth of that saying.

Recently the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Floyd E. Dominy, addressed the National Reclamation Association at Sun Valley, Idaho. The title of his speech was "Wake up, America." He expressed his concern that there were no new starts in sight and that no new projects were being authorized by the Congress. He said:

We seem to be on dead center, caught in the middle of controversy, disagreement, and unresolved issues. I am deeply concerned about this stagnation in our reclamation program.

Mr. President, I, too, am concerned. I will yield to no one in my support of reclamation. We need not be on dead center nor should we be. If the Bureau of Reclamation will come forward with realistic programs that are feasible Congress will approve them. But, if the Commissioner continues to push for projects which are unwise, uneconomical, and unfeasible, he will be denied again and again.

This year Mr. Dominy and the Bureau were once again denied the Burns Creek project which is unfeasible and impractical. Although this was the seventh time that Congress had said "No" to the Burns Creek project, Mr. Dominy gave a speech on October 25, endorsing and calling for the construction of this project which is unworthy of further consideration.

He said, "Burns Creek is still with us." And I say, how many times does Congress have to say "No" to a bad project?

Burns Creek has been considered by various committees in the House and Senate every year since 1958. Burns Creek was originally proposed for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation as a reclamation project.

Congress considered Burns Creek as a reclamation project five times and in

every instance refused to endorse the project. In 1962 the Government employees, who had been denied their project by Congress, brought forward the Burns Creek scheme as a flood control project. Never before had it been suggested that Burns Creek was a flood control project and it is not—its purpose is to produce Federal power.

The House of Representatives defeated it as a flood control project after floor debate in 1962. Again, this year the Federal power people of the Department of Interior tried to classify Burns Creek as a flood control project. Fortunately, the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee has refused to authorize Burns Creek.

This committee has demonstrated its superior wisdom but can it outwait the bureaucrats? It is the hope of the people of Wyoming and all America that Congress will not yield to the persistent but unwise pressures of the Bureau of Reclamation.

What do you have to do to convince the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies that you mean "No" when you say "No" to one of their pet projects?

I appeal to Mr. Dominy to use his energies and his staff to develop a realistic reclamation program. We need to get off dead center and to wake up America, but we cannot do this by riding a dead horse such as Burns Creek.

### TRIBUTE TO MATSON NAVIGATION CO.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the big "M" emblazoned on many a ship's smokestack in the Pacific is the proud symbol of the Matson Navigation Co. Matson can look back today over a record of 81 continuous years of service to its country in the Pacific.

Recently, Hawaii's elected lawmakers and those in Washington who have played a role in helping to develop Hawaii's ocean transportation system were honored by the shipping line. Matson's newest combination container-automobile freighter has been named the *Hawaiian Legislator*. Matson felt this was a fitting tribute to legislators in Hawaii and Washington who continue to work to develop a healthy economy for the State and an efficient and modern water transportation system between Hawaii and the Mainland.

The C-4 type vessel, named the *Coast Progress* when Matson acquired her in 1962, was renamed the *Hawaiian Legislator* this year after her conversion for her significant place in Matson's specialized Hawaiian freight fleet.

The use of occupational type names preceded by "Hawaiian" for most of Matson's freighters is relatively new in the line's 81-year history. It began shortly before America's entry into World War II and makes an interesting chapter in the derivation of the names of Matson ships since Captain William Matson entered the Hawaiian trade with his three-master schooner *Emma Claudina* in 1882. Since the "Matson Era" of Hawaiian trade shipping, the vessels of Matson—incorporated as a San Francisco-headquartered firm in 1910—have

been interwoven with the heritage and folklore as well as the economy of Hawaii—first the kingdom, then the Republic, followed by the Territory, and now the State.

The SS *Lurline*, a combination passenger-freight carrier built in 1908, was the first ship actually constructed by Matson Navigation Co. after 26 years of ship acquisitions. At the time of Captain Matson's death in 1917 there were 8 ships in the Matson fleet, a fourth of the 32 he acquired during his lifetime. Twenty-two of these were sailing vessels.

Except for the *Lurline* of 1908—the second *Lurline* operated by Matson—and the *Enterprise* and *Hilonian*, all of the remaining 29 ships during Captain Matson's lifetime retained the names given them by their previous owners.

Matson's second *Lurline* was named after the *Lurline* Captain Matson acquired an interest in during 1887, the year the ship was named by the Spreckels family of San Francisco, which had her built.

German-born Claus Spreckels, who came to San Francisco with his family in 1856, put up 58 percent of the \$2,500,000 Oceanic Steamship Co., incorporated on December 22, 1881. Oceanic, which served Hawaii, the South Pacific, and Australia, was acquired by Matson in 1926.

Spreckel's *Lurline*, a 135-foot brig, was named during her construction at Matthew Turner's Benicia, Calif., shipyard. Nor was she the first Spreckels-owned *Lurline*. John D. Spreckels, son of Claus and a music lover since boyhood in Germany, gave his 1883-built schooner-yacht the name *Lurline*.

*Lurline*, incidentally, stems from Lorelei, the title of several European operas composed in the 1800's. A three-act grand romantic opera titled "*Lurline*" was published by William Hall & Son on New York's Broadway in 1868. The words of the opera, by Edward Fitzball, refer to *Lurline* as "The nymph of the Rhine, who, by her enchanted harp and song, lures vessels to destruction in the whirlpool of the river."

The derivation of *Lurline* is of particular interest today because on December 6, 1963, in San Francisco, the fourth oceangoing *Lurline* will be christened to perpetuate this famed and beloved name in Pacific passenger service. The *Lurline*-to-be is presently the 760-passenger luxury liner *Matsonia*, the third ship named after the founder of the Matson Lines.

The first *Matsonia*, constructed in 1913, saw the start of a succession of Matson ships whose names began with the letter M. The *Matsonia*, was followed by the *Manoa*, *Maui*, *Manulani*, *Manukai*, *Mahukona*, *Makaweli*, *Makena*, *Mauna Ala*, *Makiki*, and *Malama*, and several others, all of which had Hawaiian meanings.

It is worth noting that, during this period, all the Matson ships carried the letter M on each side of their smokestacks as they do today. The smokestack lettering started with the *Enterprise* in 1902 after Captain Matson converted the ship to burn oil and carry a capacity of 22 passengers.

The breaking point in the succession of Matson Navigation Co. ships whose names started with M came in 1934 when Matson dissolved the 10-ship Los Angeles Steamship Co. it purchased in 1931. Matson retained some but not all of the line's ship names. In 1937, the year Matson took full ownership of 11 ships then owned by Oceanic and Oriental Navigation Co., it chose "non-M" names for some of its Los Angeles Steamship and O and O ships. It did so for good reason.

There are only 13 letters in the Hawaiian language and the company was hard pressed to select suitable Hawaiian "M" names which had such meanings as budding season for Maliko; coral reef-fish for Manini; winding mountain for Maunawili; fragrant mountain for Mauna Ala, and sea bird for Manukai.

By March 1, 1938, Matson owned 43 freighters and the liners *Lurline*, *Matsonia*, *Mariposa*, and *Monterey*. The 47 ships were the most ever owned at one time by Matson, although the line operated about 125 ships for the War Shipping Administration during World War II.

Just prior to the war as well as after it, Matson officials decided to rename the freighter fleet. Each ship was to have "Hawaiian" as part of its name. The reason was to avoid any confusion on the part of any mainland shippers between Hawaiian and Japanese names.

On March 19, 1947, the company announced its postwar fleet-naming program. Each of the company's 15 C-3 type freighters were to have an occupational type name preceded by "Hawaiian." This carried forward the plan inaugurated just prior to World War II with the naming of the *Hawaiian Shipper*, *Hawaiian Merchant*, *Hawaiian Packer*, and *Hawaiian Planter*. The Government requisitioned these ships during the war.

Matson's postwar fleet of 15 C-3's ultimately became the *Hawaiian Merchant*, *Hawaiian Builder*, *Hawaiian Planter*, *Hawaiian Banker*, *Hawaiian Craftsman*, *Hawaiian Educator*, *Hawaiian Retailer*, *Hawaiian Citizen*, *Hawaiian Fisherman*, *Hawaiian Packer*, *Hawaiian Rancher*, *Hawaiian Farmer*, *Hawaiian Refiner*, *Hawaiian Pilot*, and *Hawaiian Wholesaler*. These ships were mainly in the California-Hawaii service.

In the Pacific Northwest-Hawaiian trade were the Liberty-type ships *Hawaiian Forester*, *Hawaiian Lumberman*, and *Hawaiian Logger*. The *Hawaiian Trader* replaced the *Hawaiian Forester* in 1955, leaving the *Hawaiian Lumberman* and the *Hawaiian Logger* in this service. In the Hawaiian-East Coast trade were the *Hawaiian Tourist* and the *Hawaiian Traveler*, both purchased in 1956.

Three liners were in Matson's wholly owned subsidiary, The Oceanic Steamship Co., purchased from the Spreckels interests in 1926. The United States-South Pacific trade ships were the *Sierra*, *Ventura*, and *Sonoma*. These passenger liners were replaced in 1932 when Oceanic built the luxury liners *Mariposa* and *Monterey*.

In Oceanic's postwar service there were four C-2 freighters, the *Alameda*, *Ventura*, *Sierra*, and *Sonoma*. The present passenger liners *Mariposa* and *Monterey* entered the Oceanic service in December 1956 and January 1957, respectively.

In 1961 three of Matson's C-3's replaced Oceanic's four C-2's. The *Hawaiian Banker* became the *Sierra*, the *Hawaiian Pilot* the *Sonoma*, and the *Hawaiian Wholesaler* the *Ventura*.

Meanwhile, in Matson's Hawaiian fleet the *Hawaiian Fisherman* reentered the trade in 1961 as the Pacific's first automobile carrier. She was renamed *Hawaiian Motorist* in 1962.

Two "jumboized" C-4's, the *Californian* and *Hawaiian*, were purchased in 1960 for bulk sugar-container service in the Hawaiian trade. Because of their apt names when purchased the company retained the names for these two similar ships.

I have not mentioned the names of non-ocean-crossing Matson vessels—of which there have been many—but Matson has a 300-foot container barge *Islander*, a vessel designed by Matson's Engineering Development Department and built solely for Hawaiian waters. The *Islander*, which goes into service late this year, inaugurates Matson's container service between Hawaii's four major islands. She will operate out of Honolulu calling at ports on Maui, the Big Island of Hawaii, and Kauai.

The container barge, like Matson Navigation Co.'s present oceangoing fleet of 1 passenger liner and 15 freighters and Oceanic's 2 passenger liners and 3 freighters, is unique. These vessels are unique because they carry, in addition to their cargoes, the responsibilities for maintaining an unbroken link of commerce between the only ocean surrounded State in the Union, more than 2,000 miles from the nearest State of California. Matson should be justifiably proud of its 81 years of achievement.

#### PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, as the Nation emerges from its all-engulfing grief over the tragic loss of our great President—and emerge somehow we must—the question naturally on everybody's lips is "What about Lyndon Johnson?"

I am confident that those of us who know him well, those of us who have served with him anywhere along the line in his 30 years of Government service, would answer with almost one voice:

"He is undoubtedly the most superbly trained man in the country for the Presidency."

When we look back on these dark days from some vantage point in the future, I am convinced we will be able to say, with conviction and gratitude, that a fortunate nation was given the right man in the right hour. By experience, by temperament, by love of country, and by personal conception of the duties of a national leader, it is hard to imagine a man with more suitable qualities for the Presidency at this time than Lyndon Johnson. He is cast in the mold of greatness, and his compassionate heart,

his tough and resilient mind, and his ability to ask for—and get—action when it is needed, will move our country on in the work we must do to meet the challenge of the 1960's.

President Johnson is widely known and respected in Utah. He has made several visits to the State, and has been warmly received. His manner is Western, and he speaks our language. Like President Kennedy, he has always been a good friend of reclamation, and we have no fear that he will dim or change the vital place in our national life given to water resource development in the past 3 years.

President Johnson, then majority leader of the Senate, made one of his visits to Utah in the closing days of the 1959 campaign. I shall always feel that his appearance at that time—the force of his personality, and his words of endorsement—helped give me the margin for election to the U.S. Senate.

Upon one of his visits to Utah, after his serious heart attack, Senator Johnson met the late John F. Fitzpatrick, publisher of the Salt Lake Tribune, and during the years before Mr. Fitzpatrick's death, the two exchanged many letters and became warm, personal friends.

I am glad that Joseph Alsop, the noted columnist, recalled for us in his column the assessment of President Kennedy, the candidate, for the man who was opposing him for the nomination. Jack Kennedy stated:

If I didn't want the job myself, I'd get behind Lyndon. He's the ablest man I know in American politics, and he really cares about this country, as I want the President to care.

I am convinced that President Kennedy's evaluation of the man he chose as his Vice President, and the man who as his successor will now carry forth the Kennedy program, will be borne out in the months ahead. America is blessed to have him at its helm in this heart-breaking moment in history a new President of the caliber of Lyndon Baines Johnson. We can give him no less than our total support.

#### THE STRATEGY OF DECEPTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DOBBS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] praised the new book, "The Strategy of Deception," edited by Jeane J. Kirkpatrick and published by Farrar, Straus & Co. I would like to join in their recommendation.

This book is the most concise yet descriptive volume on Communist tactics that I have read in a long time. In none of the 16 perceptive essays will the lay reader become lost in theory and conjecture. These essays present hard proven facts. They show the devious, inconsistent, and conflicting methods that the Communists have used in their efforts to expand Soviet power.

Many of the contributors to this series of essays in "The Strategy of Deception" have had firsthand experience of Communist tactics. One of the writers in fact, Julian Gorkin, was a founder of the Communist Party in Levant, Spain.

This book reveals to the layman what communism really is—a totalitarian dictatorship aimed at carrying out that which is most expedient for its leaders and at any cost, even the cost of multitudes of human lives. The essays show that communism is not the panacea its masters claim for the benefit of the working class, for, as Mr. E. P. W. da Costa, one of the essayists, points out, under communism neither the lot of the working class nor the speed of industrialization is superior to that found in India or Japan; if anything such progress is inferior because of the great waste of material and human resources under Communist methods.

Among the essays is one by Mr. Asoka Mehta showing how the local Communists in India change their policies and propaganda without any concern for consistency so as to be able to toe the partyline dictated by Moscow. The Communist Party in India, as is also true in the countries of South America and Asia, merely adapts itself to whatever conflicts divide the society. Thus Mr. Mehta shows that in one State—Kerala—the Communists sided with the low caste Hindus, while in another State—Hyderabad—they campaigned for the restoration of the Maharajah.

The Communists in India have supported and opposed national independence; have supported and opposed Indian participation in World War II; have supported and opposed regional and linguistic separatism; and have supported and opposed Gandhi and his goals. This complete opportunism in India is not unique; the same opportunism is found wherever the Communists exist. In another essay Prof. Robert S. Alexander amply demonstrates that this is true in Latin America.

Jeane Kirkpatrick's book is a book which will be extremely useful to all people who want to learn what communism is all about without groping through tedious basic political theory. This is a book for the general public. Also, I recommend it to the youth of today who has not had the opportunity to observe Communist tactics at firsthand or is too young to remember the Communist's promises and their betrayal of them.

Mr. President, this is indeed a book written and edited pro bono publico and one that I highly recommend.

#### THE NEW PRESIDENT—LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State, the largest daily newspaper in South Carolina, presented to its readers on Sunday a biographical sketch of the new President of the United States. This article reports on the successful career of this distinguished American and points up the great abilities and experience which should be invaluable to him and our Nation as our new President seeks to fulfill the tremendous responsibilities which have been thrust on him by virtue of the act of perfidy which last week claimed the life of our late President John F. Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks this article from the State of November 24, 1963, together with my newsletter for next week entitled "An Assassin's Bullet."

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

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Nov. 24, 1963]

#### THE 36TH PRESIDENT—LYNDON JOHNSON: FATE TOUCHED HIM HIS BIOGRAPHY

Lyndon Baines Johnson.  
Born: August 27, 1908, in Stonewall, Tex.  
Educated: Texas State Teachers College and Georgetown Law School.

Married: In late 1934 to Claudia (Lady Bird) Taylor. Two children, Lynda Bird Johnson and Lucy Baines Johnson.

Elected to Congress: 1937, at age 29.  
Elected to Senate: 1948, at age 40. Served as Senate minority leader 1953-54. Served as Senate majority leader 1955-61. Elected as Vice President of the United States in 1960. Became President of the United States November 22, 1963.

A tall, ashen-faced man stood at the doorway of an office in the White House Friday night.

By a violent twist of fate this man, still stunned by the horror which he witnessed only a few hours before, had become the 36th President of the United States.

Lyndon Baines Johnson had surpassed the prophecy made by his grandfather the day he was born.

On that day, in Stonewall, Tex., August 27, 1908, his grandfather looked at the infant and said, "He'll be a U.S. Senator some day."

Now Johnson had the job he had prepared for all his life.

The 55-year-old Johnson was groomed for the Presidency by both his father Sam and the late House Speaker, Sam Rayburn, a fellow Texan. The Rayburn-Johnson team led a Democratically controlled Congress during most of the administration of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The prediction made by Johnson's grandfather began taking shape in 1937 when young Lyndon was elected to Congress; in 1948 he was elected to the Senate—he was 40.

He won his first seat to the Senate by a tiny margin, a bare 87 votes. This minute margin didn't squelch the now-famous Johnson sense of humor.

A short time after his election the already politically acute Senate Member began a speech with a smile and this statement: "Well, here I am—Landslide Lyndon."

Four years later the Senate Democrats picked him as minority leader. This was at the birth of President Dwight D. Eisenhower's administration when Republicans were in control of Congress.

The Democrats took over the reins of Congress during the next three sessions and Johnson became Senate majority leader.

Johnson and a fellow Senate Member, John F. Kennedy, battled for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1960. Johnson, who was strongly supported by Southern delegates, nevertheless lost out to the youthful Senator from Massachusetts.

Kennedy chose his vanquished rival for second place on the ticket. He said that "Lyndon Johnson has demonstrated on many occasions his brilliant qualification for the leadership we require today."

Almost 3 years later, Johnson took the oath of office as President on a plane in Dallas, Tex. At the moment life left the body of John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson

automatically became the leader of the United States.

Lyndon had a rich heritage on both sides of his family. Both his father and paternal grandfather, a Confederate veteran, served in the Texas House of Representatives. One of his paternal ancestors signed the Texas Declaration of Independence after battling the Mexicans with a squirrel rifle in 1836.

On his maternal side, Johnson was descended from Baptist preachers and educators. His great-grandfather, a Baptist leader in Texas during the Civil War, headed Baylor University for 2 years.

The man who became President November 22, 1963, carried an inheritance of pioneer spirit, love of adventure and a gift for public speaking.

His educational birthright was a little late in asserting itself. When he completed high school at the age of 15 he and a group of youths trekked to California. They made their jaunt by camping along railroad trestles and each night they buried their small amount of money to prevent it being stolen by other wanderers.

"None of us had been off the farm for a trip longer than the road to town," Johnson said of the band of would-be nomads.

When their money supply trickled away, each boy went his own way to find work. Johnson tramped the coast of California and he finally tramped homeward.

"The trip back home was the longest I have ever made," Johnson said. It was accomplished by walking and hitchhiking. He was away from his home State for 7 months.

Books had little appeal to the young man at that time. After his return from the California venture, Johnson went to work as a laborer on highways. He pushed wheelbarrows, drove trucks and shoveled sand and gravel. He had a serious discussion with his father after a short while and as a result he decided to go to college. He borrowed \$75 and set out for the Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

His interest in learning was revitalized there and a boyish adventurer became a politically ambitious young man.

In 1931 Johnson went to Washington as secretary to Representative Richard Kleberg, Democrat of Texas, and the career of Johnson the politician began in earnest.

When he went to the Capital, Johnson was a confirmed New Dealer and a protege of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was elected "speaker" of the "Little Congress," an organization of congressional secretaries. By the time a few years had passed Johnson returned as a Congressman and started an uninterrupted political career.

In a special election during the spring of 1937, Johnson was named to the congressional seat of Representative James P. Buchanan who had died a few months before. He won over 10 opponents.

In his first try for a Senate seat a few years later, Johnson lost by a "whisker." In his second attempt, he won by the same margin, a whisker.

During a hearing in the office of the Texas Railroad Commission in Austin in 1934, Johnson met the woman he was to marry. She was Claudia Taylor, but everyone called her Lady Bird, a name given her by a childhood nurse.

She and Johnson were married late in 1934. Their first child was named Lynda Bird and their second, Lucy Baines. This caused Johnson to remark, "We all have the same initials so we can all use the same baggage for traveling."

President Johnson is a big man, a 6-foot-3 southerner who weighs close to 200 pounds. Ever since a "moderately severe" heart attack in the summer of 1955 he has tried to hold his weight down.

But he is charged with a relentless energy. Even when doctors warned him to slow down

after his heart attack, Johnson paid little heed. A burning inner drive kept him going from sunup to sundown and in 1960, 5 years after his hospital stay, Johnson said that his health, in the estimation of his physicians, was "too good."

"They say I feel too good and go too much and work too long," he told a Los Angeles news conference.

Asked if his working hours were limited because of his heart attack, he replied "Yes, to 18 or 19 hours a day."

This super capacity for work even gleamed through gloom-filled Friday night when Johnson plunged into a meeting of congressional leaders of both parties where he asked for and got pledges of support in the days ahead.

Lyndon B. Johnson is a man who has carved an image as a tough political genius into a Washington atmosphere filled with the tough, the political, and the genius.

As Senate leader he was known as a behind-the-scenes operator who steered a middle course politically.

During the years 1955 to 1961 when he was head of the powerful Senate Democrats—in a Republican administration—Johnson counseled his party members against opposition for opposition's sake.

He urged a course of responsibility as best for his party and the country and preached the doctrine that reasonable men of good will can resolve their differences. He said, "Let us reason together."

And then suddenly, violently, tragically Friday night, Lyndon B. Johnson squared his shoulders and stepped over the threshold into the office of the President. This man, described by his wife, as a man who "acts like there was never going to be a tomorrow," picked up the massive responsibility of the tomorrows of the United States and held them in his hands.

Then he turned to his country and said, "I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask for your help, and God's."

#### ASSASSIN'S BULLET

The assassination of the 35th President of the United States has shocked and saddened Americans of all political persuasions. This act of perfidy closed a brilliant political career of one of the most personable and popular Presidents ever to serve our Nation. There were many disagreements with President John F. Kennedy's policies and proposals, but his personal popularity, according to opinion polls, continued at an unusually high level.

This tragedy contains many lessons. Some, who have sought to mix blame with their grief, credit the assassination to all who have dissented from the policies of the New Frontier. Actually, the fatal shots were apparently fired by a Communist. This man had renounced his American citizenship to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow upon moving to the Soviet Union a few years ago. When, however, he wanted to return here, our Embassy was tolerant of his anti-American views and his pro-Communist sympathies, and thus loaned him \$435 to return to America. On his return, he distributed leaflets and spoke out for Castro, being very active in the pro-Communist Fair Play for Cuba Committee. In June of this year, the State Department issued him a new passport despite his background which also included an undesirable discharge from the U.S. Marine Corps.

To a Communist the life of any individual is not worth much because it is society—the planned society—which counts most. To an American who cherishes freedom and individual rights, a life is indeed dear, even where deep political differences exist. Under the American system we settle our differences at the ballot box. Under the Communist system, ideological differences are settled with a bloodbath, individually and collectively.

This is just one of many reasons why we cannot continue to tolerate the Communist ideology, especially in our own midst.

As a consequence of the tragic murder of President Kennedy, we now have a new national leader. President Lyndon Johnson is one of the most capable and experienced public officials I know. My relationships with him in the Senate, where he has served as majority leader and Vice President, have been pleasant, even though we have not agreed on all issues.

In view of his announced plans to push for enactment of the so-called civil rights legislation and the tax legislation as proposed, I am certain we will be in disagreement on more occasions. I was very favorably impressed, however, to hear the President recently give on television an eloquent testimony in support of our form of government with its unique system of divided and separated powers and our thriving "capitalist," free enterprise economy. I was particularly pleased with his praise of our "capitalist" economy because all too many have been shamed by Communist propaganda into looking upon "capitalism" as a bad word connoting exploitation.

In this interview, the President, then Vice President, also expressed a strong measure of devotion to our country and to the importance of preserving our freedoms. Likewise brought out in this interview were his background and interest in our defense and space programs. In the Senate he served as chairman of both the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee and the Space Committee, having in effect fathered our present space exploration program.

It is difficult to assess what course the new President's administration will set for our Nation until he has had the time to chart his course aside from the policies he has inherited. I hope that his main aim will be the preservation of freedom at home and the extension of freedom around the world. If so, he will have the strong support of an overwhelming majority of Americans.

#### WALTER PINCUS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on December 1, Walter Pincus of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations will leave the staff of the committee to return to his profession of journalism as a reporter for the Washington Star.

Mr. Pincus was employed by the committee in April 1962, for the specific purpose of assisting the committee in its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign governments and of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. This study has now been virtually completed. The committee has held extensive hearings, as a result of which the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I have cosponsored legislation (S. 2136) which we feel will minimize if not correct the abuses which the committee's inquiry uncovered. Hearings have been held on this legislation, and I hope that it may be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee in executive session in the near future and reported to the Senate. We have been assured that Mr. Pincus will be available to the committee as a per diem consultant, should we need his services again in connection with this legislation.

At this time, I simply want to note for the record that Mr. Pincus performed outstanding work for the committee and

it would have been difficult to carry out our inquiry to its successful conclusion without him. When he began his work for the committee, it was contemplated, both by him and by the committee, that he would return to journalism when this particular job was done. We regret to lose his services, but we thank him for a job well done, and we wish him well in his future endeavors. He exemplifies to a high degree the best in the professional staffing of the Senate and its committees. I believe Mr. Pincus has rendered a valuable service to the Senate and to the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4276) to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is a complete substitute for the text of the bill. For the purpose of amendment, the committee amendment will be considered as original text, and is open to amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of November 13, 1963, p. 21624, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommit-

tee and the Senate conferees for successfully concluding, under difficult circumstances, the work on this important proposed legislation. As Members of this body know, this appropriation bill passed the Senate on June 26 of this year, and included therein was an amendment adopted on the floor prohibiting the use of the simplified mailing system by Members of the House of Representatives as well as the Senate. In conference, the amendment was modified to eliminate the Members of the House.

My position on the simplified mailing amendment was set out in my letter of November 13 addressed to each Member of the Senate, and I do not think it is necessary that I discuss that issue at this time. I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
November 13, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you with reference to Senate amendment No. 40 in H.R. 6868, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1964. This amendment prohibits the use of the simplified mailing system by Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The bill passed the Senate on June 26, 1963. When the bill was in the Senate Committee on Appropriations, a motion was made to prohibit the use of a simplified mailing system by Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The Senate committee rejected the proposal to include the Members of the House of Representatives within such a prohibition and made it applicable only to Members of the Senate.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations stated in its Report No. 313, dated June 25, 1963, that in the interest of comity and understanding, the prohibition should be made applicable solely to the U.S. Senate. The committee stated further that the Constitution provides that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, and while the mailing privilege does not specifically come under the rules of either body, the committee felt each House should make its own determination in this regard.

During consideration of the bill on the Senate floor on June 26, 1963, a motion to include the House Members within the prohibition of simplified mailings was adopted on a rollcall vote.

The House of Representatives has refused, since the bill passed the Senate on June 26, 1963, to send the bill to conference because of what the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations describes as a violation of the rule of comity between the two bodies.

On November 8, 1963, the bill was taken from the Speaker's table and was sent to conference. The House of Representatives, on that date, agreed to all of the amendments in the bill relating solely to the Senate. This meant that none of these amendments relating solely to the Senate would be subject to conference, since the two bodies had previously agreed to them. The House subcommittee chairman said in the House that this was in accord with tradition and comity.

A conference on the legislative appropriation bill was held on November 12, 1963, and the House conferees were adamant in refusing to include the House of Representatives within the prohibition on simplified mail. The conferees on the part of the Senate have agreed to rewrite the language and make it

applicable solely to the Senate. The conference report containing this language has been adopted on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I am writing this letter to each Member of the Senate with my earnest recommendation that the conference report, as adopted by the House, be agreed to in the Senate. I served for many years in the House of Representatives, and I know how much Members of the House resent having the Senate attempt to dictate to them on their house-keeping functions. If the House of Representatives desires to prohibit the use of the simplified mailing system by its Members, it has had ample opportunity to do so in connection with the many House actions on this bill. In addition, a bill has been introduced by a Member of the House to bar the simplified mailing by Members of the House and is pending in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I think the Senate should make every effort to restore the comity which has always existed between the two bodies, and I earnestly recommend that the Senate adopt this conference report and discontinue any attempt on our part to regulate the House of Representatives.

Yours very sincerely,

CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. HAYDEN. As is well known, the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations has made certain irresponsible charges against employees of the Senate. I, along with many others, considered these statements to be an insult to the Senate, to its Members, and to its many devoted lady employees.

In view of the serious nature of his charges, I personally made available, to the Member of the other body two documents—one showing the names of all Senate employees and their salaries, and the other all expenditures made by the Senate. These are documents available to the public. Later, I personally discussed with him this material which I had made available.

Last Friday morning, I received a letter from Representative STEED, which I consider to be an apology to the Senate, its Members, and its lady employees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter and the altered House bill may be printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., November 22, 1963.  
Senator CARL HAYDEN,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This will advise that I have carefully checked the current published list of Senate employees which you provided me and I can assure you as follows:

Although all Senate employees are not known to me personally, a great many of them are. All those on your list that I personally know are men and women of highest integrity and moral character. I found no name on the list known to me to be otherwise.

Any remarks I have made which reflected in any way on the character and integrity of these employees is sincerely regretted and I extend you my apologies by way of some amends.

Also enclosed herewith is a text of the proposed bill I have had prepared and which I discussed with you which I am sure the House will pass if the opportunity and necessity arises.

You are authorized to make whatever use of this letter you may see fit.

Again assuring you of the very high personal esteem I have for you and of my admiration for your unequalled public career, and thanking you for all your courtesies and kindnesses to me, I am,

Sincerely yours,

TOM STEED,  
Member of Congress.

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to limit the authority of Members of the House of Representatives to send bulk mailings under the franking privilege

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"4169. Limitation on authority of Members of the House of Representatives to send bulk mail under the franking privilege."

The authority of Members and Members-elect of Congress to mail matter with a simplified form of address under the franking privilege shall not be construed to permit the mailing of bulk mail matter with a simplified form of address under the franking privilege by any Member of the House of Representatives unless such matter is addressed to destinations in the congressional district from which such Member was elected. As used in this section—

"(1) 'Member of the House of Representatives' means a Member or Member-elect of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner or Resident Commissioner-elect from Puerto Rico; and

"(2) 'congressional district' means (A) the congressional district from which the Member or Member-elect was elected, (B) in the case of a Representative-at-Large or Representative-at-Large-elect, the State from which such Representative or Representative-elect was elected, and (C) in the case of the Resident Commissioner or Resident Commissioner-elect from Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

Sec. 2. The table of contents of chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4169. Limitation on authority of Members of the House of Representatives to send bulk mail under the franking privilege."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I want to make it clear that in my opinion this letter does constitute an apology from Representative STEED. However, this is a matter for the determination of each Member of this body.

I urge that the conference report be agreed to.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee of the legislative appropriation bill, I approved all questions in dispute with the exception of the item concerning junk mail, and on that item the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and I reserved our right to be against it. I also told the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that I would be in opposition to that item when it came before the Senate. I personally hope that the legislative appropriations bill will be sent back by the Senate for further conference on this subject.

I make that statement regardless of personalities, regardless of what a House

Member said about the Senate, or anything else. I do so because the way the conference dealt with the problem of junk mail, a Senator would find it impossible to conduct a political campaign against a Member of the House who would have the advantage of sending out junk mail, so called, but a Senator would not.

I hope, on that ground alone, regardless of personalities, that the item will be sent back for further conference.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his remarks in support of the Senate amendment. I hope the Senate will reject the conference report, but not only on the basis of the irresponsible statement made by a Member of the House who threatened that if the conference report were not accepted, he would expose certain alleged wrongdoings in the Senate.

My only comment on that point is that the Senate has a committee now examining alleged misconduct. We welcome the Representative to come and testify in relation to any information that he may have. If he has no such information we most respectfully suggest that he keep his mouth shut.

The fact that he has apologized for this on the basis that it was a slip of the tongue does not mean much to me, because a man does not make such statements with merely slips of the tongue unless he admits himself to be an irresponsible individual to begin with.

I believe, therefore, that on that basis, if on no other, the conference report should be rejected, but the problem goes beyond that point to the merits of the amendment itself.

A year ago the Senate adopted my amendment, and the House concurred in it, which would prohibit Members of either the House or the Senate from using the junk mail privilege. Under the law as it was prior to the adoption of the amendment a Member of Congress could make an obviously political speech and then incorporate that speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He could then print it by the thousands and distribute it over his State or his congressional district, and if he were bitten by the presidential bug, through the franking privilege, he could circulate the entire United States of America at the expense of the taxpayers.

That was permissible under the law as it was prior to the adoption of the amendment last year.

As the bill comes back from the conference today it would reinstate this privilege for a Member of the House of Representatives. It is wrong for the House of Representatives. It is wrong for the Senate. As the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, in the form in which it now is it represents a definitely unfair advantage, because a Member of the House running against a Member of the Senate would have a distinct advantage.

On the other hand, if Congress should pass the provision for both Houses an

incumbent in either the House or the Senate would have an unfair advantage over his opponent at home, because it would mean that a Member of the House of Representatives or of the Senate could finance with free postage circulation of his political material, whereas his opponent would have to raise the cash to pay the postage. That, too, would be wrong. It could run into a sizable amount of money.

The taxpayers never were supposed to be shouldered with the responsibility of financing the postal charges of political campaigns either in congressional districts or in the senatorial races or for some Member of Congress who might have the presidential "bug."

In fairness to the American taxpayers, by all means the conference report should be rejected and sent back, and the Senate should insist upon support of the Senate amendment as it was originally passed.

I urge the rejection of the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, apologies, like that referred to by the distinguished chairman, never quite catch up with the charges. They are always buried somewhere along the line, and it is necessary for the Senate to take action to rebut this affront to all the womanhood on the Senate side of the Capitol.

The gentleman in question, of another body—and I must be careful not to violate the rules—in an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of October 30, 1963, was quoted as saying:

I personally know of a Senator who keeps two call girls on his office payroll. I know because I've been at parties where they've been. I've already prepared an amendment that will require the Senate to publish all its payrolls, as the House does.

On the 1st of November, there was an Associated Press article in which the same gentleman, of another body, was quoted as saying:

They started this. If they want to violate the traditional rule of comity between the two branches and tell us how to run our shop, I'm going to aggravate them all I can.

The first paragraph of that Associated Press article also refers to:

a Senator who had two "call girls" on his payroll.

On November 13, there appeared in the Washington Evening Star an article dealing with this same matter. It is only repetitious.

But on November 14, the New York Times carried the article:

Senate Conferees Yield on House "Junk Mail."

There was this paragraph:

Representative \* \* \* recently threatened to disclose the name of a Senator who he said had two call girls on his payroll unless the Senate yielded on the junk-mail issue.

Mr. President, that sounds like blackmail in order to secure junk mail.

Then, on the 19th of November, the Washington Daily News carried the article which said, in part:

Mr. \* \* \* said "Why, of course, I wouldn't. I may be a dirty rat, but I wouldn't hurt any

human being. If somebody did that \* \* \* well, I'm pretty broadminded. I'm no reformer. That sort of thing has been going on since Adam and Eve, the historians say.

And then there was the question:

I said, "Is there a Senator with 'call girls' on his payroll?"

And then the gentleman in question, from another body, said:

There was, some time ago, but I'm not going to pin it down. I don't give a damn anyway.

Mr. President, we do care, and we are not going to let this insult to every woman working on the Senate side of the Capitol stand, or permit this sinister cloud, this innuendo, and these cheap and nasty insinuations. The one thing we can do is to send the conference report back to the conference committee and send it back unanimously, to show that the Senate will not tolerate this sort of thing.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator agree with me that the provision of having junk mail available to one House and not to the other would be completely different from the general courtesy between the two Houses regarding their own affairs? This is a matter which concerns both Houses, and cannot be permissible for one and not the other. The Senator agrees with me, does he not, that that is fundamental?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed I do. It involves a service by one of the largest departments of government, and runs into millions of dollars a year. That is something more than comity and understanding between the two Houses of the Legislature.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that is fundamental in the consideration of this item in the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It definitely is.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator propose to place those dispatches in the RECORD?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I read portions of the dispatches. I can put them into the RECORD.

Mr. SIMPSON. I make that request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in their entirety the news articles, from which I read several excerpts into the RECORD.

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

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

REPRESENTATIVE STEED SAYS HE KNOWS THE ANSWER—DOES A CERTAIN SENATOR HAVE CALL GIRLS ON HIS PAYROLL?

(By Richard Starnes)

Which Senator keeps two call girls on his office payroll?

And which ones anoint themselves with all manner of exotic hair oil at the expense of us worried, bald taxpayers?

And how many Senate lawgivers wallow in torrents of iced mineral water, charged to you-know-who?

And which ones have keys to the anonymous doorway behind which the free booze is kept?

The answers to these (and other) diverting questions are being carefully squirreled away by Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, in anticipation of a rousing "skunk fight" between the House and Senate. Representative STEED fervently hopes he won't have to launch the gamy ammunition he's laying by. But he stoutly insists he'll do it if "they" ("they" being Members of the Senate seeking to work their wicked will on the House) force him to.

He might do it, too. Once, when a group of home State newsmen asked him why he'd voted for a bill raising congressional salaries (his own included) he replied: "Because I'm a greedy s.o.b."

#### SATISFACTION

He tells the story now with obvious satisfaction, and without recourse to any nice-nellie initials.

"I figured I'd have had to quit if we hadn't gotten the raise, because I couldn't stand the financial strain," he says, "so I figured if I got beaten over the pay raise I hadn't lost anything. As a matter of fact I voted for the increase because Members of Congress needed it, and I hoped it might mean we'd get Members who could afford to pass honest legislation."

Representative STEED's war with the Senate has grown out of a deceptively picayunish issue. The question is whether Members of the House should be permitted to frank (mail free) material variously described as patron mail or junk mail, depending on whether you are for it or against it. By any name it is bulk mail addressed to, say, all rural boxholders in a Congressman's district.

#### ACCOMMODATION

The Senate violated the ancient accommodation between the two Chambers of Congress by amending the legislative appropriation forbidding the House to engage in such taxpayer-subsidized bulk mailing. Representative STEED, a salty-talking former country newspaper editor, concedes there are abuses in franked patron mail. But in the Senate action he sees a dark design whereby the Senate is seeking to dominate the House.

"By the traditional rule of comity," he says, "each House has always been responsible for its own housekeeping. We don't try to tell the Senate what to do, and they shouldn't try to tell us what to do. A Congress of two coequal Houses can't exist under any other arrangement."

As chairman of the joint House-Senate conference committee that will try to reconcile the two versions of the appropriation bill, Representative STEED is in a unique position to carry out his threat to embarrass the Senate if it refuses to lift its ban on bulk mail franking. He is armed with 11 amendments to the bill, and vows he'll use every one, if necessary.

"Nobody on earth can find out names of everyone who is on a Senator's payroll," he insists. "I personally know of a Senator who keeps two call girls on his office payroll. I know because I've been at parties where they've been. I've already prepared an amendment that will require the Senate to publish all its payrolls, as the House does."

"I've also got amendments that'll require them to give newsmen access to all the vouchers for money spent for any purpose. It isn't done now, and every Senator can have his own brand of hair oil—greasy kid stuff or whatever—as well as chilled mineral water and liquor and anything else at taxpayer expense."

Representative STEED won't go into production with his skunk works until the legislative appropriation bill is the last hurdle before adjournment. "Then we'll have our conference on the bill," he promises, "and if

the Senate doesn't back down I'll hand in one of my amendments every day, along with the reasons for it, until it does."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 1, 1963]  
STEED SAYS CALL GIRLS ARE ON HILL PAYROLL

Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, renewing his running fight with the Senate, said yesterday that he knew a Senator who had two call girls on his payroll.

He also said in an interview that "there is plenty of free whiskey around senatorial offices."

STEED, chairman of an Appropriations Subcommittee handling the congressional budget, has been feuding with the Senate since it refused to go along with a House provision that would let Representatives send mail free throughout their States without addressing it to individuals.

"They started this," STEED said. "If they want to violate the traditional rule of comity between the two branches and tell us how to run our shop, I'm going to aggravate them all I can."

STEED said he did not know whether the two girls of shady reputation still are employed by the Senator whom he refused to identify.

Their employment, he said, was discovered by him inadvertently at a Washington party.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 13, 1963]  
OCCUPANT MAIL ACCORD MAY SPEED UP BILLS

A long-stalled \$106 million appropriation bill for the operation of Congress was expected to start moving again in the House today because of a proposed compromise on so-called occupant mail.

There was some doubt, however, that the Senate would readily accept the compromise worked out late yesterday by a joint House-Senate conference committee. The compromise would limit a proposed Senate ban on the sending of occupant mail to Senators and permit Representatives to go on using this type of mail.

#### BAN ON BOTH HOUSES

The controversy, similar to one which stalled some legislation last year, flared up last spring when the Senate amended the House version of the legislative appropriation bill by prohibiting Members of Congress from sending mail to dwelling and business addresses without specifically naming the recipients.

This occupant mail, often referred to as junk mail in congressional debates, has been defended by House Members as a proper and necessary method of communicating with large numbers of constituents, particularly in election years.

Many House Members protested that Senate adoption of such a ban on House Members as well as Senators violated the comity which should exist between both branches of Government. They warned that the House would reject any legislative appropriation bill compromise containing such a prohibition.

One irate House Member, Representative STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, threatened at one point to reveal the name of a Senator who, he said, had two call girls on his payroll. Mr. STEED had refused to meet with Senate colleagues until they assured him the prohibition would be dropped.

#### CALLED POST OFFICE OPERATION

Some Senators have contended that congressional comity was not involved because the problem of handling occupant mail relates primarily to the operation of the Post Office Department and is not, strictly speaking, a housekeeping operation of the House or Senate.

Although House and Senate passed the legislative appropriation in different forms

last June, it was only last week that the House consented to sending the measure to conference.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 14, 1963]  
SENATE CONFEESES YIELD ON HOUSE JUNK MAIL

WASHINGTON, November 12.—Senate negotiators gave in Tuesday to House insistence that its Members be given free junk mail privileges.

The settlement in a House-Senate conference resulted in approval of a \$168,293,069 compromise money bill providing funds to operate Congress, the Library of Congress and the Government Printing Office for the budget year ending next June 30.

Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, recently threatened to disclose the name of a Senator who he said had two call girls on his payroll unless the Senate yielded on the junk mail issue.

[From the Washington Daily News, Nov. 19, 1963]

#### BLACKMAIL? OR JUST JUNK?

(By Tom Donnelly)

Have things reached such an ugly pass that Congressmen now practice blackmail right out in the open, and no voice in an amoral Congress is raised in protest?

A wire story the other day said, casual-like, that Senate negotiators gave in to the House's insistence that its Members get free junk mail privileges. "In return, a House threat to expose alleged call girls on a Senator's payroll was never mentioned."

One newspaper reader, me, was shocked. To snatch at just one shockmaking aspect, I thought dirty deals were made in the back end of the Capitol cloakroom, or some place shady like that. Not in public, for all the world to see. Or at least, for such parts of the world as might be paying any attention. I waited for somebody in Congress to take the floor in righteous wrath. I'm still waiting.

It was several weeks ago that Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, said he knew of a Senator who kept two "call girls" on his payroll, and intimated that the Senate had better let the House have junk mail privileges, or else.

I phoned Representative STEED. After some gingerly preliminaries, I said "You didn't name the Senator with the 'call girls' on his staff, and the Senate negotiators surrendered on the free-mail-privileges-for-the-House issue. Some people might say that looks like blackmail."

Mr. STEED said amiably, "Whatever interpretation people put on that has nothing to do with me."

I said, "Would you have named this Senator, if it came to that?"

Mr. STEED said, "Why, of course I wouldn't. I may be a dirty rat, but I wouldn't hurt any human being. If somebody did that \* \* \* well, I'm pretty broadminded. I'm no reformer. That sort of thing has been going on since Adam and Eve, the historians say."

I said, "Is there a Senator with 'call girls' on his payroll?"

Mr. STEED said, "There was, some time ago. But I'm not going to pin it down. I don't give a damn anyway."

I said, "You mean there isn't a Senator now with call girls on his payroll?"

Mr. STEED said, "I don't know. I haven't seen a recent Senate payroll. It did happen once. But the Senate keeps its records secret. They say they don't, but they do. These things could not happen if the Senate kept its records accessible, the way the House does. What I was doing, I was showing the Senate what would happen if we tried to impose our rules on them, the way they were trying to impose their rules on

us. And I think we've got a lot more right to have free mail privileges than they've got to keep their records secret. I'll cure 'em of trying to affront the House."

I said, "Then you were making a genuine threat, and a bargain was made?"

Mr. STEED said, "Why, there wasn't any bargain. No such thing. Why, under the rule of comity I'd be the worst offender of all if I named names. I was dramatizing the need for the traditional rule of comity, which makes each House responsible for its own housekeeping. Now, after 4 months of patient effort on this free mail issue I gave the Senate an example of how distasteful it would be if there wasn't any rule of comity."

I said, "And one could say the threat was effective?"

Mr. STEED said, "That's just your interpretation. I was just trying to be as resourceful as I knew how. Maybe I illustrated the need for comity in a crude and defenseless sort of way. But after 4 months of nothing happening, I made my slip of the tongue and I got my story across."

"Slip of the tongue?" I echoed.

Mr. STEED said, "These are days when all sorts of things get out of focus and out of gear. It's probably very unfortunate that I used that illustration. But if there isn't going to be any rule of comity \* \* \*. I guess it all shows you newspaper people are more interested in sex than constitutional government."

"Is that what it shows?" I said.

I couldn't think of anything else to say.

[From the Washington Daily News, Nov. 13, 1963]

#### SENATE GIVES IN—CALL GIRL THREAT IS JUNKED

Senate negotiators gave in yesterday to the House's insistence that its Members be given free junk mail privileges.

In return, a House threat to expose alleged call girls on a Senator's payroll was never mentioned.

#### FUNDS OK'D

The settlement, in a House-Senate conference, resulted in approval of a \$168,293,069 compromise bill providing funds to operate Congress, the Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office for the budget year ending June 30.

Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, had threatened to disclose the name of a Senator who, he said, had two call girls on his payroll, unless the Senate yielded.

The compromise bill permits House Members to send franked congressional mail addressed to "occupant" if they so desire, but prohibiting Senators from enjoying the same privilege.

#### "COMITY"

The Senate earlier had approved an amendment by Senator JOHN L. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, extending the Senate mail ban to the House.

Representative STEED, head of the House conferees, had complained this was a "violation of comity" between the two Chambers. He had refused since June to meet with Senate negotiators until he got assurances that the Senate would scrap the Williams amendment.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 14, 1963]

#### SENATE CONFEREES YIELD ON HOUSE'S JUNK MAIL

WASHINGTON, November 12.—Senate negotiators gave in Tuesday to House insistence that its Members be given free junk mail privileges.

The settlement in a House-Senate conference resulted in approval of a \$168,293,069 compromise money bill providing funds to operate Congress, the Library of Congress,

and the Government Printing Office for the budget year ending next June 30.

Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, recently threatened to disclose the name of a Senator who he said had two call girls on his payroll unless the Senate yielded on the junk mail issue.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 14, 1963]

#### SENATORS LOSE ROUND TO HOUSE MEMBERS ON JUNK MAIL ISSUE—FULL HOUSE APPROVES CONFERENCE VERSION, SENATE TEST DUE—BATTLE HOLDS UP SPENDING BILL

WASHINGTON.—The Senate lost a round in this year's battle to deny so-called junk mail privileges to House Members.

The House and Senate have been deadlocked over the issue since June 26, when the Senate voted 58 to 26 to continue a ban on broad-scale congressional mailing to unnamed occupants. Yesterday Senate champions retreated in a conference with House Members and the full House approved the conference version restoring the mailing privileges. The key test, however, will be in the full Senate.

Ordinarily, each Chamber is content to let the other mind its own affairs. But many Senators fear ambitious House Members trying to win Senate seats could use the disputed mail privileges to blanket States with campaign material.

Outraged House Members argue that the Senate, which has never sought such mail privileges, has no right to meddle in House business. The leader of the House forces, Representative STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, has even threatened to disclose evidence of alleged Senate extravagances and scandals if the Senators don't yield.

This year the battle has held up congressional action on a bill appropriating \$168.3 million to operate Capitol Hill. House Members hope the session's lateness will force Senate surrender. Tarrying tactics have worked before for the House. After losing on the issue in 1960, the House voted itself the privilege the day before adjourning the 1961 session. The Senate had no choice but to accept. Last year, however, the Senators outmaneuvered House Members and the proviso was defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In response to the question of the Senator from Massachusetts about comity between the Houses, is it not a fact that existing law prohibits bulk mailing privileges to either the House or the Senate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The proposal in the conference report would reinstate the privilege for the House of Representatives alone; which, as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, would be wrong in that it would give House Members an unfair advantage over the Senate. It would be equally wrong, or even worse, to extend the privilege to the Senate because then both the House and Senate Members would have an unfair advantage over an opponent at home.

It was not intended that the Congress extend free junk-mailing privileges to political candidates who happen to hold office in the Congress. The Congress recognized that as being wrong, and both the House and the Senate by overwhelming votes had rejected the proposal. We have denied such junk-mailing privileges

for the American businessman even though he pays for them.

Yet we are now asked to extend this special privilege to the House of Representatives. It is a privilege which both Houses of Congress deny to the American businessman even though he would pay for it.

We are now asked to say—if we accept the conference report—that a Member of the House of Representatives can use his franking privilege for the mailing of his political propaganda.

I agree further with the Senator from Illinois that the irresponsible statement which was made by a Member of that body is an insult to the integrity and character of every girl working on the Senate side of the Capitol. The Senate should rise up and by unanimous vote send the report back and by so doing accept the challenge of the man who made such an irresponsible statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, amplifying in part what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said, there are 41 Members of this body who at one time served in the House of Representatives. It is fair to assume, without any definite information, that many who serve in this body and who were Members of the House came here as a result of a contest with an incumbent Senator.

That was not true in my case, because I had retired from the House, but I know of instances in which the junk mail privilege was used for the purpose of a political campaign.

We cannot extend this privilege to one House and not the other. We believe, however, that it is wrong. We believe it is unlawful. We do not believe it comes within the provisions of the so-called comity understanding between the two Houses. Therefore, the conference report must go back. The Senate conferees must stand their ground. The Senate amendment, which passed by a record vote, must be insisted upon by the Senate conferees.

The House has an election in the matter. If I remember the rule correctly, after 20 days the House can discharge its conferees. It can appoint new conferees. After our deliberations with the House conferees, we shall know what to do. So this situation does not necessarily have to be a stalemate. The answer lies in the hands of the House of Representatives, because it can do what it will, and can select new conferees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of having the yeas and nays ordered?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand, in connection with the conference report, that there is an item still in disagreement that could be acted on and disposed of, so that it would not have to go back to conference, if the conference report is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that has reference to the amendment having to do with withdrawal of authority from the

Capitol Building Commission of unlimited construction authority for the west central front.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. It withdraws the authority of contract from the Capitol Building Commission. Only a small amount could be spent for a nongovernmental survey as to the actual physical condition for the construction of the foundation for the west front.

With the exception of that expenditure, appropriations will first be required.

Therefore, I think it would be wise, considering the great difficulties between the House and the Senate on this unhappy bill, at least to agree to the amendment that the conferees have agreed on, and have the Senate accept it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator from Illinois has said, why can we not consider all the matters with the exception of the so-called junk mail item? We are all agreed upon them. There is no question as to the other items. In that way action could be completed on the conference report except for the junk mail item.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. There is general agreement. If the Senate could accept the items on which the conferees have agreed, and take final action, leaving out the Williams amendment, it would still have plenty to do. The conferees will still have great difficulty. They have had this bill under consideration since May or June.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Such action would be wise, because the House conferees receded on the Senate amendments. So action on the bill would be complete except for this one item.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that this difficulty can be cured by the Senate concurring in the amendments, or taking any other action the conferees propose, after action on the conference report. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate can act on any amendment of the House after action on the conference report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was a member of the conference committee. I basically supported our chairman, who rendered admirable service in obtaining, in the main, House concurrence in the Senate language. I shall vote to send the report back, not because of the provisions of the report, because I think they are essentially proper. I shall vote to send it back because of the innuendo in the regrettable, unfortunate, and indefensible remarks which have been made by a Member of the other body regarding conduct in the Senate.

On that basis I feel that the report should be sent back.

I want to make it quite clear that I believe the conference committee did the best that possibly could be done under the circumstances relating to the provisions of the bill itself.

All the talk to the effect that, somehow or other, members of the conference were blackmailed or threatened is mere "hogwash." I was present. There was no such talk. All the loose talk occurred after the conference committee had done its work. At that time stories appeared to the effect that one or more Members of the Senate had so-called call girls on his or their payroll, making a serious reflection upon every Member of this body and on every lady that works for the Senate.

On the basis of what the minority leader has said, I join him. I think his suggestions are entirely proper in this area. The report should be sent back.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I rise briefly to express the hope that the report will be sent back with an overwhelming vote. The attack on the Senate in this case is one of the most inexcusable breaches of congressional courtesy, as well as one of the most massive assaults upon the truth, that I have ever seen during my service in this body.

This attack was originally made before the conference ever met and before the House appointed conferees. That is what makes it absolutely inexcusable. If it had occurred after the conference, it might have been explained.

The Washington Daily News of October 30 carried this headline: "Representative STEED Says He Knows the Answer—Does a Certain Senator Have Call Girls on His Payroll?"

It continues:

He knows that he had call girls on his office payroll.

Then the news story states further—

In anticipation of a rousing "skunk fight" between the House and Senate.

The article does not say the conference would be a fight between skunk and man, but that is a fair interpretation. This man was free with charges that he was not willing to substantiate by giving the name of the Senator who, he alleges, had call girls on his payroll.

It has been said here that this is a reflection on all the fine young ladies who work on the Senate side of the Capitol. Indeed, it is. Mr. President, it is more than that. It is a direct insult to every Member of the Senate. It forces every Senator to live under the charge of his enemies, at least, that he has call girls on his payroll.

This man ought either to have the courage to come out and give the name of the Senator who he claims has call girls on his payroll, or who had them in the past, or this man ought to admit that he is an unmitigated liar.

There are other charges in this story. I did not hear all the earlier discussion on the floor, but I assume these news items have been discussed at some length. I will not go into details.

It is said that Senators keep their payrolls secret. That is another charge that is without a semblance of truth. The Senate payrolls were opened some time ago. They are published quarterly. The Senate publishes a report that carries the name of every employee in the office of every Senator, and the compensation that those employees receive.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it not only carries all the names, but every employee must be sworn in and identified as he goes on the payroll. The list also carries the name of every Senate employee generally employed and performing Senate functions of any kind.

Furthermore, it is required that the financial clerk and the Sergeant at Arms publish annually a complete list of all the vouchers showing all the expenditures of the Senate.

I have a letter before me written by Robert A. Brenkworth, the financial clerk of the Senate, pointing all this out in detail. I should like to ask to have it printed in the Record at this point, with the Senator's permission.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to have it inserted at this point in the Record. What I have said applies not only to employees in the office of every Senator, but also to every employee of every committee, and of the Senate generally, down to the lowliest laborer on the payroll of the Senate.

Their names are published quarterly, along with the amount of money that each of them has received in the preceding quarterly period.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, October 31, 1963.

Hon. MIKE MONRONEY,  
Chairman, Legislative Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: The following information is furnished in response to your recent inquiry as to the availability of information regarding the payrolls and other disbursements of the Senate.

You will recall that on June 25, 1959, the Senate agreed to a resolution (S. Res. 139) requiring the Secretary of the Senate to publish a quarterly report of the names, titles, and amounts paid to all employees of the Senate. The first such report covered the fiscal quarter July-September 1959, and reports have been printed for every fiscal quarter since that time. We are presently preparing, for the Secretary, the report for the July-September 1963 quarter which will go to the printer shortly and be available to the public on or before November 29. Being responsible for the preparation of the reports, I can assure you that the name, title, and amount paid every employee in every office of the Senate authorized to be paid from appropriated funds of the Senate, is carried in said reports. While this document is distributed by the Secretary of the Senate, I am sufficiently aware of the distribution procedures to assure you that anyone requesting this publication, in person or by mail, is accommodated.

The information contained in these reports, as well as itemized and detailed information regarding all receipts and expenditures of the Senate by fiscal years is also available to the public in the annual report of the Secretary of the Senate, which is submitted to the Senate in January of each year and available as a Senate document shortly thereafter. This annual report is prepared for the Secretary by this office and I can assure you that it is a direct and accurate reflection of Senate disbursements without exceptions. As a matter of fact, the galley proofs of this report are prepared from copies of the original vouchers submitted to the

General Accounting Office in support of our disbursing accounts.

In regard the intimations that liquor is being purchased by the Senate, I can assure you that during my tenure as financial clerk of over 9 years, this office has not issued a check paying for or reimbursing anyone for liquor. By order of the Committee on Rules and Administration, this office audits all vouchers to insure, among other things, that only official expenses, in accordance with law or regulations, are paid. With the exceptions of meals furnished laborers required to remain on the job because of late sessions, the specifically authorized reception of foreign dignitaries by the Foreign Relations Committee (S. Res. 247, agreed to February 7, 1962), and the reception for the President and Vice President of the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, we do not pay or reimburse for luncheons, dinners, or any other entertainment expenses.

I am unaware of any organization at any government level, public or private, that reveals to the general public more information regarding its financial transactions than does the U.S. Senate and this includes the House of Representatives. I would be very much surprised to learn of any published reports as revealing, or more revealing than the Senate's. I am constantly amazed by the newspaper statements regarding secrecy of Senate transactions in this area and cannot understand how or why these charges are made when the existence of these reports entirely refutes them.

Respectfully,

ROBERT A. BRENK WORTH,  
Financial Clerk,  
U.S. Senate.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. As I understand, this information is also printed in booklet form, so that anyone who wishes to do so may obtain a copy of the booklet.

Mr. RUSSELL. Anyone who was interested in the truth would have at least investigated to see whether there was any substance to the charge before it was made. Any Member of either House can easily obtain a copy of each of these printed reports.

I read another paragraph from the News article:

"Nobody on earth can find out names of everyone who is on a Senator's payroll," he insists.

"I personally know of a Senator who keeps two call girls on his office payroll."

The Senate is entitled to have the Member of the other body give the name of that Senator. If he does not do so, if he refuses to do it, only one conclusion can properly be drawn.

He continues:

I know because I've been at parties where they've been. I've already prepared an amendment that will require the Senate to publish all its payrolls.

As I have said, that has already been done.

The other business, about Senators using "greasy kid stuff" on their hair would not apply to me or some of my colleagues in the Senate, but I suppose this statement was a poor attempt to lard a little humor onto a monumental falsehood.

I do not see how the Senate could possibly maintain its self-respect if it accepted the conference report. I am as much in favor of comity between the two Houses as anyone else, but I have a

vivid recollection of an instance in which this rule did not work. It is a poor rule that does not work both ways. I am sure Senators will recall the last supplemental appropriation bill of 1961, when the Senate received the conference report on that bill after the other body had adjourned and gone home. A number of things had been done in that conference report which caused a great deal of discussion in the Senate, not only in the wee small hours of the morning, but up to the break of day. In that conference report, there was one item which increased the clerk hire of each Senator by \$3,000 basic.

If ever there were a housekeeping item, pertaining solely to the office of a Senator or Representative, that was it.

That was vastly different from an item affecting not only Congress, but also the Post Office Department and the delivery of mail throughout the entire United States. The definition of mailing privileges is a matter of policy, not of comity. The House, in that conference report in 1961, rejected the \$3,000 addition to the Senate payroll, which was truly a matter of comity.

That did not cost me any personal tears because I have never utilized all of my payroll allowances. I have returned to the Treasury thousands of dollars. However, it did offend me, as a Senator, to have such a breach of the rule of comity that had always obtained between the House and the Senate.

Therefore, the cry of comity can appeal only to those with very short memories, because back in 1961, only 2 years ago, with the sun rising in the east, the House of Representatives having gone home several hours earlier under the joint resolution of sine die adjournment, the Senate found itself without the comity that traditionally has permitted each House to fix the allowances for staff assistance in the offices of the Members of each body.

Mr. President, the Senate cannot afford to leave the matter in this position. I have the utmost sympathy for Senators who must deal with this matter as conferees. I know from my own experience how difficult it is to meet with Members of the other body, men of good will, who want to do what is fair, proper, and appropriate under the traditions and the understandings that have always guided these two bodies, and then to encounter a situation of this kind. I do not know how it is to be dealt with, but we in the Senate cannot afford to leave it in this position.

This person ought to name the name of the Senator who, he said, had these two call girls on his payroll, in order that the Senate might then take the necessary steps to protect its own dignity and its proper position in the view of the people of the United States.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I reiterate the point the Senator has made, that this is not a matter of comity, but a question of policy with relation to the whole Congress. I believe that is a very important point that the Senator brought out in

connection with the conference, where, we know, comity exists to a great degree between the two Houses, but on the question of policy it becomes a question of discussing and arguing out and reaching a common ground for both branches of the Congress.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Georgia for the service he has rendered to the Senate and the country. Every statement he has made is unanswerably sound, and I associate myself with his statements.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I commend the Senator from Georgia for his fine analysis of the problem. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Merely because an apology might be tendered, I would hope that it would not be the position of the Senator from Georgia or other Senators that that would cure the problem raised by the Williams amendment. Suppose the Senate received a humble apology from the other body.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not undertake to pass on that question. I do not believe the Senate is passing on it at this time. The conferees will deal with that question when they go into conference. Whatever is agreed upon will have to be brought back to the Senate for the approval of the entire Senate.

Mr. MILLER. But I would hope that the Senate at this time would not by the expression of our concern over this unfortunate incident indicate that the situation could automatically be cured by a simple apology.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said I did not undertake to pass on that question, because I am not one of the conferees. I do know that the Senate cannot afford to leave the matter in this situation and still maintain its self-respect in the eyes of the American people.

I yield the floor.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC AND PRESIDENT OF THE ARGENTINE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is distinctly honored this morning by having as a visitor in our Chamber Dr. Carlos Humberto Perette, Vice President of the Argentine Republic and President of the Argentine Senate. We have heard of this distinguished gentleman over the years and are delighted that so high ranking an official of the Argentine Government is among us.

We are extremely happy to have him escorted to the Chamber of the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], our President pro tempore.

It is indeed a privilege and an honor to welcome to our midst Dr. Perette and also Dr. Roberto T. Alemann, the Am-

bassador of the Argentine Republic. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I concur in the sentiment expressed by the distinguished majority leader. It is always a felicitous occasion when our Latin American neighbors come to visit us, and particularly when they visit the legislative branch of the Government.

So we salute the gentlemen and bid them welcome.

#### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Georgia upon his remarks concerning the conference report on the legislative appropriations bill.

For several years, I have been chairman of the subcommittee which handles the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. In that bill in 1960, the House included a provision for the free distribution of unaddressed mail in cities, mail which the Department had theretofore declined to handle. The subcommittee of which I am the chairman eliminated that provision. The Senate confirmed that action, and the item remained out of the bill.

The next year, the provision for the House to put the taxpayers to the expense of sending franked mail unaddressed to cities was included in a supplemental bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry; I do not recall.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is my recollection that such a provision was included in a supplemental appropriation bill. Just why, I do not know. I was not one of the conferees. But when the provision was considered by the Senate, the Senate yielded to the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am advised by the assistant chief of staff of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that the Senator from Virginia is correct, that such an item was in the bill and was left in disagreement when the House adjourned. The Senate later was compelled to adopt it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As a matter of policy, the Senate has consistently objected to what it regarded as an improper expense to the taxpayers of the Nation of permitting Members of Congress, primarily for campaign purposes, to send franked mail into the cities, to be distributed without addresses, only to boxholders.

As the Senator from Georgia has said, in a legislative appropriation bill, not a bill dealing with the Post Office Department, again the Senate is confronted with a similar provision in the conference report. What is desired is to have the Senate agree that only the House may send such mail, but not the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not sure as to that. I have not been too much concerned about this particular item. It is my understanding that the original provision that came to the Senate from the other body provides that both bodies could distribute such mail. The Senate struck out the entire item, and it was agreed in conference that the House could have that privilege.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am relying on the statement of one of the conferees that the issue is one that applies to the Senate. If the House gets the privilege, the Senate gets it, too.

I wish to emphasize that, as a matter of public policy, the Senate for a number of years, starting with the bill that I handled in 1960, has stood practically unanimously, so far as I can recall, against this practice.

The Senator from Georgia is eminently correct in saying that the Senate should insist on its amendment, especially in view of the reflection that has been made upon the entire membership of the Senate by the claim that some Senator, unknown, now has, or in the past has had, call girls on his payroll.

I shall with pleasure support the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Georgia to send the conference report back to the other body.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the motion before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on the legislative appropriations bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 2, nays 88, as follows:

[No. 257 Leg.]

YEAS—2

Hayden

Monroney

NAYS—88

Aiken

Gore

Moss

Allott

Gruening

Mundt

Anderson

Hart

Muskie

Bartlett

Hartke

Nelson

Bayh

Hickenlooper

Pastore

Beall

Hill

Pearson

Bennett

Holland

Prouty

Bible

Hruska

Proxmire

Boggs

Humphrey

Randolph

Brewster

Inouye

Ribicoff

Burdick

Jackson

Robertson

Byrd, Va.

Javits

Russell

Byrd, W. Va.

Johnston

Saltonstall

Cannon

Jordan, N.C.

Scott

Case

Jordan, Idaho

Simpson

Church

Keating

Smith

Clark

Kennedy

Sparkman

Cooper

Kuchel

Stennis

Cotton

Long, Mo.

Symington

Curtis

Magnuson

Talmadge

Dirksen

Mansfield

Thurmond

Dodd

McClellan

Tower

Dominick

McGee

Walters

Douglas

McGovern

Williams, N.J.

Edmondson

McIntyre

Williams, Del.

Ellender

McNamara

Yarborough

Ervin

Mechem

Young, N. Dak.

Fong

Metcalf

Young, Ohio

Fulbright

Miller

NOT VOTING—10

Goldwater

Morse

Carlson

Long, La.

Pell

Eastland

McCarthy

Smathers

Engle

Morton

Lausche

Neuberger

So the report was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Senate has decided by an overwhelming vote of 88 to 2 not to agree to the conference report.

I point out that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and I as chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee voted in support of the conference report.

I can say for myself—and I feel certain for the Senator from Arizona—that we voted in that manner on the basis that we asked for the conference. We feel that the legislative content of the conference report is good and that the report is one that the Senate could have considered. The amendment in disagreement was the junk mail amendment which the Senate had written into the Senate bill. Our agreement in conference to the language that the Senate would deny the junk mail privilege to Members of the Senate and permit the House to use it if they chose to do so we felt would be an exercise of the proper responsibility of comity between the two Houses.

I believe the vote was not upon the content of this particular amendment or other adjustments, but resentment—and properly so—against the charges made by a Member of the other body that were completely unfounded and reflected on the morality of Senate employees, charges that were irresponsible in the extreme.

Consequently, the Senate has rejected the report by what could be called a

unanimous vote, except for the two of us who had to arrange the conference, and perhaps will have to arrange the next one—if there is one.

Mr. President, there is an amendment, discussed earlier, that does not pertain to anything with which the Senate is in disagreement. It is a House amendment to the Senate amendment which would withdraw unlimited authority in the Capitol Reconstruction Commission to contract for expenditures without either House passing upon them. They usually are allowed only to pick up the final cost.

There was no control whatever over that authority, which was given and properly used by the Capitol Reconstruction Commission during the building of the east front. There is considerable feeling that the authority would carry over and be available for a \$20 million or more expenditure for remodeling the west front, unless the language were changed, and the unlimited authority for contract authorization withdrawn. The Senate withdrew the authority. The House adopted an amendment which would withdraw the authority completely, as the Senate had done, except in the case of a nongovernmental survey of the actual state of the facility, the construction, the foundations, and the walls of the west front.

That would be a small expenditure that could still be authorized; otherwise, there would be no funds available to go ahead without specific appropriation of Congress. The amendment is the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6868, which was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 33, and 39 to the bill (H.R. 6868) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That the proviso to the paragraph entitled 'Extension of the Capitol' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended, is amended by striking out 'and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof,' and by substituting in lieu thereof 'and, prior to any appropriations being provided for extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the west central portion of the United States Capitol, to obligate such sums as may be necessary for the employment of nongovernmental engineering and other necessary services and for test borings and other necessary incidental items required to make a survey, study, and examination of the structural condition and such west central portion, to make reports of findings, and to make recommendations with respect to such remedial measures as may be deemed necessary, including the feasibility of corrective measures in conjunction with extension of such west central portion.'"

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the

House amendment to Senate amendment No. 32.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. My understanding is that the amendment would permit the special commission to engage the services of nongovernmental engineering firms?

Mr. MONRONEY. Specifically nongovernmental engineering firms. We hope they will be the leading engineering and architectural firms of the country, which will give us a solid, sound report on the exact condition of the west front, and what needs to be done to remedy it.

Mr. COOPER. Acceptance of the report and determination as to what should be done, however, would still be reserved to the Senate and the House.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, indeed. The proposal would withdraw carte blanche authority in the case of the modernization of the east front. One thing we wish to avoid is carte blanche authorization. We wish to come back for authorization and appropriation of funds for whatever improvements Congress itself desires.

Mr. COOPER. I will not take any more time than is necessary, but I assume the Senate will consider amendment No. 33. Do I understand correctly?

Mr. MONRONEY. We do not intend to take up any amendment except No. 32. We intend to move that the Senate further insist upon its amendment.

Mr. COOPER. May I ask a question regarding amendment No. 33 while I still hold the floor?

Mr. MONRONEY. Of course.

Mr. COOPER. Amendment No. 33 would give authority to the Commission or the Capitol Architect to determine what plans would be followed in the restoration of the old Senate Chamber and the old Supreme Court?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. This was the exact language as it passed the Senate. The House adopted this language, so it is not in disagreement.

Mr. COOPER. It is accepted?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. The House accepted it.

Mr. COOPER. We hear talk about restoration of the old Senate Chamber. There have been some examples of restoration in the Capitol which I assume were not authentic restorations. Would the decision as to how the old Senate Chamber and the old Supreme Court chamber would be restored be left in the hands of the Capitol Architect or in some special commission?

Mr. MONRONEY. The report provides only for research, securing old pictures, drawings, and plans for the restoration.

They will be subject then to whatever committee or subcommittee the Senate wishes to have consider the matter.

This has been a favorite work of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. For many years the Senate has put the item in the bill. Each time heretofore it has been eliminated by the House.

I assure the Senator from Kentucky that great care will be taken to see that

the restoration is actually to restore as nearly as possible the original Chamber.

Mr. COOPER. And not to modernize.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I correct in saying that this is merely to determine how much it will cost and what it is possible to do?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. It will commit us to nothing except with respect to plans and research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the House amendment to the Senate amendment No. 32.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

#### HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4276) to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4276.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill be passed. I understand there is no objection to it. It was placed before the Senate last night merely for the purpose of having something as the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 4276) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that the Senate recently passed House bill 4276, to provide for the creation of horizontal property condominiums in the District of Columbia. In view of certain difficulties which recently have developed in connection with condominiums, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the committee amendment was agreed to and engrossed and the bill was read the third time and passed be reconsidered, in order to make possible further study of this measure by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, what was the request?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I asked for reconsideration of the votes in connection with the bill providing for the creation of horizontal property condominiums in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report House Joint Resolution 809 and ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to its immediate consideration.

The House joint resolution would continue until January 31, 1964, appropriations for those functions of the Government for which funds have not as yet been provided by law.

Mr. President, I regret as much as anyone the necessity for another continuing resolution during this session of the Congress. As Senators know, most of the delay on the appropriations bills has been occasioned by the lack of necessary authorization and, to date, only the foreign aid authorization bill remains to be enacted. For the RECORD, I am submitting a listing showing the status of all appropriations bills for fiscal year 1964:

Enacted into law are the bills for the Interior, Treasury, Post Office, Executive Office, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Defense Departments, and their related agencies.

With respect to the legislative branch appropriations bill, the Senate has just rejected the conference report.

Three bills have passed both Houses of Congress, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and the Independent Offices appropriations bill, and conferences on these bills are being held or will be in the near future.

Three bills are presently in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Hearings are underway on the military construction bill, and awaiting subcommittee markup are the bills for public works and the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary.

Still remaining in the House committee, pending finalization of the authorization bill, is the foreign aid appropriations bill.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like briefly to explain why I have objected.

There is at the desk an amendment I have submitted to the joint resolution, which would substitute the date "December 31, 1963," for "January 31, 1964." I should like to call up that amendment and discuss it in some detail.

This does not mean I would attempt to delay inordinately the passage of the joint resolution, but I am not in a position to agree to have the joint resolution acted upon before the Senate goes to the House to hear the message of the President at 12:30.

If the Senator from Arizona will renew his request for unanimous consent after the Senate returns, I shall not object at that time, but I will then call up my amendment. I wish to discuss it at reasonable length.

I hope the amendment will receive support from Senators, because in my judgment we should remain in session and finish our job. We should pass the appropriation bills which have not yet been passed before the end of this year, so that those appropriations will not hang over us like a shadow—over the tax bill, over the civil rights bill, over the program of the President—1 minute longer than necessary.

In my judgment—and I may well be wrong—we can pass those appropriation bills before the end of this calendar year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have talked with the Senator from Arizona, who has indicated, in view of the objection raised, that he will accede to the request made by the Senator from Pennsylvania. Therefore, I hope now the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Nitze to be Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this is the day before Thanksgiving. Most of us plan to go home to our families. Could not a unanimous-consent agreement be arrived at to limit debate with reference to this matter, so that all Senators can make plans as to transportation for going home? Senators must rely upon the commercial lines. One cannot make such arrangements as easily as one would like.

Most Senators would like to join their families tomorrow. I believe we have that right. It is now late in November. We are still working at our business. Most Senators will return on Monday or Tuesday, I am sure. Can there not be a unanimous-consent agreement to allot time so that we can know exactly what will be involved?

Mr. MANSFIELD. All we can know exactly is that at the conclusion of the joint meeting the Senate will come back into session. I hope that the Senate will then consider the joint resolution reported by the Senator from Arizona. In the meantime, in the view of the fact that Senators must leave the Chamber at 12:12 or 12:13, I suggest that the Senator from Rhode Island discuss this matter with the Senator from Pennsylvania, to see if something can be worked out.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with respect to the proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania to change the date in the resolution from January 31 to December 31, that was discussed by the House leaders. We had a session of our own people on that yesterday morning.

The joint resolution comes to us from the House, and fixes the date as of January 31. I believe that is a proper date.

I can only say now that when the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is offered it should be rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I listened to the colloquy in reference to the resolution for continuing appropriations to January 31, 1964. I wish to make the record clear.

I believe after Members of this body hear the message of President Johnson today they will know we have work to do. They will know we will proceed with that work as best we can, as rapidly as we can, and as decisively as we can.

There is not a thing in that resolution that prevents this Congress from passing bills, particularly appropriation bills, promptly. The leader of the majority has made it clear that we are going to be in session until very close to Christmas—in fact, during the Christmas period itself, until December 20. We are going to have an opportunity to work on the appropriation bills. In the meantime, I do not think we ought to tie the hands of the Government by denying adoption of a continuing resolution which has as its objective the continuation of the operations of the Government. I am going to insist, also, that we act on every bill that it is possible to move to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I agree implicitly with everything the Senator from Minnesota has said. That is not exactly the problem that confronts us. The Senate can vote the resolution up or down, and I think it should; but I think we should vote one way or the other.

The proposal is to move the date up from January 31 to December 31. I think the Senate ought to work its will, but I think we ought to be reasonable about it. I think 1 hour's debate is enough.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This matter has been discussed by the Republican leadership. It also has been discussed with various members of the Appropriations Committee. As a senior member of that committee, I say December 31 is impracticable and impossible.

While I am just as anxious as the Senator from Pennsylvania is to get through with the appropriation bills, we cannot do it by that time, and therefore the best available date is January 31.

I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania, for whom I have high regard in many respects—I do not include this proposal as one on which I agree with him—will withdraw his proposal, because I think what he is proposing is impossible.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a friendly question. Why does he think we cannot get the appropriation bills through this year, so they will not stand in the way of the civil rights bill and the tax bill? If we cannot have them passed by the end of the year, let us have another continuing resolution to the

middle of January. Let us not commit ourselves to what I am convinced is a well thought out plan to hold up appropriation bills until next year so as to help defeat the program of the President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am fully aware of the possibilities that may be involved in having undue delays on appropriation bills, but, frankly, I may say that this subject has been discussed not only with Republicans but with responsible Democratic Members of the Senate.

After the President's message to the Congress today, every person who supports the administration and the program laid down by our late and beloved President Kennedy will want to get these matters considered, particularly the appropriation bills. But if we cannot, we must have the money to continue the operations of the Government. Incidentally, the continuing resolution is a little more generous than what is contemplated in some of the appropriation measures.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, our purpose can be accomplished by a 1-month extension. We do not need a 2-month extension. I think the Senator from Minnesota in his heart agrees with me.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SIR ALISTAIR McMULLEN, PRESIDENT OF THE AUSTRALIAN SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is honored this morning by having as its guest Sir Alistair McMullen, President of the Australian Senate. He came here for the purpose of attending the funeral of our late President. He holds a distinguished position in the Australian Government. We are indeed fortunate and proud he has seen fit to honor us by visiting this body.

At this time it gives me great pride to introduce a fellow parliamentarian, the President of the Australian Senate, Sir Alistair McMullen.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a distinguished visitor from "down under" is always welcome in this Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the Senate, the Chair extends a cordial welcome to our distinguished guest.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the consideration of the nomination on the calendar.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the name of Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Navy.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, my remarks on this nomination will be very brief. I cannot support confirmation of the appointment of Paul H. Nitze to be Secretary of Navy.

In years past, Mr. Nitze expounded views on Defense policy which, in my opinion, are contrary to the best interests of the Nation. I refer specifically to a speech or lecture made by Mr. Nitze at the Asilomar seminar on April 28, 1960. To be sure of keeping this speech in context, I will not attempt to quote from it, but I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. Nitze was questioned about this speech during the hearing on his nomination. Mr. Nitze testified that his speech at the Asilomar seminar was, in effect, nothing more than an academic exercise, or the presentation of ideas by him which he did not advocate nor even agree with, but merely articulated in order to stimulate intellectual discipline. He stated to the committee that his views on defense policy now are at variance with those presented by him at the Asilomar seminar.

Mr. President, the present views of Mr. Nitze on defense policy may be in conflict with his Asilomar speech. There are those for whose judgment I have a great respect who attest to the soundness of Mr. Nitze's present and past views on national security policy.

Despite Mr. Nitze's protests to the contrary, however, I cannot believe that the Asilomar speech given by Mr. Nitze was only an academic exercise. Despite the apparent disclaimers in the presentation, the entirety of the speech is a work of advocacy. It is no less the work of a salesman because it was the soft sell.

In many respects, Mr. Nitze's proposal for defense policy has subsequently been followed by national policy, although the policy may not have been attributable to Mr. Nitze. Indeed, the portion of the Asilomar speech on composition of military forces and on unilateral actions to be taken in the interest of stability could well have been a charter for the recent policies and actions of our Government, so closely do they follow.

In the final analysis, however, it is Mr. Nitze's attempts to evade his remarks in 1960 which reflect most on this nomination. The denials of the nominee that he advocated or even agreed with the remarks he himself made at the Asilomar seminar represent a lack of candor and forthrightness which should not be condoned. A nominee who engages in equivocation in his testimony on his own nomination is not likely to be more candid in his appearances before congressional committees after he is confirmed to his position of trust.

It seems to me clear that of late there is an increasing problem in obtaining forthright and unequivocal testimony

from some officials in the executive branches. It is a problem which will plague the Congress until it is by some means brought to an end.

When this tendency is apparent even in hearings on nominations, it is time that the Senate draw the line.

I, therefore, cannot support Mr. Nitze's confirmation.

Mr. President, there are other matters which bear on this nomination about which I am not satisfied with the explanation given. One of these is a report of section 2 of the Fifth World Order Study Conference convened at Cleveland in November 1958 by the Department of International Affairs of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Mr. Nitze was reported to be chairman of section 2. In his testimony, the nominee stated that he merely presided at this Conference, that he was not a delegate, and had no vote. Although no record of a dissent was made, Mr. Nitze testified that he did not concur in the report. I ask unanimous consent that this report also be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who opposed the nomination of Mr. Nitze in the Senate Armed Services Committee request that they be recorded against the confirmation of Mr. Nitze's nomination.

#### EXHIBIT 1

#### POWER AND POLICY PROBLEMS IN THE DEFENSE OF THE WEST

(Speech by Paul Nitze before Asilomar Seminar, April 28, 1960)

When Mr. Carter first suggested that I talk to you here this evening, he stressed one point. He said that the daytime presentations and seminars were to be serious exercises in disciplined analysis, while the evening speakers were free to toss ideas around as they saw fit. I shall therefore adopt for this evening's talk the standard suggested by one of the less widely accepted definitions of the economist. According to that definition the skill of the economist is adroitly to pass over the minor inconsistencies, the better to press on to the grand fallacy.

So let me begin by listing some of the assumptions upon which my argument will rest. Each one of these assumptions has ample room in it for inconsistency, difference of opinion, and substantial possibility of error. I take it that the rigorous daytime sessions will have clarified all these points, and I will therefore be free to spin out my chain to its full length without dwelling on the possibilities of error in each step as I go along.

The first assumption is that there is a radical distinction between a policy of deterrence and a military strategy. I take it that in a general war, or a central war, as my Rand friends prefer to call it, the rational aim of wartime military strategy would be substantially to disarm the enemy and thereby leave him no rational choice but to accept our will, while preserving our own essential core as a nation capable of exercising policy. I further take it that the aim of a policy of deterrence is to make it unlikely that we shall ever have to put our military strategy to the test.

The second assumption is that to support a military strategy aimed at disarming the

enemy, if deterrence fails, one would need what I shall call a class A state of advance preparation. This would include all the essential elements, so often stressed by Dick Foster and Herman Kahn, including an effective first strike, counterforce capability backed by a secure second strike capability, plus excellent intelligence as to the extent and location of enemy forces and essential supporting installations; also active defense, passive defense, plus a program for rapid recuperation. To support a policy of deterrence something less than this may suffice. How much less is debatable. The key element obviously is a secure second strike capability, able under all foreseeable circumstances, including a surprise first strike by the enemy, to penetrate and do unacceptable damage to the enemy. Let us call this a class B capability. The essential definition of a class B capability is that it denies a class A capability to the other side.

The third assumption is that it is possible, in principle, to distinguish between relative stability and relative instability in the relationship between the U.S.S.R.'s central war capabilities and those that we possess. If either side, or both sides, have a strong first strike counterforce capability but a weak second strike retaliatory capability, the important thing is who strikes first. Under such circumstances, any serious situation of tension, making it appear possible that one side might strike, will lead the other to try to get in a preemptive strike. If, on the other hand, both sides have inadequate first strike counterforce capabilities but have strong second strike capabilities, there will be little or no advantage in initiating a central war. In the latter case, a situation of relative stability should result.

The fourth assumption is that the situation today and for the next few years can be judged to be relatively unstable. The probable advantage of being first in getting off a counterforce strike is now so great that whoever does so may have some hope of following a rational military strategy, while the one striking second can have no such hope.

The fifth assumption is that in the next 3 or 4 years it should be possible for us to develop a secure second strike capability and that the Russians, because of their superior opportunities for secrecy and concealment, will need less time to provide themselves with such a secure second strike capability, if they do not now already possess one.

The sixth assumption is even more debatable than the other five. It is that the progress of technology is unlikely to make it easier than at present for one side to achieve a true class A capability, as against a major power that devotes itself intelligently and with timely measures to maintaining a secure retaliatory capability.

The basis for this assumption is that limits can already be foreseen beyond which further improvements in speed, range, power of warhead, accuracy, and reliability would appear to be of marginal significance. On the other hand, improvements in simplification, smaller size, lower cost, greater numbers, concealment, dispersal, hardening, mobility, and control are factors that seem to favor a second strike retaliatory capability more than a first strike counterforce capability. Obviously, some presently unforeseen development, such as a belt of ionized gas giving complete invulnerability to one side, would falsify this assumption. But the most radical of today's weapons systems were foreseen as possible in principle many years ago. I just don't know of any systems now thought to be possible in principle that would make a class A capability feasible against a determined opponent taking timely steps to counter it. I repeat, however, that this is a highly debatable assumption and one which would in no way justify any relaxation of research and development work attempting to prove whether the assumption

is right or wrong. But for the moment let us assume it to be right.

Now if we start from these assumptions and look at our power and policy problems over the longer term future, what thoughts come to mind?

In the first place, we would naturally ask ourselves, what is the nature of our policy aim which it is the function of our military power to support? We dealt with this subject at considerable length in the first chapter of study No. 8 which the Washington Center for Foreign Policy Research prepared for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This evening I will merely summarize a few of the main points of the argument there presented. These are the following:

The fundamental purpose of the United States is laid down in the preamble of the Constitution. The aim of our foreign policy is to create and maintain in the world an external environment within which a nation with purposes such as ours can survive and prosper.

Today the fundamental world issue is, who is it to be who will succeed in constructing a new system of world order to take the place of the one which was destroyed as a result of the two world wars? We can no longer rely, as we did prior to World War I, upon the balance of power in Europe and Britain's command of the seas for the maintenance of such an environment. No country today other than the United States has the power and influence to challenge the U.S.S.R. in its effort to build a Communist world system, a system that would be incompatible with our purposes as a nation. We are therefore faced with a dual task—that of constructing a world system compatible with our purposes and appropriate to the world of today and tomorrow, and also of defending that system, while it is still being built, from successful attack or subversion by the Soviet Union and its associates. Our policy then is both to construct and to defend; not only to defend ourselves but to defend the entire coalition of non-Communist nations.

I imagine our second question would be, what are the aims of the Soviet leaders? I suggest they are threefold: first, to maintain the power of the Communist Party within Russia; second, to consolidate their hold over the Sino-Soviet bloc; third, to create their kind of a world system, a system in which no center or aggregation of power and influence would exist that could challenge their power and preeminence. The degree to which the original ideological fire of communism has burned itself out in the Soviet Union is debatable. To some extent that fire has transformed itself into a powerful bureaucracy. But powerful bureaucracies can also be dangerous. And ideological fervor seems still to maintain its intensity in Communist China. In any case, the historical development of communism has been such as to put special emphasis upon conflict and conflict management, almost to the complete subordination of other purposes.

The question which is now pertinent to our analysis is that of the means on which the Sino-Soviet leaders may prefer to put primary reliance in their conflict with us. Specifically, will they bend every effort to build a class A nuclear capability, or will they be content with a class B counterdeterrent while they rely primarily upon other than nuclear means for the pursuit of their policy objectives?

My guess is that they will strive for what they consider to be predominant military posture, but that this does not mean that they will strive at all costs for a class A capability, as I have defined it. I believe that they would much prefer to achieve their aims through means other than a nuclear counterforce strike and that if we apply ourselves intelligently to the task, we should be able to so shape our policy and programs that it neither appears possible nor

desirable to them to rely upon a class A nuclear capability.

Clausewitz makes a distinction between hostility of feeling and hostility of intent. What I am suggesting is that Soviet hostility to us has become less a hostility of feeling and more a hostility of intent; and that a sustained effort to put oneself in a position to defeat another great power in nuclear war requires passion and not merely reason. In any case, if my first six assumptions are conceded, we ought to know within the next 3 or 4 years. If my assumptions are correct, this would be the period within which the U.S.S.R. would have the best chance of executing a counterforce disarming attack. If we get through that period, we may have greater reason to believe that the U.S.S.R. does not wish to put primary reliance upon achieving its objectives through the initiation of a counterforce attack.

So my seventh assumption is that we get through the next 3 or 4 years without a general nuclear war.

Now what broad alternatives for power and policy in defense of the West do we see as possibilities for the period 1964 and beyond? I propose to discuss three broad ranges of alternatives. One alternative will be for the United States to strive for a class A capability. The second will be for the United States to strive for a continuing unilateral class B capability. The third will be for the United States to strive for a system that utilizes collective defense in an effort to maximize collective security and thus create a system making mutual deterrence surer and more stable.

In years past I have supported the first of these alternatives, largely because it has never seemed clear to me how deterrence could be made certain if it was not backed up by a military force that could pursue a rational military strategy if deterrence failed. On the other hand, if deterrence is uncertain, to be capable of pursuing a rational military strategy is, a fortiori, important. I have been in the past, therefore, I think, among the first to ferret out or support the various possibilities for creating or maintaining a class A capability, including not only a counterforce capability, but a secure second-strike capability, active defense, passive defense, and recuperation.

But today one must ask oneself three questions when considering this first alternative. Is it technically possible? Is it possible in domestic economic-political terms? Is it desirable in international political and policy terms?

If my sixth assumption is conceded, a true class A capability after 1964 becomes hard to foresee on technical grounds alone, unless we accomplish some kind of a scientific breakthrough of a type which I have not yet seen even as a gleam in some scientist's mind.

The attempt to achieve such a capability within the limits of presently foreseeable technology would certainly require an economic effort of far greater magnitude than anything we are now seriously contemplating. And the barriers are not merely economic. Nelson Rockefeller's civil defense effort in New York State foundered not so much because of the expense involved. People just don't want to burrow into the ground on the off chance that they will be enabled to survive long enough to participate in the immense job of re-creating a nation from piles of nuclear rubble.

The third question, of the desirability of creating a class A capability in international political and policy terms, is also not to be ignored. If both we and the Russians succeed in building a class A capability, this means that neither will have a truly secure class B capability. In other words, the value of the initiative, the initial strike, would then be conclusive. Such a situation would be highly unstable. And an attempt to build such a capability that came off second best

could be disastrous. It is useful from time to time to look at analogies from games. In a poker game with several players, what is the most dangerous hand? Not the worst hand, but the second best hand. With the second best hand, one is tempted to follow up the betting, but if one does, one gets clobbered.

So we must consider our second alternative, the attempt unilaterally to maintain merely an invulnerable second strike capability as a foundation for a policy of deterrence. Wohlstetter, Herman Kahn, and others have shown why the maintenance of a secure second strike capability is no easy job. The principal problem, however, with this alternative, is that it provides us with no rational military strategy if deterrence fails. From such a posture we cannot possibly hope either to disarm the enemy or to preserve the core of our Nation as a body capable of executing policy. If deterrence fails, the only reaction open to us is retaliation in support of a purpose that no longer exists—the purpose of deterring the enemy from taking the action that they have already taken.

The policy of deterrence is, therefore, a policy resting on psychological rather than on military grounds. Its premise is that Russian action will be controlled by rational considerations and that one of those rational considerations will be their judgment that we are capable of engaging in an irrational response; that is, that we will retaliate when no rational purpose can be served by that retaliation. I think this is sound psychology. If the tables are reversed and one assumes that we have struck the Soviet Union with a surprise counterforce blow and they have enough left with which to retaliate even though not enough with which to pursue a rational military strategy, I think the Russians would similarly be capable of such a basically irrational action.

But the problem becomes more difficult in the gray area where something less than an all-out counterforce attack is involved. Let us suppose that we are relying upon 20 Polaris submarines under the icecap, 100 mobile Minutemen in Alaska, and 50 planes in the sky with Skybolts for the invulnerable component of our deterrent force. Let us say that one day we wake up to find that four Polaris subs don't report. It is unlikely that such a loss was an accident. But does it justify reprisal against the Soviet Union, and if so, of what kind? Then one day 10 Minutemen are sabotaged. Again we are faced with a decision as to what to do. My point is that a policy that rests upon psychology rather than upon a capacity for rational military action can possibly be probed in a gradual manner, so as to avoid the psychological reaction that would rightly be expected from a sudden and all-out challenge.

Furthermore, a policy of deterrence backed solely by a secure second strike capability can give little beyond class I, or passive, deterrence. Its influence in deterring aggressive acts against minor members of the coalition, or even in deterring an attack with conventional weapons against our major allies, cannot be relied upon. The very instability of today's nuclear relationship spreads a precarious deterrence out to class II and even class III deterrence. A stable second strike deterrence posture, unless accompanied by a substantial measure of political detente, would tend to increase the prospect of limited peripheral aggression. We should, therefore, under this second alternative, concurrently have to build forces appropriate to meet the increased limited war threat. These forces would have to be largely independent of, and require only in a secondary sense the backup of, the deterrent power of our central war capabilities.

Since our first two alternatives look pretty unsatisfactory, we are then brought to ex-

amine seriously the third class of alternatives—collective or multilateral approaches to increased security.

Last month I was in Geneva for a few days and sat in on the disarmament discussions that were going on there. Neither the extreme Soviet proposal of total and complete disarmament within 4 years, nor the Western position of total and comprehensive disarmament, with a continuing United Nations force stronger than any national force, looked as though they were going to get anywhere. The Russian proposal leads to a situation of inherent instability in which even a small number of secreted weapons or a more rapid mobilization capability could be decisive. The Western proposal involves the unlikely prospect that the Communist countries will agree to a force outside their control which would be in a position to dominate them. It appeared that each side was jockeying to squeeze the maximum propaganda advantage out of its extreme position before going on to discuss more limited agreements.

I would not assert that useful limited agreements are impossible. The difficulties are, however, immense. These difficulties are in part those of negotiation, including the effort of each side to get the maximum advantage for its side, and the fact that each side naturally tends to a conservative approach in estimating the risks and gains to its side of such an agreement. A conservative approach means a cautious estimate of the possible gains and a full appraisal of possible risks. There seems to me to be an even more fundamental difficulty. This goes to the nature of the problem. If one rules out an arbitrating third force, a United Nations force superior to any combination of national forces, the agreement must be inherently self-executing by the two sides. The problems of inspection, verification of violations, and enforcement become interrelated. As Bob Bowie has pointed out, in the absence of an arbiter with power to enforce, each side must do its own enforcement. The basic sanction is abrogation. But abrogation is apt to set off a period of great tension increasing immeasurably the risk of war, or at a minimum a most serious arms race. The suggestion is then made that modification or abrogation should be made very easy, so that partial sanctions can be indicated or initiated without causing a possibly fatal crisis. Major reliance would then be placed upon reciprocal action based on a common interest in mitigating the dangers of a hazardous and unstable nuclear relationship rather than upon the binding power of a treaty or other piece of paper. I think there is much to recommend this point of view. It leads to a search for a series of reciprocal actions resulting in a tacit working agreement.

We have had some experience with this sort of thing. The mutual cessation of nuclear tests of the last couple of years has been of this nature. The reciprocal limitations on the Korean war were of this nature. Neither of these instances is wholly satisfactory. But were they any more unsatisfactory than the Korean armistice agreement which was a clear-written agreement, provided for international inspection, and was nevertheless of little use beyond permitting a termination of hostilities? The only sanction available, other than the resumption of hostilities, was abrogation. The Communists violated the agreement. We did not wish to resume hostilities. We were, therefore, forced into reciprocal violation of the agreement.

I should like to make one further comment before pressing on to the main point. That comment is that I have a hard time seeing how we can look forward to ratification by the Senate of the type of treaty that is apt to result from negotiation of a limited disarmament agreement. To secure ratification of a treaty requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate. I should think at least a third of the

Senators would take a most conservative view of the benefits and risks to our side of such an agreement; and that means a low view of the benefits and a possibly exaggerated appraisal—at a minimum a fully realistic appraisal—of the risks involved in such a treaty. At the moment, Senate approval appears doubtful even for a test ban treaty, which involves far smaller risks than would a disarmament treaty.

My eighth assumption then is that the prospects for a disarmament treaty are not sufficiently good to warrant our failing seriously to explore other approaches to meeting the policy and defense problems of the West.

I have now completed the first task I set myself—that of passing rapidly over the minor inconsistencies. I am now ready to press on to the great idea—or, if you will, the grand fallacy.

In brief, my proposal is (1) that we accept the improbability that we can achieve a true class A nuclear capability, (2) that we accept the proposition that a class B nuclear capability only exists for the purpose of denying a class A capability to the enemy, (3) that we take seriously the proposition that the aim of our foreign policy is to construct a world system compatible with the survival and development of nations with purposes such as ours, and (4) that a possible route toward the aim is a series of unilateral actions designed to produce reciprocal action on the part of our allies and also on the part of our enemies.

The actions I propose are the following:

(1) that we concentrate on building a variety of secure, purely retaliatory systems, preferably those exploiting mobility and concealment, and locatable away from population centers, in the air, under the sea, or in the deserts or tundra; (2) that when we have such a mix of relatively secure systems, we scrap the fixed-base vulnerable systems that have their principal utility as components of a class A capability; (3) that we multilateralize the command of our retaliatory systems by making SAC a NATO command, and (4) that we inform the United Nations that NATO will turn over ultimate power of decision on the use of these systems to the General Assembly of the United Nations subject to the following conditions:

(a) That we and our allies will assume continuing responsibility for manning, maintaining, and improving these systems.

(b) That U.N. inspectors would be invited to inspect and satisfy themselves that these are the only nuclear systems we are maintaining.

(c) That a U.N. order to use them will be honored only in the event some nation has initiated the use of nuclear weapons other than on or over its own territory in self-defense against military aggression.

In order to guard against the increased danger of local aggression, we and our allies would have to support a substantial increase in forces appropriate for limited war. A considerable stock of small tactical nuclear weapons might be maintained to be made available to any country subject to overt military aggression and desiring to use such weapons in and over its own territory in self-defense. An intensified research and development program would be maintained to guard against the possibility that technological developments do in fact make a class A nuclear capability possible—in other words, that our sixth assumption may be wrong.

As part of the plan, the Soviet Union would be invited to take reciprocal action. In particular, it would be hoped that the U.S.S.R. could give convincing demonstration that it, too, was prepared to restrict its preparation for the contingency of central war to a class B capability.

It would be made clear that we and our NATO allies reserve the unilateral right to modify or terminate the plan. New technological developments or evidence that the

U.S.S.R. was continuing to strive for a class A capability might well cause us to judge some new approach more conducive to the world's and our security.

Such, in outline, is the idea I offer for critical examination—most probably so that you can demonstrate it to be in fact the grand fallacy I suggested in my introduction.

Some of the objections can be anticipated. In the first place, it may be said that this isn't much of a plan. We make no binding commitment. We can modify the plan unilaterally. We get no assurance from the U.S.S.R. that they will do anything at all. We don't refrain from doing anything that it would make much sense, or any sense, for us to do anyway.

This is all quite true. But in a matter of this kind, pieces of paper aren't worth much. The stakes are too high. The important thing is that our action be sensible from the standpoint of our larger interests and remain sensible. We can't expect the Russians to do more than what they continue to consider sensible from the standpoint of their interests. If there is, in fact, a common interest in both our and the U.S.S.R. restricting ourselves to deterrent retaliatory forces and letting our opponents be sure that that is what we are doing, the thing to do is to do it. If there is no such common interest, pieces of paper aren't going to help much.

A related objection may be made that we don't give the U.N. much real control, because we continue to maintain and man the retaliatory systems ourselves. It is quite true that we maintain an effective veto on the use of the weapons and that, in the event of a direct attack, U.N. control might break down. I do not believe it would be to our interest to have it break down and that we can, therefore, make the offer contained in the plan with all sincerity. On the other hand, uncertainty on the part of a potential aggressor who might otherwise hope for nonaction on the part of the U.N. is essential to the plan.

A third objection is that if we do not continuously strive for a class A capability we increase the possibility that the Russians may achieve one. This objection worries me most of all. The fact that we are not now striving for a class A capability is at least a partial answer. When we cancel the Bomarc and Sage elements of our active defense for all except the eastern industrial area, we may be giving the Russian bombers a substantially free ride over much of the United States. We have never done much but talk about passive defense or recuperation. It does not seem to me, therefore, a valid objection to the suggested plan to argue that we would be abandoning an effort to build a class A capability. We just have not been doing it anyway.

But, nevertheless, I am worried by this objection. It is not so much that I really believe that my sixth assumption is wrong. I don't think the danger is some fantastic and one-sided technological development that will give to the Soviet Union, or perhaps to us, such a clear and unambiguous technological superiority that one side can be assured thereby that it can defeat the other side without unacceptable losses to itself. It is rather that I fear that one nation, which devotes itself intelligently and persistently to the problem of how to win a war through a rational military strategy geared to a consistent political aim, may well develop a strategic doctrine, tactics, training, and deployments that will give it a decisive advantage against the side that devotes itself solely to deterrence of war through military means that cannot be adapted to any sensible military strategy if deterrence fails. Strategic doctrine, tactics, training, and deployment may be decisive where technology alone is not. The early German successes in World War II were not based on

any radical technological superiority. Their blitzkrieg successes were based more on doctrine, training, tactics, and initiative than on technical superiority of equipment.

In conclusion, therefore, I might say that the key to whether the suggestion I have put forward is worthy of further serious study, or should be quickly relegated to the scrap heap of other grand fallacies, depends upon whether the Soviet leaders show themselves determined at all costs to strive for a predominant nuclear position, a true class A capability, or whether they give some indication that they perceive a common interest in a more stable nuclear relationship.

#### EXHIBIT 2

#### THE POWER STRUGGLE AND SECURITY IN A NUCLEAR-SPACE AGE—REPORT OF SECTION II

(Chairman, Paul H. Nitze, Cochairman, Kenneth W. Thompson. Rapporteurs: Harold E. Stassen, Raymond E. Wilson, George W. Rathjens, Jr.)

This report was "received by the conference and referred to the churches for study and appropriate action" by vote of the conference.

#### I. THREATS TO SECURITY

We remind ourselves, in considering this subject, that we are thinking and speaking, not only as citizens but more particularly as Christians. Ours must be a sustained effort to relate the love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ to the complex problems of our time. Two temptations must be resisted: on the one hand, the temptation to be so impressed with complexities and difficulties that we fail to say clear words on issues that require moral judgment; and on the other hand, the equally strong temptation to overleap concrete problems in the enunciation of general principles.

Christians have a loyalty which transcends the Nation. The security they seek cannot be limited to any nation or group of nations. Their obligation is to God-given life. All of it. But this, again, does not mean that Christians should be indifferent to the survival of the Nation. For the survival of a nation may be important to the defense of human personality as the Christian faith understands it.

In the contemporary world situation, the question for Christians in the United States is not simply whether the Nation is righteous but also whether our national existence is valuable, both to the people of this country and to the life of mankind. Some aspects of life in the United States could, without loss, perish, just as some characteristics of life in nations opposing us are worthy of survival. Nor should Americans claim that this Nation, taken as a whole, is better for human life than other nations. We can, however, say that the present and potential character of our country makes it possible for the United States to beget continued service to human welfare. Not to try to preserve the security of our Nation could be moral dereliction to mankind. Although the Christian's national loyalty is always qualified, it may, nevertheless, be a part of his loyalty to mankind. This does not exclude recognition of the possibility that mankind may be served and enriched by a wide variety of social forms and cultures.

It is implicit in what we have said that security should not be thought of primarily in national terms. The Christian obligation to mankind and the technical developments of our time now combine to make a purely national concept of security wrong from every point of view. Freedom, justice, social welfare and security are indivisible. And the nationalistic approach to these goods is both morally and practically obsolete.

What today threatens our security? The manifold aspects of the revolution of our time constitute both a profound challenge and a threat to the basic security of the United States and others of the older na-

tions. The continuing security problem comes from the age-old problem of nations struggling for strategic advantage and competing in national armaments, in a situation lacking order and often approaching anarchy. The growth of Russian and Chinese military power controlled by and coupled with the Communist movement and ideology constitute the present focus of this struggle.

The Marxist-Leninist view of man and society, coupled with a national and personal urge to worldwide power, make the contemporary struggle profoundly serious. The Communist powers are resolved to win the worldwide struggle. They expect to win. They will acquiesce in a genuine coexistence only when their own continued existence clearly demands it, or when, with the passing of time, some of their basic convictions have been eroded.

That the intransigence and aggressive tactics of the Communist powers are caused, in part, by fear for their own security is not to be denied. The tragic experience of the Russian people in two world wars and the history of Western imperialism must be taken into account if we are to understand contemporary Communist attitudes. American nuclear stockpiles and widely scattered military bases, some of them near the borders of the Soviet Union, arouse apprehension. Accordingly, we, on our part, must try, more earnestly than we have done, so to conduct ourselves that Communist nations will have less cause to fear our intentions. But their fear also arises out of a legitimate Western response to their aggression. The aggressive aims of the Communists are a real and formidable factor in world tensions and a responsible national policy must take this into account.

From some such appraisal of the threat to security, all considerations of the most effective methods of dealing with the threat should start. It should be added that our response to communism should always include the recognition that the whole Western World, and particularly the Christian church in prerevolutionary Russia, carries heavy responsibility for the movement's emergence, because of an inadequate emphasis on social justice and human welfare. Communism is, in part, a judgment upon our sins of omission and commission. Humility and repentance are incumbent upon us. But to underrate the threat is no service to human well-being or to world peace.

#### II. THE SECURITY ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Neither the United States nor any other nation can insure its security in the years ahead through the unilateral development of military or other power. It is our firm conviction that the best hope for the creation of a system of world order lies in an increase in the power of the United Nations to assume wider responsibilities. Very frequently it may appear that actions taken by that body, in the resolution of disputes, will not be, from the short-term point of view, to the best interests of the United States. We hold, however, that there must be an increased recognition that U.S. interests can find their long-term satisfaction only within a far wider structure of interests that includes those of the rest of mankind. The United States should show a greater willingness than has heretofore been demonstrated to resolve disputes through the organs of the United Nations including the World Court.

We are agreed that if military force is to be used it should be sanctioned by, and under the control of, the United Nations.

The United Nations in deterring aggression and in resolving disputes relies upon the authority and moral force of its recommendations backed by the support of those nations committed to the principles of the Charter.

Much more emphasis must be placed upon the development of economic and political stability, efforts to settle disputes as early as

possible, and the amelioration of situations before they break down into armed conflict or result in situations that invite aggression.

Our basic goal would be a system of international disarmament and security to supersede continued reliance upon military pacts and alliances such as SEATO and the Baghdad Pact.

### III. TOWARD THE CONTROL, REDUCTION AND ABOLITION OF ARMAMENT

Progress toward the goal of universal disarmament is of major importance in the achievement of world order, in reducing the threat of war, and in lessening the tensions of the power struggle. It is urgent that greater emphasis and multiplied efforts be made by the United States and other nations to reach disarmament agreements because of the rapidly increasing destructiveness of nuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles; because of the growing difficulty of bringing these weapons under adequate inspection and control, and because of the large sums now being spent on armaments compared to aid and technical assistance, in a world characterized by widespread hunger, disease and illiteracy.

It is not possible at a conference such as this to spell out the process of arms reduction and control in detail, but the following are suggestions for continued efforts. In its efforts toward world disarmament, the United States should:

1. Assume greater initiative toward bringing national armaments under international inspection and control in a process directed toward their consequent limitation, reduction, and eventual abolition.

Toward this end, we should follow up on the progress of the United Nations negotiations and the successful Geneva scientific talks and keep pressing for an early agreement to stop nuclear weapons tests and to install a United Nations inspection system to verify the fulfillment of the agreement, along the lines recommended by the conference of scientists at Geneva. We believe the U.S. Government should continue its present suspension of tests, unilaterally if necessary, for a sufficient period of time to permit full exploration of the possibilities of arriving at a definitive international agreement.

2. Follow up this significant first step of inspection and limitation by additional steps of international control and reduction.

3. Continue to seek an international agreement setting up a U.N. agency for the peaceful exploration of outer space, and a control system to assure the use of outer space for peaceful purposes.

4. Cooperate in establishing the proposed inspection system of the International Atomic Energy Agency in the hope that this may help furnish the pattern necessary for supervising worldwide cessation of production of nuclear weapons.

5. Continue negotiations with the U.S.S.R. for a mutual aerial and ground inspection system to guard against surprise attack and thus seek to aid in creating a climate where more far-reaching disarmament negotiations may be undertaken.

6. Recognize the close relationship between political settlements and disarmament and be more willing to broaden the framework of disarmament negotiations. These discussions might include the possibility of mutual withdrawal of nuclear forces from points of closest proximity, and disengagement in areas such as the Middle East or central Europe.

7. Work to reopen, as soon as possible, disarmament discussions within the U.N. for the purpose of prohibiting production of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, to transfer nuclear weapons stockpiles to peaceful purposes, and to begin the process of reducing arms and armed forces.

8. Press for the creation of a permanent U.N. police force for border patrol, inspection, and the various functions of a genuine international police system.

Within its governmental system, the United States should:

1. Enlarge the staffs and strengthen the programs of the executive branch for studying the problems of world disarmament and formulating workable plans for its accomplishment. The proposal of a carefully worked out, safeguarded, comprehensive disarmament plan by the United States would serve as a focus for specific negotiations and for rallying world opinion.

2. Expand and make permanent the important work of the Special Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

3. Undertake a coordinated program among Government agencies to work in cooperation with management and labor for making the transition in as orderly a manner as possible, to an economy less dependent on military expenditures, and to remove the fears that disarmament steps will result in a depression.

4. Offer to devote a substantial percentage of the savings from armaments to allocation for development of underdeveloped countries, using the United Nations as far as feasible.

5. Abolish the system of military conscription and allow the authority of the selective service system to draft men to lapse on its expiration next June. The Government should consider ways of encouraging recruitment to meet those of its manpower requirements as would result from following the interim military policy suggested in the next section of this report.

### IV. INTERIM MILITARY POLICY

Until substantial progress has been made toward disarmament, we must use all our influence to see that wisdom and imagination are used in limiting and controlling military force.

As citizens we have a natural concern for the security of our Nation. As Christians we have a wider concern for the security of mankind. We cannot, therefore, view with equanimity preparations for nuclear war which might result in the genetic destruction of the human race as well as widespread destruction of civilized life. Since we as Christians could not ourselves press the buttons for such destruction, we must now declare our conviction that we cannot support the concept of nuclear retaliation or preventive war.

During the interim period prior to a strengthened system of world order, law, and disarmament:

1. We urge our Government to consider all methods for contributing to world security other than reliance upon nuclear weapons.

2. If the Government continues to rely in any way upon nuclear defenses, we urge that it be only for the deterrent effect that their possession by us may have on their possible use by anyone else.

3. If any such weapons are to remain in U.S. possession, we urge that the U.S. Government shift the character of the nuclear weapons it is developing away from systems implying very rapid and inadequately considered decision in the event nuclear warfare is believed to have, or has, been initiated by others. Weapons systems more nearly invulnerable to surprise attack would permit time for political consideration, for negotiation, for the exercise of third party judgment, and for the force of the moral opinion of mankind to be brought to bear before a decision would have to be made as to the appropriate reaction in such a crisis. Such a shift in weapon systems would materially reduce the danger of nuclear war arising from misunderstanding or error.

With respect to providing military aid to other nations, the United States should give due regard to the character and objectives of the recipient governments, the effects of the aid on their economic and political systems, and the effects on neighboring states.

### V. PEACEFUL COMPETITION AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The nuclear stalemate prompts both U.S.S.R. and ourselves to shift competition to nonmilitary fields. Presumably, American leaders ought to welcome peaceful competition in ideas, institutions and opposing conceptions of the good life. Yet, up to the present, national initiative has not been equal to the task. Why have American policies been unsuccessful in this sphere?

Five reasons are advanced for these failures. First, American attitudes have been too one sided in seeing the cold war in simple, military terms. The power of communism rests in part in its offering opportunities for rapid economic development to technologically underdeveloped nations. In the next decade, the results of Chinese and Indian experiments will be watched for the object lessons they carry for other new nations.

Second, we have hesitated to accept the fact of living with two major communist nations for an indefinite period and of recognizing that hostile grimaces and provocative acts will be of no avail.

Third, we have not seized every opportunity to react creatively to more hopeful developments within the communist world, particularly within the so-called satellite nations.

Fourth, Americans are disposed to see the present struggle as a conflict between good and evil. A simple black-and-white moralistic approach may impair the effectiveness of our policies toward satellite countries or those whose political goals are not immediately our own.

Fifth, many assume that the world is and must be divided into two ideological blocs. In fact, an important part of the world's peoples are not allied with either side. More understanding and effective policies must be evolved for cooperation with this part of mankind.

The United States should:

1. Seek continuation over a 5-year period of the International Geophysical Year.

2. Extend trade and travel with mainland China, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

3. Encourage association and fellowship of various professions and groups across the Iron Curtain, for example, exchange of farmers, students, and religious groups.

4. Explore more effective use of its surplus food for distribution in communist countries and in underdeveloped nations.

5. Evolve more seminars and conferences for social scientists and scientists from the Soviet bloc and the West. We commend the Department of State for persisting in negotiating an agreement for expanded exchange of persons with the Soviet Union and urge the lifting of restrictions on the travel of Soviet visitors in the United States.

6. Implement programs for common attacks on basic human problems of disease, such as malaria, and threats to crops such as wheat rust, that may be carried across national boundaries.

7. Invite wider participation by the U.S.S.R. in U.N. technical assistance programs.

8. Encourage private investments in underdeveloped areas with appropriate safeguards both for the private investor and for the host nation.

9. Encourage the religious and philosophic dialogue above the level of present political struggles. In particular, we urge that all opportunities be utilized, through the World Council of Churches and other channels, for meetings of churchmen from the Soviet nations and the West.

## VI. POINTS OF POLICY WITH RESPECT TO SPECIFIC AREAS

Several of the areas of the world pose particular challenges to American foreign policy at this time.

With respect to China, U.S. policy has not been responsive to the realities. While we cannot condone many of the things for which communism stands, it is the part of wisdom to admit that we see no reasonable alternative open to us other than to recognize that Communist China is a nation of tremendous and growing importance with whom we must live. To continue to treat this great power as an outcast can serve only to deepen existing tensions and to further developments in China which we must deplore. Moreover, continuation of such a policy by the United States is indefensible. We feel that the stiffness of our attitude has already cost us dearly in world opinion, and has made the resolution of our difficulties with China more difficult than might have been the case had there been official channels of communication from the beginning.

The section would urge a more flexible approach to the Far Eastern problem in the interest of a more adequate representation of American purposes and objectives. In the interest of greater stability in the Far East, Washington should encourage the Chinese Nationalist Government to evacuate exposed positions that may be militarily unsound and politically detrimental, and submit to the U.N. the question of securing peace and security in the area of Formosa. The people on Formosa should be protected in their right freely to determine their own future.

At minimum, the Western World should not be prevented from liberalizing trade relations with any Far Eastern country. The United States should liberalize its policies with respect to travel of Chinese nationals in the United States and of U.S. citizens within Communist China. At the same time, our policy should move in the direction of an acceptable solution of the problems of participation by the People's Republic of China in the councils of the United Nations and the establishment of diplomatic relations with that Government by the United States.

We feel that, with respect to peaceful competition with communism, one of the most crucial contests is that being waged in India. Inevitably, all of the underdeveloped nations of the world will compare progress in India with that in China; it will be tragic if the comparison is unfavorable. We, therefore, urge that special consideration be given to providing India with sufficient economic and technical assistance to insure the success of her development program. The fact that India has been unwilling to identify itself with us in our military policy should not deter us in this. Rather, we should welcome the fact that free, uncommitted nations can exist in the world today, and that they may facilitate settlement of disputes in which any of the great powers is involved.

At the heart of any settlement of European problems is the question of the two Germans. Moreover, the continued isolation of West Berlin is clearly a source of great vulnerability to the West. We see no means of materially reducing tensions in this part of the world while remaining faithful to our obligations to the people of West Germany, and of Berlin particularly, other than in unification. We, therefore, urge that our Government continue to support the unification of Germany.

We are deeply concerned that Christians better understand the involved and explosive situation in the Middle East. With humility and penitence we confess that our own lack of understanding and sympathy both in our reluctance to resettle in Christian countries the oppressed Jews of Europe, and in our disregard of Arab rights, has contributed to the

tragedy of Palestine. We believe that Christians must join with Moslems, Jews and others in a continuing search for just and durable peace in the area. We urge that every effort be continued to find agreement by negotiation whether under the U.N. or by direct consultation among the governments immediately concerned. Particularly we call for the implementation of the U.N. resolutions providing for the return, where possible, of the Arab refugees to their homes; and, where not possible, for adequate compensation for their loss. We believe the Christian community should stand ready to assist in the repatriation or resettlement of the Arab refugees.

We call on our Government to support the legitimate aspirations of the Arabs for unity, and of Israel to survive in peace.

We firmly record our support of the U.N. recommendation providing for the internationalization of Jerusalem and its environs.

In general, we feel that our attitudes toward the whole Middle East should be conditioned less by our fear of Soviet expansion into the area and become more responsive to the needs of the peoples of the region.

We must recognize the aspirations of the people in the area for independence and economic development. The United States should generously support a widespread program for economic development of the region. We feel that the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower doctrine are not responsive to the major problems of the area, and that the former in particular, may have hindered the development of peaceful solutions to Middle East problems.

## VII. CALL TO THE CHURCHES

We call upon the members of the Christian churches:

To dedicate themselves to the task of working in a spirit of Christian love for the healing of the nations;

To pray for a spirit of penitence for the selfishness of our affluent society in a world of hunger and need,

To make common cause with the disadvantaged and dispossessed for the realization of their hopes and freedoms;

To transfer the conflict of ideas and ideologies from the battlefield to the realm of peaceful competition and the rule of law;

To translate into reality the old Russian proverb, "Mountains may never come together but men can";

To multiply their efforts toward beating swords into plowshares and achieving a warless world.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE  
RELATED TO SECTION II<sup>1</sup>*Resolution on nuclear retaliation, preventive war, and the elimination of war<sup>2</sup>*

The conference, in receiving the report of section II and commending it to the churches for study and appropriate action, wishes to record that there were differences of views in the conference on certain statements in that report, specifically, regarding the fourth sentence of part IV<sup>3</sup> of the section report.

Members of the conference agree in categorically rejecting the concept of preventive war.

There are many of us who emphatically do not agree with the inference that deterrence

<sup>1</sup> For official actions of the National Council of Churches related to the topics dealt with in the resolutions see appendix A, sec. II, and appendix B.

<sup>2</sup> There was some dissent to this resolution on the part of those who preferred the statement in the report of sec. II, pt. IV.

<sup>3</sup> This sentence reads: "Since we as Christians could not ourselves press the buttons for such destruction, we must now declare our conviction that we cannot support the concept of nuclear retaliation or preventive war."

through the capability for nuclear retaliation is to be bracketed with preventive war.

Such peace as there is today, precarious as it may be, rests to some measure upon the capability for nuclear retaliation. The world's hope of achieving international agreements leading toward universal disarmament may similarly rest in part upon that capability.

In expressing these views it was made clear that this is not to be taken as approval by the conference of the moral acceptability of all-out nuclear retaliation, or as modification of the view of the conference that the elimination of nuclear warfare and of war itself is a Christian imperative. The problem of whether or not a Christian can support nuclear warfare in any form must be squarely and prayerfully faced by the churches.

The conference directs that this resolution be recorded in the appropriate place with the published version of Section II's report.

## RESOLUTION ON THE MIDDLE EAST

We are deeply concerned that Christians understand better the involved and explosive situation in the Middle East. With humility and penitence we confess that our own lack of understanding and sympathy, both in our reluctance to resettle the oppressed Jews of Europe in Christian countries, and in our disregard of Arab rights, has contributed to the tragedy of Palestine. We believe that Christians must join with Muslims, Jews, and others in a continuing search for just and durable peace in the area. We urge that every effort be continued to find agreement by negotiation whether under the United Nations or by direct consultation of the governments immediately concerned. Particularly we call for the implementation of United Nations resolutions providing for the return, where possible, of the Arab refugees to their homes; and where not possible, for adequate compensation for their loss. We believe the Christian community should stand ready to assist in the repatriation or resettlement of the Arab refugees, and in the meantime should urge less grudging and more generous support of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

We firmly record our support of the United Nations recommendation providing for the internationalization of Jerusalem and its environs.

The United States should support the legitimate aspirations of the Arabs for unity, of Israel for survival in peace, and of both for political and economic progress. In particular, our country should continue its search for plans satisfactory to both the Arab States and Israel for the development, to their mutual benefit, of water and other resources.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the confirmation of Paul H. Nitze to be Secretary of the Navy. I had the privilege and the honor of serving in the greatest navy in the world, the U.S. Navy, during World War II. I am still proud of that service, and maintain my relationship with it through membership in the Naval Reserve.

Because of my pride in the Navy, and because of my concern for the strength and morale and effectiveness of the Navy, I must oppose confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Nitze. Because I believe the Navy's performance is a vital role in the defense of the free world, a role that must not be diminished. Because of his views on disarmament, his views on our military posture, and his views on the disposition of the military forces, I feel that his nomination should not be confirmed.

I bear no personal animosity toward him. I understand he is a man of considerable ability. Were he being nominated for some other office not connected with the Nation's defense, I undoubtedly would vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Under the circumstances, it is my fervent hope that the Senate will not vote to confirm his nomination.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Texas with respect to the nomination which is now before the Senate. I cannot bring myself to vote to confirm Mr. Nitze's nomination, especially in view of his statements, uttered, printed in the press, and in his speeches. From all I have observed from him, he is another "one worder." We have too many of them as it is.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have known Paul H. Nitze since 1945, as an outstanding citizen, both as an acquaintance and later as a friend. In my opinion, he is highly qualified for the position of Secretary of the Navy. It is fantastic to me that objection should be raised on the basis of his military views. My one disagreement with him is that he is entirely too belligerent. I am confident that as Secretary of the Navy he will be as astute and as determined to advance our national military strength as any man in America. In my judgment, he is too belligerent, and I would wish that he could modify his views in the interest of the proposals made by the late President in support of general and complete disarmament. The suggestion that he is not adequately qualified to advance our naval strength to the best of his ability in his position as Secretary of the Navy seems to me fantastic.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I listened to all the testimony with relation to the nomination of Mr. Paul H. Nitze for Secretary of the Navy. I have known him ever since my days in college at Cambridge, Mass., a good many years ago. I have never been close to him, but I have known him as a man of great intellect and great energy and force, and a man of strong opinions.

I hope he will be a good administrator. I should like to call attention to some testimony given before the committee, particularly with relation to the question that I asked him. He was a consultant to the so-called Gaither committee. He recommended a stronger security position for our armed services and for our country. As a consultant, he helped write the report. We, as Members of Congress, never saw that report, but we know it was a very emphatic report, and stimulated a sense of security in all of us.

In the testimony Mr. Nitze said:

I believe I have taken no position which would make it difficult for me to do so.

In other words, to support the Navy.

In fact, I believe my position has been and certainly is today in support of an increasing role for the Navy. Certainly in the field of nuclear deterrence, I believe the Polaris system is one—is the strongest element we have.

Certainly in the field of support of overseas positions which might be threatened, I think our carrier strike forces are most apt to be there quick and with the necessary power.

Then I asked him:

Senator SALTONSTALL. And the protection of our shores through ASW and other means of the Navy is of vital importance to our security? You thoroughly believe in that?

Mr. NITZE. I thoroughly believe in that.

Mr. President, I believe that he is a patriotic American citizen of strong convictions and that he will be a good Secretary of the Navy. I hope so, in every respect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand there is no demand for a yeand-nay vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Paul H. Nitze. The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has requested me to ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that he would vote against the confirmation if a yeand-nay vote were had.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, anyone who has known the nominee for as long as I have known him cannot sit silent at a time like this.

I first met Mr. Nitze during the war, when I was an officer in the Army and he was concerned with matters of a military nature.

He has always been a strong-minded man and a dedicated public servant, one who is disciplined to accord with policy decisions which are taken and which bind a person to carry them out very well.

This is a very interesting attitude, which I understand as a lawyer; namely, that a man might disagree with a decision and yet have the ability to carry it through, notwithstanding his disagreement. It is a very interesting aspect of Nitze's abilities. He is certainly a man of enormous experience.

It is my judgment, as it is that of the Senator from Massachusetts, that, if he is given this important position of Secretary of the Navy, he will perform it superbly and faithfully in accordance with the commitments that he has undertaken.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I, too, have known Paul H. Nitze since he first came to Washington, and I have followed with a great deal of satisfaction the distinguished career he has made here under various administrations. He is a loyal, dedicated American. He brings to Government a great capacity, both mentally and physically, to see through the very difficult problems that lie ahead in our strategy for defense and our strategy for the production of armaments and equipment which will keep this Nation safe and free and keep for us the supremacy that we need in the cold war in connection with our military armaments.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I support the nomination of Mr. Nitze. I have known him for many years. The news of his appointment was highly gratifying to me. He is a man of the highest character, hardheaded, and is most worthy of the appointment which he has received.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have not known Mr. Nitze for a long time, but

I had some conversation with him during the recent hearings held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with reference to nuclear propulsion of an aircraft carrier. I found him to be a sensible, practical, dedicated, patriotic American. I am happy to support the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, today, we have the opportunity to vote in confirmation of the nomination to the position of Secretary of the Navy of a man who has provided outstanding service to his Government and his country for a period of 20 years.

Paul Nitze was born in Amherst, Mass., while his father was a professor at Amherst College. He was brought up and attended schools in Chicago and Connecticut, graduating from Harvard University. Upon completion of college, he entered business and was associated with Dillon, Read & Co. of New York until 1941 except for a short period during which he had his own investment firm.

Beginning in 1940 he came to Washington on several occasions for particular assignments with Mr. Forrestal, General Marshall, and General Hershey. During this period, he participated in the formulation of the Draft Act of 1940 at a time when it was vitally needed as an element of our national security. He also worked as a consultant to Mr. Burden and Mr. Harding, who were instrumental in effecting the elimination of German and Italian airlines from Latin America during World War II.

In 1941 he left his position as vice president of Dillon & Read and moved permanently to Washington where he became Financial Director of the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs working for Mr. Nelson Rockefeller. He had participated with Mr. Forrestal in the creation of this Office.

Subsequently, he joined the Economic Warfare Board which was later changed to the Foreign Economic Administration upon merging with the Lend Lease Administration. He continued to serve there as the Director of the Foreign Procurement and Development Branch which was responsible for the procurement abroad of the strategic materials required to sustain our World War II effort. From 1944 to 1946 he served, first as Director for the European phase, and then as Vice Chairman for the Pacific phase, of the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey. In the latter phase, this survey determined the effects of nuclear weapons exploded over Hiroshima and Nagasaki and ascertained the role of airpower in the results of the Pacific war. A great deal of important data for application in subsequent military planning was produced by this group.

Upon completion of this survey, in 1946, he began a period of service with the State Department becoming, successively, the Deputy Director of the Office of Trade Policy, Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and then, for 3½ years beginning in 1950, the Director of the Policy Planning Staff. During this service in the State Department he was a key staff officer involved in the development of the Marshall plan, and in forming up its or-

ganization from the time of the announcement of the plan until Mr. Paul Hoffman took over its operation. He was also instrumental in the formulation of policies which helped resolve the recurrent British currency crises.

It was during this period that Mr. Nitze played a vital role in the development of a study, NSC 68, which was a basic review of our national security position. As an example of the dramatic nature of the conclusions of that study it proposed that we treble defense expenditures. The conclusions and recommendations of that study were approved by President Truman, but could not be significantly implemented prior to the outbreak of war in Korea. Nevertheless, they formed the basis for an early start toward the necessary defense buildup.

Other sectors in which he provided strong support for policies which have contributed to U.S. security were in the Iranian oil crisis generated by Premier Mossadegh, the creation of SHAPE, the strong U.S. position in the Berlin blockade, and the negotiations which led to the Austrian Peace Treaty. He also played a part in the development of the DEW line.

With the advent of the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Nitze left Government and succeeded Gov. Christian Herter as President of the Foreign Service Educational Foundation, and became a trustee of Johns Hopkins University. During this period, however, he continued active participation in public affairs. He served as a consultant to several groups studying defense issues. These included the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, the Applied Physics Laboratory of Johns Hopkins University, Project Nobska which had a bearing on the development of the Polaris submarine, and Project Lamplight which led to the concept of the extension of the DEW line. Additionally, he was a consultant to the Gaither Committee and shared fully the Committee's view that the U.S. defense posture was at that time in a poor state and badly needed bolstering.

Upon the inauguration of President Kennedy, Mr. Paul Nitze became the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs where he has played a key role in the development of a defense posture which, in my opinion, has improved by an order of magnitude the readiness of this country to meet any threat. I have had it reported to me by men who worked extremely closely with him during the Cuban missile crisis that he was a strong supporter of the decision to force the missiles and bombers out of Cuba and in policies designed to achieve these decisions. I have also learned that he is noted for his insistence upon referral of problems to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and for his careful reflection upon and consideration of their military judgment.

As for his views on seapower, I shall merely quote a page from the statement he gave before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I am a strong believer in the importance of maintaining superiority over the Communist bloc in every element of our military power.

I believe that the United States must maintain its strategic superiority over the U.S.S.R. I believe that the U.S. Navy plays a vital part in the maintenance of that strategic superiority through its invulnerable Polaris submarine missile system and its attack carrier strike forces. I believe that our strategic forces provide the only sure deterrence, in the present era, against strategic nuclear attack by the Communist bloc.

I believe that the deterrence provided by our strategic forces is not adequate by itself to restrain all forms of conventional military attack by the Communist bloc and that deterrence of such conventional attack can best be achieved by maintaining adequate non-strategic military forces and overseas bases. This in turn makes it imperative that the U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps have the tools to maintain the control of the seas necessary to bring these nonstrategic forces to bear and to assist our allies against conventional or paramilitary aggression.

I believe that only by maintaining this superiority of strategic and nonstrategic military forces can the United States have the optimum opportunity to use its military power short of war to support its foreign policy or be in a position to win a military victory, at the lowest level of conflict adequate to do the job, if war should, nevertheless, occur.

I urge the Senate to confirm the nomination of a man who has been a successful businessman, a proven patriotic public servant in war and peace, a vigorous and able administrator with the Departments of State and Defense, a man who over the years has served his country with outstanding capability and talent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pertinent excerpts from the hearings be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Chairman RUSSELL. I assume, Mr. Secretary, that you recall a speech you made in the Asilomar National Strategy Seminar, on April 28, 1960, dealing with policy problems and the defense of the West. You wrote this speech, I assume.

Mr. NITZE. I did.

Chairman RUSSELL. There are one or two statements in it that caused me some concern.

There is here your proposal that we should multilateralize the command of our retaliatory systems by making SAC a NATO command, and that we should inform the United Nations that NATO will turn over ultimate power of decision on the use of these commands to the General Assembly of the United Nations subject to the following conditions:

"(a) That we and our allies will assume continuing responsibility for manning, maintaining, and improving these systems;

"(b) That U.N. inspectors will be invited to inspect and satisfy themselves that these are the only nuclear systems we are maintaining;

"(c) That a U.N. order to use them will be honored only in the event some nation has initiated the use of nuclear weapons other than on or over its own territory in self-defense against military aggression."

Would you care to make any elaboration as to the circumstances under which this speech was delivered, or just what you had in mind by proposing to turn our retaliatory systems over to NATO, and NATO, in turn, turn it over to the United Nations?

Mr. NITZE. Mr. Chairman, in the very first paragraph of that speech I said that I was going to press on to the grand fallacy. I think four or five times in this speech I in-

dictated that what was contained in this package was to be viewed as probable grand fallacy, or the grand fallacy.

As I say, five times in the speech I made this point clear, that this was either a grand fallacy or probably a grand fallacy.

But let me say a few words about why I dealt with this at all.

I had been a participant in the Gaither Committee. We had been deeply concerned about the security, or the adequacy of our military posture at that time. We felt that we faced the prospect of a missile gap, we faced a situation in which SAC was vulnerable or would become vulnerable at such time as the Russians had missiles if we didn't do a great many things about it.

This report recommended that we accelerate our missile program, it recommended a program to accelerate the construction of BMEWS, the ballistic missile early warning system, it recommended a dispersal—

Chairman RUSSELL. I am sorry, Mr. Nitze, I am not quite clear as to what report this is you are referring to.

Mr. NITZE. I am talking now about the Gaither Committee report, in which I was a participant. And this preceded this Asilomar seminar.

Chairman RUSSELL. It was between this Cleveland conference and the Asilomar seminar?

Mr. NITZE. This is correct.

Chairman RUSSELL. And you were on that board, or that Committee?

Mr. NITZE. I was a consultant to that Committee, participated in the drafting of its report.

It recommended a number of other things which we considered to be necessary for the improvement of our defense posture. It was our feeling that our recommendations were not being adequately prosecuted. We were under instruction not to talk publicly about our recommendations or our disappointment.

This speech in part was meant to shock people into a realization of what the requirements of our security were, and what unpalatable alternatives we might have to face if we did not do things, many of which we subsequently have done, to improve our defense posture.

Chairman RUSSELL. Was that the report that never was released?

Mr. NITZE. I believe it never was released, that is correct.

Chairman RUSSELL. Who was responsible for that Committee?

Was it appointed by the President?

Mr. NITZE. It was appointed by the President. I think Mr. Sprague and Mr. Gaither were the co-Chairmen.

Chairman RUSSELL. I remember there was a great deal of comment on it. I never did see a copy of it.

I read this speech hurriedly. I saw where you said this is either a great idea or a grand fallacy. You didn't undertake to say it was the only plan. It was a discussion of scholars and intellectuals. And you threw this out as something worthy of consideration, as I understand it, that is the way I would interpret it. But you are now here before this committee nominated for the position as the Secretary of the Navy. We have a responsibility. We have a responsibility to have some idea of your views.

Do you think today—as you outline in your speech—that it would be wise for us to see that the SAC was turned over to the General Assembly of the United Nations?

Mr. NITZE. No, I see nothing that would make that wise.

Chairman RUSSELL. Do you have any intention in your position of power as Secretary of the Navy of advocating a policy that would result in SAC being turned over to any command other than that of the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. NITZE. I do not, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Nitze, I think you know that great concern has been expressed in a number of letters and telegrams to members of the committee with respect to the views that were expressed in a report of section II of the Fifth World Order Study Conference that was convened in Cleveland in November 1958 by the Department of International Affairs of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. The text of this report indicates that you were the chairman of section II.

Some of the views expressed in this report have caused many persons to be concerned about your nomination.

In all candor, I must say that I would be hesitant to vote, myself, for the confirmation of a man to serve as Secretary of the Navy who adhered to all of the views expressed in this report.

Your staff has furnished us a compilation of material relating to the circumstances in which this report was prepared. I think it would be well at this juncture to have this compilation printed in the record at this point. It includes all of section II, as well as a summation or compilation that was furnished by your staff.

As I understand this compilation, it indicates that you were only the moderator of section II, that the views expressed in the report of this section are not necessarily yours, and that in fact in some respects your views are quite contrary to those expressed in the report.

I think it important to clear up any doubts that might exist on this subject. And I have a few questions based on those statements.

In asking these questions, I will use some quotes that are, necessarily, out of context. This is always unfortunate, but in any event, the entire report has been inserted in the record.

This report states that, "We are agreed that if military force is to be used it should be sanctioned by, and under the control of the United Nations."

Does that statement represent your views?

Mr. NITZE. It does not, Mr. Chairman, and it did not at the time.

Chairman RUSSELL. You do not think the utilization of military forces in this country should be dependent upon any affirmative action of the United Nations?

Mr. NITZE. I do not. I think there are many potential occasions when we might have to use force ourselves, even though not sanctioned by the United Nations.

Chairman RUSSELL. And can you conceive of conditions where it would be necessary for the United States to utilize its full military force even if this were contrary to the expressed views and resolutions of the United Nations?

Mr. NITZE. I do. I would hope that such an occasion would not arise.

Chairman RUSSELL. I am sure we all would.

At least I hope the occasion never arises when we must use them, in any event.

Just what effect do you think we should give to the resolution that the—

Mr. NITZE. I did not quite understand the question.

Chairman RUSSELL. To just what extent do you think we should be guided by the views of the United Nations in the utilization of our military forces? Do you think that we should wait until we were attacked before we would utilize them, if the United Nations had not approved it, or disapproved it, or do you think we would be justified in using them in a peripheral war, pursuant to our obligation under some worldwide agreement, even though this were contrary to the present-day opinion of the United Nations?

Mr. NITZE. I agree with the latter point. I think we should use them if it is necessary, even if it were contrary to a United Nations resolution.

It would seem to me, however, that we did have an advantage in the Korean war when our military response to the Korean war was in conformity with the United Nations resolution.

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes. Of course we were fortunate in one extent at that time. The Russians had withdrawn, as I recall it, from the Security Council.

Mr. NITZE. That is correct.

Chairman RUSSELL. And we were able to get the approval not only of the General Assembly, but of the Security Council, which would not have been the case if the Russians could have vetoed the action in the Security Council.

Do you draw any distinction as to action this country should take, as to whether it has been approved by the General Assembly and the higher group in the United Nations, or do you think it should depend entirely upon the security of the United States and our national interests?

Mr. NITZE. I think it should depend upon the security of the United States and our national interests.

But I think our national interest is to be broadly interpreted. I think it is important that we have the support of our allies and the free world as well.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, do you think that we should solicit that support before taking any military action?

Mr. NITZE. I do not think that would apply in many conceivable contingencies.

Mr. Chairman, may I say a few words about the substance of this?

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes, I want you to make as full a statement as you wish, because it is an important matter.

Mr. NITZE. With respect to this National Council of Churches meeting—this was a meeting in 1958, the success of which was of very much interest to Mr. Dulles and Mr. Ernest Gross, they were very much interested that that be a successful meeting. They were worried that it would not turn out well.

Mr. Gross asked me whether I would chair one of the six panels. He assured me before I went there that I would merely preside, I was not to be in any way responsible for the views expressed by the delegates of the 27 denominations of the Protestant church who were there.

They hoped that as presiding officer I might put forward some of the realities of our foreign policy and the necessities of our defense posture in connection therewith.

I tried to do so. I was unsuccessful. And the report reflects the fact that I was unsuccessful.

But at that time I felt that almost all the views in that panel II report were contrary to what I thought was right, and I still think so.

Chairman RUSSELL. I am not completely clear. Did the members of this section sign this report or not?

Mr. NITZE. They voted upon the report section by section. Many of the views expressed therein—well, for instance, the question of the recognition of Communist China—this was unacceptable—the view expressed there was unacceptable to Mr. Dulles, who made the principal speech at the conference. It was unacceptable to Mr. Ernest Gross, who was in charge of that division of the National Council of Churches. It was put to a vote of the full plenum. The full plenum voted, as I remember, more than 75 percent in favor of this language, which none of us thought was correct.

I make this statement only as an example of the way in which the conference went.

Chairman RUSSELL. I am not too familiar with the parliamentary procedures. I regret to say, of the National Council of Churches.

Mr. NITZE. I wasn't a delegate, did not have a vote, myself.

Chairman RUSSELL. You did not have a vote?

Mr. NITZE. No, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. That is rather remarkable, isn't it—for a man to chair a seminar or a meeting of this kind without participating in it, or having any power of participation?

Mr. NITZE. I was asked to do this, even though I was not a member.

Chairman RUSSELL. Was Mr. Dulles a member?

Mr. NITZE. He was a member, and, as I remember, at one time chairman of their governing board.

Chairman RUSSELL. And you think he was a delegate?

Mr. NITZE. He made the principal speech at that occasion.

Chairman RUSSELL. Did he have a vote?

Mr. NITZE. My recollection is he left the meeting before the final votes were taken. I believe that in Mrs. Eleanor Dulles' book she relates his deep unhappiness with this particular session of the National Council of Churches.

Chairman RUSSELL. Having known him personally, I know he was very unhappy with any recommendations for this country to recognize Red China. But the thing that concerned me was if there was one person who was opposed to the report, under the parliamentary procedure did they not have the authority to file a minority report? In other words, was this report of your section ever submitted to the entire conference, or was it just a unilateral action within each subdivision?

Mr. NITZE. My recollection is it was submitted to the entire conference after having been developed by majority vote within section II.

Chairman RUSSELL. Did you make any statement to the conference to indicate you disapproved of any part of this report?

Mr. NITZE. I wasn't present at the final conference but I voiced frequent objections during the preparation of section II. After I had finished doing what I agreed to do, to chair that, preside over that panel, I left, as did the cochairman, Mr. Kenneth Thompson.

Chairman RUSSELL. Were you not apprehensive, Mr. Nitze, that the views of this report would be considered your views, inasmuch as you had presided over this section?

Did you, anywhere, at anytime, disavow these views, or disassociate yourself from these findings?

Mr. NITZE. To the best of my recollection, I did not see the final conference report until Senator JACKSON, 2 days after my nomination had been announced, asked me about it, and I didn't know what he was referring to. So I then had our office get the records of the National Council of Churches, and they showed me the report.

To the best of my recollection, this is the first time that I was aware of the fact that the report had appeared with my name in a position which might seemingly attribute these views to me.

The fact that I not only did not consider myself associated with the report but also registered my concern during and after the conference is attested by the letters which the chairman has entered into the record.

Chairman RUSSELL. I would assume it was carried quite widely in the press in the city where the meetings were held, if not over the country as a whole.

But I have no information as to that. I haven't made any detailed inquiry into it.

I assume that you did agree with some parts of the report.

Mr. NITZE. I am sure there must be some parts. But, as I say, I think the report contains almost every view that I disagree with.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, you have read the report several years after the session that you chaired had made the report. I assume you have read it, since Senator JACKSON called it to your attention.

Mr. NITZE. I did.

Chairman RUSSELL. Are you familiar with the part that recommends that the United States should continue its suspension of nuclear tests unilaterally, if necessary, for a sufficient period of time to permit exploration of the possibilities of a definitive international agreement in this area?

Mr. NITZE. I am trying to recollect what my views were on that particular thing at the time.

Chairman RUSSELL. If you don't recall the exact wording, perhaps you can tell the committee now just what are your views on disarmament generally, particularly with respect to measures of inspection and control in an agreement for international disarmament.

Mr. NITZE. Now that I have thought back on the preceding question, I believe the word "unilateral suspension" is in there.

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes, sir; it is.

Mr. NITZE. And this I disagree with. I think my recollection is I disagreed with it at the time.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, all of us, I think, are in favor of disarmament. We all have our own particular formula for disarmament and they differ very widely.

Do you mind telling us generally, since you are in a position where your views have influence, what your views are on disarmament agreements, inspection, and whether there should be comprehensive procedures to assure compliance with the agreement?

Mr. NITZE. With respect to the test ban agreement, I did support the test ban agreement as it has been approved, and I support Mr. McNamara's testimony with respect to the test ban agreement.

#### NITZE AND BUNDY NOMINATIONS

Chairman RUSSELL. You are in good company there with many Members of the Senate, even though I happen to be in the unfortunate minority.

Mr. NITZE. With respect to disarmament agreements reducing and controlling armaments, there it would seem to me they would be quite unwise unless they provided thorough inspection, adequate inspection provisions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Do you think it is possible to have a system of inspection that would protect the interests of this country without it being onsite? Do you believe it can be a treaty by means of devices, black boxes, and things of that kind?

Mr. NITZE. I do not have confidence in black boxes, and I think I so testified before the Stennis subcommittee when it was having hearings on the test ban treaty, when a comprehensive test ban treaty was under discussion. I think the utility of black boxes—there may be some utility of black boxes in a test ban, a comprehensive test ban agreement. But I do not believe that one can rely just on the black boxes.

Chairman RUSSELL. There is another statement in the report, and I quote:

"Until substantial progress has been made toward disarmament we must use all our influence to see that wisdom and imagination are used in limiting and controlling military force."

I am curious to know what that statement means. I am a little confused.

You say you have nothing to do with it—that you just chaired the section. But to what extent would you endorse any injunction of this nature, limiting and controlling military force?

Mr. NITZE. To the extent that it was suggested by my introductory statement. I think at the end of my introductory statement I said I believe that only by maintain-

ing this superiority of strategic and non-strategic military force can the United States have the optimum opportunity to use its military power short of war to support its foreign policy or be in a position to win a military victory at the lowest level of conflict adequate to do the job if war should nevertheless occur.

Chairman RUSSELL. I assume by the lowest level of conflict adequate to do the job, that you have in mind avoiding, if we can, nuclear war.

Mr. NITZE. If that is possible, and if we can still achieve our objectives without so doing, it seems to me this is an important objective for us to have.

Chairman RUSSELL. If we could avoid it, we would limit it to conventional weapons.

Mr. NITZE. If we could avoid it and still achieve our objectives.

Chairman RUSSELL. A number of the communications I have received with respect to your nomination quote this sentence from the report:

"Since we as Christians could not ourselves press the buttons for such destruction, we must now declare our conviction that we cannot support the concept of nuclear retaliation or preventive war."

Now, as Secretary of the Navy it might be necessary for you to participate in pressing the button that would set in motion one of our most formidable nuclear weapons, the Polaris submarine. Do you have any reservations about nuclear retaliation if we should be attacked by nuclear weapons?

Mr. NITZE. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. You have no reservation whatsoever?

Mr. NITZE. No, sir. That particular section I remember taking violent exception to at the time of the conference. And the steering committee at the time of the conference also took exception to it, and I believe there was some language put into the report which registered that disagreement.

Chairman RUSSELL. So you personally believe that a person could be a Christian and believe in nuclear retaliation all at the same time?

Mr. NITZE. I do.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. NITZE, this report states that—

"Washington should encourage the Chinese Nationalist Government to evacuate exposed positions that may be militarily unsound and politically detrimental."

I don't see how we could avoid the conclusion that that refers to Quemoy and Matsu, at least, if nothing else.

Did you in 1958, or do you today, believe that we should pressure the Chinese Nationalists to evacuate Quemoy and Matsu?

Mr. NITZE. I do not think so today. My recollection is in 1958 I did think so.

Chairman RUSSELL. It might help some of us in our thinking if you tell us what brought about the change in your thinking on that subject.

Mr. NITZE. At that time, as I remember it, the U.S. planning was that in the event of an attack on Quemoy and Matsu, the response would be a nuclear response. It did not seem to me that Quemoy and Matsu, which were right close to the border, to the coast of China, which were not part of our security guarantee, would merit that kind of response.

Subsequently, when the threat really developed against Quemoy and Matsu, the Chinese Nationalists were able to hold them with logistic support from the United States, and so it turned out that you could hold the position without taking what had been the planned action.

Chairman RUSSELL. You don't think the Chinese Nationalists could hold Quemoy and Matsu if Red China made an all-out assault on them?

Mr. NITZE. With our support, I think they can.

Chairman RUSSELL. I mean without our active participation.

Mr. NITZE. As it turned out at that time they were able to.

Chairman RUSSELL. I understand that. But you don't think firing several thousand shells out there was an all-out attack on Quemoy and Matsu. Do you think that the Nationalist Chinese could hold without the 7th Fleet which would be under your command?

Mr. NITZE. If it were necessary for the 7th Fleet to support them, that is, if the actions which we took back in 1958 and 1959 were not adequate, then we would have to use the 7th Fleet in support of Quemoy and Matsu.

Chairman RUSSELL. I believe at one time you held some position of trust and responsibility in the Eisenhower administration, did you not?

Mr. NITZE. I did, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Policy planning staff?

Mr. NITZE. It continued over from the Truman days, through the first 6 months of the Eisenhower administration.

Chairman RUSSELL. I thought you were an expert in planning.

Did you disagree with the position of the U.S. Government with respect to Quemoy and Matsu in the Eisenhower administration, when we took a position on that matter, and the Senate passed a resolution on it?

Mr. NITZE. I do not recollect that this issue came up during the period January to June 1953.

Chairman RUSSELL. I did not mean to say it did. As a matter of fact, I know it did not.

But, at that time, were you still of the opinion that we could not participate in Quemoy's and Matsu's defense without the use of nuclear weapons?

That seemed to be the predicate you laid for your belief at that time, that we should not help defend Quemoy and Matsu. I was in some of those conferences. I never heard anybody say we had to use nuclear weapons. The question was whether the President should have the authority to commit our forces to their defense. And we generally talked about the 7th Fleet.

Did you approve or disapprove of that action? You are familiar with it.

Mr. NITZE. I did not believe that I was—I was not in support of that resolution at that time.

Senator BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, does he mean he does not believe he was in support of the resolution, or does he mean that he was in support of the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Navy?

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that between now and 12:13

p.m. there will be only a few brief remarks and a quorum call. At 12:13 the Senate will leave the Chamber in a body to attend the joint meeting with the House of Representatives.

I hope that Senators who obtain the floor during the interim will give the leadership an opportunity at approximately 12:05, to ask for a quorum call to enable Senators to come to the Chamber.

It is anticipated that after the reconvening of the Senate, following its return to the Chamber after listening to the message of the President, a motion will be made by the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to consider a continuing resolution.

#### PROPOSAL FOR INVESTIGATION OF ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I hope the majority leader will hear me out, because I desire to speak on a subject to which I wish to direct his attention.

Yesterday there was considerable discussion in the Chamber, in which I participated, not by any advance design, but only because I was moved to do so by the discussion, concerning the national calamity which befell the country in the assassination of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy. The discussion related to how the American people might have at one time and place, and in the most authoritative way, an assessment of what occurred and of what might be done to avoid ever again any such dreadful eventuality.

The sequel to that discussion came in an announcement by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary would undertake a complete inquiry, as is indeed its right. In a matter of this kind, one could have proceeded, for example, by way of a national commission. If a similar situation had faced the British or the Canadian people, it undoubtedly would have resulted in the appointment of a Royal Commission consisting of the most distinguished people in the country, including legislators and judges, to bring to the nation its authoritative assessment, report, and recommendation. In our case, that does not necessarily have to be the way the investigation should be made; however, it is still a possibility.

Speaking as one American and one Senator of conscience, I am entirely satisfied that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary should conduct the investigation. But I urge and hope that the leadership could, by arrangement with the President and the leaders in the other body, see to it that the only investigation to which the American people would look would be the Senate investigation. The members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary are dedicated, high-minded, capable Americans. The staff would be of the best. The executive department would cooperate fully in such an investigation.

Americans are concerned that there will not be an investigation by the Senate, that there will not be an investiga-

tion by the House, since the President has already ordered an investigation to be made by the FBI, with its report to be made public. Other people may have other ideas, which would only result in so much confusion concerning this terrible, serious, national situation.

So I address a plea to the leadership that, within the limits of their authority, they do their utmost to bring about a situation in which, if the die is cast that way—and, as I say, I am sure it can be done, and done superbly well—the Senate Committee on the Judiciary will be the investigating body, and that everybody's ideas and everybody's desires to get to the bottom of the whole situation may be pooled in that committee, and that its report be the authoritative report to the people.

I assure the leaders that the people will not be satisfied with anything but an authoritative report and recommendations on the highest national level, representing the entire Nation. If the people are given bits and pieces, many Americans will be left dissatisfied, and we would be derelict in our responsibility to the country.

I suggest this procedure to the leaders, who I know have the utmost good conscience on this subject, and are most desirous of seeing this dreadful, serious, tragic national duty performed, as I said yesterday, with the dignity that Mrs. Kennedy showed to the Nation we are capable of as a people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday, after a conference with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and a majority of that committee, we came to about the same conclusion; that is, that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is the proper instrumentality to conduct the investigation, to tie all the information together. It was also the belief that the committee should "tool" and organize for such an investigation, so that it would be thorough in every respect. I believe we can consummate that end; we shall certainly try to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the minority leader. I am sure the country will be. I hope that the one central idea that the committee will have, the one report which will speak for the whole Nation, is that which will find the most congenial echo in the hearts of every American.

I thank the minority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, many questions are connected with the assassination of last Friday which have not been answered. Too many questions remain. Those questions must, and I am sure they will, be answered before Federal Government in the person of the Executive and in the person of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate will be through with their investigations.

#### TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, recently the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Bank-

ing and Currency held out-of-town hearings in three cities on S. 750, the truth-in-lending bill.

This bill simply requires that all lenders and credit extenders fully disclose to the customer the interest rates or finance charges involved in consumer credit transactions. It would not in any way attempt to regulate or control the terms of credit but merely requires full disclosure of credit costs so that the consumer may have full information in order to make intelligent choices about using credit.

Unfortunately some powerful elements in the finance industry are opposed to this bill, and so far the opposition has been able to keep this legislation bottled up in the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee.

Earlier this summer, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the author of the truth-in-lending bill, indicated his wish that additional hearings be held on the bill in various cities throughout the country. I am delighted to say that the committee received a warm invitation to hold hearings in Pittsburgh from many local labor and public-spirited groups. Moreover, the citizens of Pittsburgh have formed a local truth-in-lending committee.

I am also pleased that so many of Pittsburgh's leading citizens and representatives of leading organizations turned out to testify in support of the bill. Among those appearing to endorse this legislation were Mayor Joseph M. Barr, Allegheny County Commissioner John E. McGrady, Ellwood C. Knapp, president of the Friendship Savings & Loan Association, Mr. William Lawry, a director of the Pennsylvania Credit Union League, Mr. Paul Normile, director, District 16 of the United Steelworkers, Mrs. Margaret L. Martin, chairman of the Women's Activities Department, Allegheny Labor Council, Mr. William J. Hart, president of the Allegheny County Labor Council, Miss Kathryn Knapp, of the Catholic Social Services, as well as representatives from the Pittsburgh Catholic Diocese, the St. Vincent DePaul Society, the Society for the Improvement of the Poor, and many others.

Indeed, there were more witnesses than the subcommittee could possibly accommodate during the 1-day hearing in Pittsburgh. I am delighted that there is such strong support for the truth-in-lending bill in the Pittsburgh area and that so many of Pittsburgh's citizens have taken such an interest in the problems caused by consumer credit abuses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very excellent article on the Pittsburgh truth-in-lending hearings, which was published in the October 1963 issue of the newspaper *Steel Labor*, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### PERSONAL EXPERIENCES AIRED AT TRUTH-IN-LENDING HEARINGS

The right to know is all that Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, is asking for in his truth-in-lending bill which will require only that all lenders and credit sellers fully disclose to the consumer the costs of

using credit in an accurate and uniform manner.

Pittsburgh, Pa., was the scene of one of four out-of-town hearings authorized by the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee of which Senator DOUGLAS is chairman. Members of the United Steelworkers of America led the list of witnesses testifying from their personal experiences on loans made from finance companies at interest rates which committee staff members quickly computed as ranging from 26 to 73 percent.

The United Steelworkers of America, guided by Director Paul Normile of district 16, spearheaded a citizens' committee to generate support for the bill by enlisting the aid of individuals and organizations. The response was tremendous from all labor unions in the area and other organizations that wanted to be heard such as credit unions, savings and loan associations, Pittsburgh Catholic diocese, St. Vincent DePaul Society, Improvement of the Poor, and city and county administration officials.

There were so many witnesses willing to testify in support of this bill that the limited time allotted to the hearing prevented them from appearing.

It was clear from the evidence submitted at the day-long hearings in the Federal Building in Pittsburgh which overflowed courtroom 6 why the reactionary and conservative members of the committee opposed Senator DOUGLAS' suggestion that the committee go into communities to get grassroots testimony on consumer credit abuses.

The subcommittee voted to authorize out-of-town hearings on the truth-in-lending bill in May. However, because of a parliamentary objection to the vote taken at that time, the full Banking and Currency Committee met on July 17 to reconsider the question of whether or not out-of-town hearings should be held on the truth-in-lending bill. On July 17, the committee reaffirmed the decision of the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee to hold out-of-town hearings on S. 750 by an 8-to-7 vote.

Two members of the committee who voted against holding out-of-town hearings were Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, and Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming, both of whom accompanied Senator DOUGLAS to Pittsburgh and indicated strong opposition to the bill.

The battle lines on this Senate bill have been drawn. Those in favor of the truth-in-lending bill include almost everybody who buys on the installment plan. The opponents of the bill include the powerful, well-financed lobbies in Washington such as small loan companies, retail merchants association, automobile dealers, particularly used car merchants, American Bankers Association, American Bar Association, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The opposition within the committee is represented by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, a well-known Salt Lake City automobile dealer and a former president of the National Association of Manufacturers. His brother, Harold H. Bennett, also a Salt Lake City businessman, is the president of the National Retail Merchants Association, an organization devoted to the defeat of the bill.

"It seems incredible that there is so much opposition to this bill," stated William J. Hart at the Pittsburgh hearing. Mr. Hart is president of the Allegheny County Labor Council, AFL-CIO, which represents approximately 160,000 union members in Allegheny County. He also serves as director of District 19, United Steelworkers of America. Continuing, he asked: "Why the objection to a law which would merely require businessmen and lenders to state in plain English exactly what they charge for their merchandise and the cost of credit? The public and our Nation need the Douglas truth-

in-lending bill and it should be enacted as soon as possible."

Joseph Martonic, a steelworker, said he borrowed \$152 which he paid back at the rate of \$11 a month for 24 months, a total of \$264, which staff workers for both Republican Senators and Senator DOUGLAS figured at 73 percent interest. "I was sucked in real good," Martonic testified.

Speaking as an official representative of the Pittsburgh Catholic Diocese, Miss Kathryn Knapp of the Catholic Social Services indicated the church's strong support of the truth-in-lending bill and urged immediate enactment for the protection of consumers.

Representing the Friendship Federal Savings & Loan Association of Pittsburgh, Mr. C. Ellwood Knapp urged passage of the bill, stating: "It is in the belief that applicants for credit might be more reasonable in assuming debt if they understood the real costs thereof and that credit, like all other commodities, should be sold at a price buyers understand."

A. William Lawry, director of the Pennsylvania Credit Union League and the Credit Union National Association, appeared as a witness and urged the committee to act favorably on the truth-in-lending bill.

The Women's Activities Department (WAD) of the Allegheny County Labor Council, AFL-CIO was represented by Mrs. Margaret L. Martin, who told the committee: "Since women today do most of the family budgeting and purchasing, any way in which we can learn to do this more economically and wisely would be welcomed. And in fact—this information is absolutely necessary because of the complex manner in which goods and services are marketed today."

"The truth-in-lending bill provides that the amount of interest charged on a time-payment contract must be stated in two ways on the face of the contract. In dollars and cents for the total time the contract runs and the simple annual rate on the outstanding balance. We hope that this bill will be brought out of committee, voted on by the Senate and enacted into law as quickly as possible," she said.

The hearings in Pittsburgh certainly demonstrated to Senator DOUGLAS, the author of the bill, that there is a vital need for legislation to require the full disclosure of the costs of consumer credit. Senator DOUGLAS said "my bill would not in any way regulate credit costs, charges, or interest rates. All we ask is that the consumer be told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the cost of credit."

"Today, consumers owe more than \$235 billion in their personal debts—approximately \$171 billion on their homes and \$64 billion in short- and intermediate-term debt. On this personal debt, consumers last year paid out approximately \$15 to \$17 billion in interest and finance charges."

DOUGLAS concluded, "we must restore consumer sovereignty in the consumer credit marketplace. Every individual has the right to know what he is paying for credit."

President Kennedy has strongly urged enactment of truth-in-lending legislation.

In his consumer protection message last spring he said: "Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public."

"Legislation should therefore be enacted requiring lenders and vendors to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amounts and rates which they will be paying for credit. Such legislation, similar in this sense to the truth-in-securities laws of 1933-34 would not control prices or charges. But it would require full disclosure to installment buyers and other prospective credit users, and thus permit consumers to make informed decisions before signing on the dotted line."

Pittsburgh Mayor Joseph M. Barr, Allegheny County Commissioner John E. Mc-

Grady, and State Senator Paul Mahady, Latrobe, Pa., urged enactment of the truth-in-lending legislation.

## FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND A NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Special Subcommittee on the Arts has recently concluded hearings on bills introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], to provide for a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation. It has been my privilege to cosponsor these bills and to serve on this subcommittee in this Congress and in the 87th Congress as well.

The chairman of this subcommittee in this Congress and the last is Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island. He has contributed determined leadership and effort to the goal of enacting legislation to provide encouragement and assistance to the arts. He deserves the thanks of all of us in this regard.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "CLAIBORNE PELL, A Profile," written by Daniel Millsaps, and published in Art Voices for October 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD. I am glad that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] has won this recognition from the arts world he serves so well.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope very much that President Johnson will take the same interest in the future of the country's cultural field that President Kennedy did, and that he will go through with the appointment of the Advisory Committee on the Arts. This action is well underway and is an essential first step in the outstanding work to which the Senator from Pennsylvania has referred, to which he and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are parties, and to which I have made my contribution during past years.

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

CLAIBORNE PELL, SENATOR FROM RHODE ISLAND, THE KEY FIGURE IN ART LEGISLATION (By Daniel Millsaps)

Forty-five-year-old CLAIBORNE PELL, who is a key figure in current art and Government legislation in the U.S. Senate, divides his time between Washington and Newport, R.I. Educated at Gibb's Preparatory School in London and at Princeton and Columbia Universities here, he served as an officer in the U.S. Coast Guard during World War II. He then had 7 years of duty with the State Department in Czechoslovakia and Italy before being elected to the Senate in 1960. His forebears include many statesmen; his father, Herbert, was for a time Ambassador to Portugal and Hungary and served in the U.S. House of Representatives from New York. His stepmother is Olive Bigelow Pell, the portrait painter.

PELL is married to former Nuala O'Donnell, a close niece of Huntington Hartford, the art patron. She adds vivacious charm to their Georgetown home in Washington where they entertain other socially prominent guests and

are surrounded by many beautiful objects of art, mostly inherited by the young Senator from his family. Their four children and two dogs make a lively household when they can all arrange to be together.

Senator PELL's interest in art began quite early and he minored in art history and appreciation at Princeton. One of his classmates there was Livingston Biddle, the author of the well known novel "Main Line." Recently PELL brought Biddle down from Philadelphia to work on his staff with part of his duties being directed at the details connected with legislation in the arts.

Last year PELL was named head of the subcommittee which heard testimony by many leaders in the art world to get their views on three bills then being considered. He conducted the hearings most efficiently and lent a sympathetic ear to all the testimony both pro and con. His subcommittee approved a combined version of the bills which was passed by the Senate but died at the end of the session without any action having been taken in the House of Representatives. This year PELL is expected to be selected to head the same group and he says he will work toward passing something out of committee which will be acceptable to the full Senate as well as having a chance of passage by the House.

PELL also has another official duty in the Senate which can affect Government and art relationships. He has been named head of the subcommittee which oversees the operation of the Smithsonian Institution. The major art collections belonging to the U.S. Government come under this Institution. The subcommittee has been in existence since 1947 but there has never been a meeting. PELL plans to have meetings soon and hopes to achieve more vitality in the programs of the Institution. He is the man to whom suggestions may be made for expansion of the collections and any other improvements thought desirable.

Senator PELL believes in bringing "art to the people," and he has some pet projects of his own in this field. At his personal expense last year he arranged for a pilot program of exhibits of reproductions of master works to be shown in his State. He worked with John Walker of the National Gallery to send framed prints of both traditional and more modern art to city halls in Rhode Island for a 10-month tour. His idea met with great success for the most part although some local politicians were somewhat bewildered. He hopes the pattern will be followed by others until more formal programs are established by the Government.

Again footing the bills for transportation, Senator PELL exhibits works of Rhode Island artists in the reception room of his suite of offices on Capitol Hill. He has a jury of private persons in that State select the works for him; his assistant in charge of the project is Isabelle Leeds of the Rhode Island office. Currently there are works by these artists on exhibition: Antonio Dottaro, Florence Lief, Waldo Kaufer, Michael Mazur, David Aldrich, and John Bozarth.

CLAIBORNE PELL is the first to show up when it is felt that his prestige is needed to boost a community art affair. In visiting him at home and in his office one feels that he is willing to do whatever is necessary to further the cause of art and artists, even though the pressures of politics and duties in other areas of interest are heavy and time consuming. It is perhaps through men like him that early President John Adams' ambition for his grandchildren may come true. Adams put aside art in his day for more imperative business, but he said: "My sons ought to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history and naval architecture, navigation, commerce and agriculture in order to give their children a right

to study painting, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry and porcelain."

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for their kind words.

#### NAMING OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER IN HONOR OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in these hours when we search our minds and hearts for some suitable commemoration for our late President, John F. Kennedy—during these days when in West Berlin a square, through which marched thousands and thousands of free German students in candlelight procession honoring his memory, is being dedicated in his memory—I fully endorse the concept that a fitting memorial for President Kennedy would be to name the National Cultural Center here in Washington the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

As we know, construction of the Center has not yet begun; yet our former President's thoughts were directed toward the ideal of its growth as a symbol of our Nation's cultural vitality.

During his administration President Kennedy and his First Lady devoted an important part of their energies and their aspirations to the development of the arts, to the enhancement of our cultural resources. Together they looked upon the arts as having a deeply significant, central meaning to our national life. Together, they gave distinction and high purpose and grace to this definition; together, they, themselves, created a new environment for artistic achievement in the United States.

Mr. President, great art speaks in a universal language. The great poet, or painter, or sculptor or musician—the fine artist, no matter what his medium of expression—goes beyond narrow limits of time and place. He uplifts us. He shows us the harmonies which our world can possess and did possess generations or even centuries ago.

He gives us a sense of continuity, of mankind's always renewing inspiration. He creates a work of abiding value. He illuminates our vision, so that we can better understand each other and better comprehend the goals we seek.

In this sense, I believe President Kennedy was a true artist—not alone in the words he used to motivate us, but in the impulses which motivated him. Therefore, Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate for our National Cultural Center—as it is contemplated, as it is planned, as it emerges to reality—to bear his name.

I am further struck by the proposed location of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center. Fortuitously, its site is close by the Lincoln Memorial, on the edge of the historic flow of the Potomac River across whose waters our late President is buried.

The Center would be more than just a stone monument. In accord with the highest ideals of our Nation, it would be a living tribute to all creative talent.

As our first President George Washington wrote in 1788:

The arts . . . are essential to the prosperity of the state and to the ornament and happiness of human life. They have a primary claim to the encouragement of every lover of his country and of mankind.

Two months ago, in an address before the United Nations, President Kennedy said:

Let us complete what we have started.

The words seem particularly applicable to this memorial. It would be a wonderful flowering of the zest and intellectual sparkle that President Kennedy gave our country during the past 3 years.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. PELL. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. PASTORE. I compliment my colleague for his magnificent statement and his very brilliant idea, and I associate myself with everything he has said.

Mr. PELL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island.

During his lifetime, President Kennedy made the White House a living center for the performing arts; and nothing could be more appropriate to the memory of this great man than to name the National Cultural Center for the Performing Arts for President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I gladly associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island. I think it is apparent and will be eternally memorable that during his relatively brief administration, President Kennedy and his brave and lovely wife, Jacqueline Kennedy, made the White House a cultural citadel to an extent that it had never been before in all its history. They refurbished and redecored the interior of the White House, with distinction and taste bringing to it examples of outstanding American painting, sculpture, ceramics, furnishings—treasures of the art and craftsmanship of our American civilization. Jack and Jacqueline used the facilities of the White House to recognize, encourage, and support the arts. They invited poets, musicians, actors, and dancers. A poet, Robert Frost, graced President Kennedy's inaugural. President Kennedy gave important recognition to the Nobel Prize winners; and to Pulitzer Prize winners. At his invitation, outstanding demonstrations by exponents of American culture and creativeness were made at the White House.

I think nothing could be more appropriate than the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island to name the proposed Capital's Cultural Center after President Kennedy, and I trust that it will be adopted. This will

not and should not be his only memorial, but surely none could be more fitting and more deserved.

### THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact—we are reminded of it again, this morning—that the Genocide Convention, pending before us now for 13 years, has not been approved. I urge the Foreign Relations Committee, which is considering three other United Nations conventions, on forced labor, slavery, and the political rights of women, to consider the one on genocide, as well, at this time. All of these have been approved by the Department of State for immediate ratification.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the editorial entitled "Genocide," which appeared in the Washington Post, November 27.

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

#### GENOCIDE

Genocide—the deliberate destruction of an ethnic group—was declared an international crime by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1950. The United States, to its great credit, was a leading influence in the drafting and adoption of the Genocide Convention. But to its enduring shame, the United States has been laggard in ratifying this convention. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate seems to have filed and forgotten it.

Genocide was defined in the General Assembly as a deliberate policy involving acts intended to destroy, in whole or in part, "a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group"; and the acts characterized as entailing genocide were specified as "killing members of the group, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members . . . deliberately inflicting . . . conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part, imposing measures to prevent births . . . forcibly transferring children . . . to another group."

One would suppose that in the United States there could be no hesitation about outlawing such practices as part of a deliberate extermination policy. But among some of the country's southern lawyer-statesmen, there developed an anxiety about the language of the convention. Could southern patterns of segregation be regarded as "causing serious . . . mental harm" to Negroes? Could the United States be haled before the World Court as a perpetrator of genocide in relation to its colored minority?

The anxiety is manifestly fantastic and reveals much more about the southern sense of guilt than about any defects in the Genocide Convention. Odious as the aspects of racial discrimination may be, they cannot be considered a pattern designed to bring about the destruction of an ethnic group. Nevertheless, southern fears have kept the Genocide Convention from coming to the Senate floor.

Instead, the administration this year is pushing, somewhat timorously and tentatively, three more modest U.N. conventions—those on forced labor, slavery, and the political rights of women. Before his death President Kennedy sent these three to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification. They are significant and desirable, of course; and American adherence to them should be speedily approved. Once they have been ratified, we hope the Senate will turn serious attention to the Genocide Convention.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today 65 nations—Venezuela as recently as 1960—have acceded to the Genocide Convention, including the Soviet Union—which ratified it in 1954—and its satellites; but conspicuous by their absence among the nations are the United Kingdom and the United States.

The United States took the lead in helping to draft this convention and was one of the first of 20 nations to sign it. Why then have we failed to ratify it and thus bring it into force?

We have come a long way from the international fears and domestic considerations which kept the convention from the Senate floor. Genocide as defined in the convention has never occurred in the United States and there is no likelihood that it ever will. Yet, action at this time by our country would have a tremendous influence on the other nations of the world. The Genocide Convention should be reconsidered now—at the session of the 88th Congress—and hearings should be reopened by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Two years of painstaking effort by the United Nations Economic and Social Council went into the drafting of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and it was unanimously approved by the General Assembly on December 9, 1948. It came into force on January 12, 1951, as between the states that had ratified it.

The convention came before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1950, and hearings were held. A subcommittee reported the convention favorably to the full committee but after discussion in executive session and in spite of the urgings of the Department of State the committee withheld its recommendation. Thus, after more than 11 years the Genocide Convention is still pending in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and without the advice and consent to ratification of the Senate, the convention cannot be made effective as to the United States.

The convention defines genocide to mean certain enumerated acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group; and this is made a crime under our own as well as international law. As long as dictatorships exist which seek to destroy their opposition, there will be groups subject to the kind of mass murder outlawed under this convention. Who can deny that as long as the conditions exist which brought about in recent years the suppression of Hungary, the conquest of Tibet, and the tribal conflicts in Africa, there is need to outlaw the shocking crime of genocide? And who has not felt a tremor of fear at the recent reports of the nature of Soviet persecution of Jews for alleged economic offenses?

Long after we are gone, the deep significance of the trial of Eichmann for the crime of joining in organizing the mass slaughter of 6 million Jews will continue to disturb the conscience of man. It has made us look again into the terrifying depths to which human

depravity can fall and the delicate balance of a humane civilization in the 20th century. What happened in Nazi Germany could happen again and the world should take concerted action to serve clear notice that it is outlawed and will not be tolerated.

We must not permit the pressures of the cold war to distract us from the memory of the horrifying acts of genocide committed by the Nazis before and throughout World War II; we must not weaken in our resolve to make genocide, in the words of the United Nations resolution of 1946:

A crime under international law which the world condemns—and for the commission of which principals and accomplices . . . are punishable.

In the 1950 hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, the Deputy Under Secretary of State concluded his appeal by saying that ratification would "demonstrate to the rest of the world that the United States is determined to maintain its moral leadership in international affairs and to participate in the development of international law on the basis of human justice." I commend these words, which he may remember as his own, to our present Secretary of State Dean Rusk. I add to them my own appeal that he call for prompt and conclusive hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There is much sound reason for ratifying the convention and time has eliminated some of the known objections. For example, the Soviet Union and its satellite states, in spite of initial objections and reservations, deposited instruments of ratification with the United Nations in 1954. This was one of the reasons presented by the Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in 1953 when he told the Senate Judiciary Committee:

The solution of the problem which is envisaged by that (genocide) treaty could better be reconsidered at a later date. I would not press at the moment for its ratification.

As long as the specter of genocide continues to haunt mankind, the United States has a basic international obligation to assume the responsibilities of this convention.

Our country has a long history of moral leadership in alleviating the plight of oppressed peoples, and many will recall the successful efforts of our leaders at the turn of the century in awakening public opinion in the United States to the persecution of Jews in Russia and Rumania. At other times we have intervened on behalf of persecuted Armenians, Greeks, Cubans, and other peoples. We have entered into conventions with other nations to prevent and punish criminal action many times in the past without endangering our sovereignty, and there is no reason to fear that by ratification of the Genocide Convention we shall be inviting foreign powers to intervene in domestic questions, as some critics have charged. If international law is to have any sanction for enforcement, it must rely upon treaties, and the convention is a treaty.

We should be taking every opportunity to champion the rule of law in the conduct of nations, and we can give fresh vitality to our peace leadership by acceding to this convention.

Hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee, followed by Senate ratification, are needed now to strike a powerful blow in the struggle for human rights and the advancement of the rule of law.

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

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

#### DESIGNATION OF ESCORT FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the part of the Senate, the leadership designates the following Democrats to constitute a committee to escort the President of the United States: The majority leader, the assistant majority leader, the secretary of the majority caucus, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who will be the senior Member of this body due to the fact that since there is no Vice President, the President pro tempore will be presiding with the Speaker of the House.

When the Senate returns to its Chamber, it will take up the continuing resolution.

#### JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the announcement made yesterday, that the Senate now proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the President pro tempore, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives, to hear the message of the President of the United States.

(The message of the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD, pp. 22838-22839.)

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Upon the conclusion of the joint meeting of the two Houses, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASINS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 628, the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, in accordance with our word and our pledge, we intend to take up a joint resolution which would continue appropriations. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who will handle the joint resolution, and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who has some observations he desires to make, are in the Chamber.

#### CONTINUATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 809.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of October 30, 1963 (Public Law 88-162), is hereby amended by striking out "November 30, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1964."*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the joint resolution would continue until December 31, 1963, appropriations for

those functions of the Government for which funds have not been enacted into law.

I regret as much as anyone the necessity for another continuing resolution during this session of the Congress. As Senators know, most of the delay on the appropriations bills has been occasioned by the lack of necessary authorization and, to date, only the foreign aid authorization bill remains to be enacted. For the record, I am submitting a listing showing the status of all appropriations bills for fiscal year 1964:

Enacted into law are the bills for the Interior, Treasury, Post Office, Executive Office, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Defense Departments, and their related agencies.

With respect to the legislative branch appropriations bill, the Senate has just rejected the conference report.

Three bills have passed both Houses of Congress, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and the Independent Offices appropriations bill and conferences on these bills are being held or will be held in the near future.

Three bills are presently in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Hearings are under way on the military construction bill, and awaiting subcommittee markup are the bills for public works and the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary.

Still remaining in the House Committee, pending finalization of the authorization bill, is the foreign aid appropriations bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In order that it may be clear in the RECORD, am I correct in my understanding that, as a result of the Senate having rejected the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill, neither the House nor the Senate will be able to use junk-mailing privileges under the continuing resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is my understanding. The Post Office Department has been consulted, and the committee has been advised that under the continuing resolutions, first enacted June 29, 1963, and extended to January 31, 1964, if House Joint Resolution 809 is adopted, no Member of the House or of the Senate is authorized to use the simplified mailing system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "January 31, 1964" and to insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1963".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Has the House of Representatives adjourned until after the first of December?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is unable to advise the Senator. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that that is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I say to my colleagues who are concerned about their vacation plans that, while I do not intend to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on my amendment, I have no intention of protracting the debate with the result that some Senators might miss their Thanksgiving dinners with their beloved families.

If during the course of my remarks it should develop, as I have been informally advised, that the House recessed or adjourned until after the first of December, I hope the Senator from Montana will cause me to be advised during the course of my speech, because if that is the case, my action will be somewhat different from what it will be if it is not the case.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the Senator that if any information comes to my attention the Senator will be promptly notified.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 258 Leg.]

Aiken	Hart	Morse
Allott	Hartke	Morton
Anderson	Hayden	Moss
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bayh	Hill	Muskie
Beall	Holland	Nelson
Bennett	Hruska	Pastore
Bible	Humphrey	Pearson
Boggs	Inouye	Pell
Brewster	Jackson	Prouty
Burdick	Javits	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Robertson
Case	Keating	Russell
Church	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Clark	Kuchel	Scott
Cooper	Lausche	Simpson
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Curtis	Long, La.	Smith
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dodd	Mansfield	Stennis
Dominick	McCarthy	Symington
Douglas	McClellan	Talmadge
Edmondson	McGee	Thurmond
Ellender	McGovern	Tower
Ervin	McIntyre	Walters
Fong	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Goldwater	Metcalfe	Yarborough
Gore	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania takes judicial notice of the fact that a quorum is not present, and asks the clerk to observe that there are only seven Senators present in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The record shows that a quorum responded.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. When it is clear to the Senator who has the floor that a quorum is not present—and I ask the Chair to take judicial notice of that fact—is it within the power of the Senator who has the floor to suggest the absence of a quorum, even though no business has been transacted since the previous quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that a second quorum call is not in order until business has been transacted.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is it the transaction of business to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it is not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it the transaction of business to ask unanimous consent to insert a matter in the RECORD?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If request is granted, it will be business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert sundry matters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for that purpose?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the introduction of a bill, without losing the floor?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota without losing my right to the floor.

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

#### PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have noted in the press and in the RECORD a number of suggestions that various activities and buildings be named after our late President, John F. Kennedy. This is fitting and proper, and I am happy to see at work a number of minds seeking to find the most appropriate memorial to President Kennedy.

I have a personal hope that the National Cultural Center might be designated as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. President and Mrs. Kennedy were uniquely instrumental in advancing the state of the arts in our country, and I feel sure that there would be widespread agreement upon the designation of the proposed cultural center in the late President's name. However, Mr. President, in deference to President Kennedy's family and to insure that only the most appropriate memorial or memorials be created for President Ken-

nedy, I would strongly urge the immediate creation of a special commission for the John F. Kennedy National Memorial and further, Mr. President, that there be no Federal activity designated as a John F. Kennedy memorial until such time as such a commission would come forth with its official recommendations and guidelines. Such a commission would be expected to consult with the family of the late President before coming to the Congress and the Executive with its recommendation. Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill calling upon the President to establish a President John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission and ask that it be appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for an additional week so that other Senators can add their names as cosponsors if they desire, and that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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.

The bill (S. 2347) to provide for the establishment of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, 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 there is hereby established a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").*

#### MEMBERSHIP

Sec. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 13 members as follows:

(1) Four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(2) Four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and

(3) Five members to be appointed by the President of the United States from among private citizens of the United States.

(b) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) The President shall designate a Chairman and a Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(d) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

#### DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete study and evaluation with respect to any plan or plans which shall have been proposed with a view toward memorializing the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. In the course of such study and evaluation, the Commission shall consult with members of the immediate family of the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in order to determine their sentiments concerning all such plans.

(b) The Commission shall submit to the Congress a preliminary report of its findings and recommendations not later than six months after the organization of the Commission for the performance of its duties. The Commission shall submit a final report

setting forth the results of its study and evaluation, together with its recommendations, not later than three years after its organization for the performance of its duties. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days after the submission of its final report.

#### COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission appointed from private life shall each receive \$75 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

#### STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for individuals.

#### EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of \$100,000.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me so that I may address a request to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has the floor. He has yielded to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield briefly to the Senator from New York without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may join with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as a cosponsor of the bill, if that is agreeable to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the Senator from New York do so.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I compliment the Senator from Minnesota. I am a member of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission, I believe the Senator's approach to this very important national task is exactly right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am honored to have the Senator join as a cosponsor of the bill.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 809) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, preparatory to a suggestion which I shall make in a moment, I believe it is highly desirable that we have a yeas-and-nays vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I therefore declare that it is my intention to suggest something in a moment, which will call for a live quorum. This will be insisted upon until a sufficient number of Senators are present to order the yeas and nays.

Therefore, with the full intention of obtaining a live quorum, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for that purpose?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, let me say to the dwindling number of Senators on the floor, whose needs for sustenance are fully understood, because I have those same needs for sustenance, that I can allay their fears. This is not a filibuster. I have a point which I, at least, believe is a valid point, with respect to the pending joint resolution. I had hoped that I would be able to debate my point before a reasonable number of my colleagues in the Senate. I may be talking long enough to permit most of my colleagues to finish their lunch, in the hope that some of them, at least, will return to the Chamber.

Let no Senator be unduly concerned. I shall not keep the Senate in session this afternoon long enough to interfere with the plans of any Senator to get away at a reasonable time this afternoon.

Having, as I am sure many of my colleagues do not know, operated a dude ranch in Wyoming for 8 or 9 years during the decade of the twenties, and in that endeavor having become acquainted, at least to some extent, with the habits of the horse, and having learned that it is a wise dude rancher who does not come too close to the heels of a cranky horse, I have observed that Senators—I say this with all deference to my beloved colleagues—have a number of characteristics in common with the horse. As I say this, I would like it

well understood that I consider the horse to be a noble animal.

I have great affection and admiration for the horse, just as I have great affection and admiration for my 99 colleagues. I hope that to some extent they reciprocate in their affection, if not in their admiration, for me.

But I found, during the period when I was operating the dude ranch in Wyoming, that there was much truth in the old fable, the old saw, that "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink." It has been my experience that a U.S. Senator can be led to a live quorum, but he cannot be made to sit and listen to one of his colleagues talk. This is particularly true when the Senator, unlike the horse who will not drink, is not only hungry, but is thirsty, as well. Therefore, I have no sense of affront because a number of my colleagues, having, no doubt, charming luncheon companions, and being also, I have no doubt, hungry—because I am hungry, too—think it more desirable to finish their midday meal rather than to come to the floor of the Senate and hear the senior Senator from Pennsylvania deliver another little comment about the Senate establishment.

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

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

Mr. HART. I have asked the Senator to yield for a question. Would the Senator from Pennsylvania be willing to let me leave the floor, notwithstanding what he has said, in order that I may consult the dictionary which is in the reading room, to obtain a definition of "act" and "action now"? I thought I understood the definition until a recent conversation as we came back from the House Chamber, after listening to the President urge us to act now. I would be more comfortable if I could find the dictionary definition.

Mr. CLARK. I thoroughly sympathize with the mission that the Senator from Michigan intends to perform. I not only give my approval; I give my enthusiastic approbation to have him consult the dictionary; and when he finds the definition, I hope he will bring it into the Chamber. After all, the word "act" is a fairly basic word; it has only three letters in it—a-c-t. "Action" has only two syllables—ac-tion. I thought I knew what the word "act" meant, and I thought I knew what the word "action" meant, even before the President called those words so forcefully to our attention only a few minutes ago in the other Chamber.

So I encourage the Senator from Michigan to consult the dictionary.

I observe that one of our assiduous and able pages, always interested in the welfare and comfort of the Members of the Senate, has already carried that heavy volume into the Chamber, where I hope the Senator from Michigan can consult it, and that my words, spoken so close to his right ear, will not detract him from his pursuit of the intellectual enterprise to which he has dedicated himself.

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

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

Mr. McGEE. I suggest that the dictionary will indicate that "to act," "to act now," and "to act speedily" do not take into account recesses for Thanksgiving and Christmas; that they mean getting down to work.

I can think of no more appropriate single move than an expression of willingness by Senators to make themselves available, to express a willingness to forgo holiday recesses if the President and the leadership think it is necessary, and to devote ourselves to the tasks ahead.

The President outlined a formidable list of tasks for our consideration. He said that the time to begin on them is now. I do not understand the reasoning of those who say we must wait until January. We would lose momentum; we would experience a time lag between now and then. Instead of standing still, we ought to be moving forward now.

I can think of no finer response to the new President, I can think of no more rewarding endorsement of the principles of John Kennedy, than to devote ourselves promptly to the tasks ahead.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his interjection. I find myself in complete accord with what he has said. The Senator from Wyoming is a hard taskmaster. I have no doubt he represents, to some extent, the same Puritan ethic in which I was brought up.

I see my dear friend, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], looking at me anxiously. I will keep my commitment to him.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. This is merely a rejoinder to what has already been said by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who is not willing to stay here and do his work. The subject of vacations was discussed some time ago. However, in the meantime, the country has experienced a terrible, tragic incident. In view of what President Lyndon Johnson said today, I believe the whole subject should be reappraised. Most of us would be willing to forgo our holidays and do the work that must be done for the betterment of mankind and for the good of our country. I do not understand why anyone is quarreling about that today. It would be unfortunate to leave the impression that this great body, which is dedicated to the welfare of the country and its people, is more anxious to go home for a holiday than it is to stay here and do its work. I do not believe anyone has said that; I do not believe anyone intends to do that.

All I said this afternoon was that this is an important matter. We all know what it means. I do not think it is necessary to talk about it endlessly.

All I said was that it is not hard to explain to the intelligence of this august

body the difference between December 31 and January 31. It is a difference of a month. The only situation that confronts the Senate now is that if the Senate amends the joint resolution, it will have to go back to the House. The joint resolution that is now in effect will expire November 30. Therefore, there would be a hiatus. If that had not been the case, I would go along with the idea that the date should be December 31. If it were then necessary further to extend the time for a week or so, that could easily be done.

I should like to say a word in fairness to the Committee on Appropriations. I do not know how many Senators now in the Chamber are familiar with the work of that committee. It is the only committee of the Senate that is authorized under a continuing unanimous-consent agreement to meet while the Senate is in session. All other committees must have particular, specific consent to do so.

Mr. CLARK. That is not true. Yesterday on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] objected to allowing the Committee on Finance to meet this morning.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely say that the Committee on Appropriations has a continuing unanimous-consent agreement to meet when the Senate is in session. I am speaking only about the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CLARK. That is true.

Mr. PASTORE. That is true.

What does that mean? It means that we work day in and day out. I do not say this in deprecation of anyone else. Every Member of the Senate works. But the assignment to the Committee on Appropriations is a difficult one. We sit for hours, as I am certain the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] will attest. Sometimes the hearings are monotonous. We try to accommodate witnesses as much as we can.

The committee has done its work this year. The only bill we are now awaiting is the foreign aid appropriations bill. I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will bear out my statement that the only big appropriation bill we are waiting for is the foreign aid appropriations bill. It has not yet come from the House. The minute it comes to the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations will work on it as assiduously as it has done with respect to the other appropriation bills. We will do our work.

I am for what the Senator from Philadelphia is for.

Mr. CLARK. Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He is the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PASTORE. Pennsylvania; excuse me. The Senator was formerly mayor of Philadelphia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. He is now the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PASTORE. No offense whatsoever was meant.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And none was taken.

Mr. PASTORE. All I am saying is that all of us want quick action on the civil rights bill, and all of us want quick action on the tax cut bill. I hope the committees will process the bills and

place them in our hands as soon as possible.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I wish to make a brief statement to the Senator from Rhode Island. I believe he quite inadvertently made a mistake in point of fact when he said there would be no opportunity to pass a continuing joint resolution, with my amendment in it, without allowing a hiatus to take place.

I have just been advised that the House of Representatives is in recess until noon on Friday, November 29. Friday, November 29, is 2 days before the hiatus would occur. The House of Representatives customarily—and I hope that when I say this, I am within the limitation of the rule—in effect puts a pistol at the head of the Senate and says to the Senate, "Take this bill as we have passed it or leave it. We are going home."

For once in our lives we should say to the House of Representatives—and should go on record to this effect—that we want these appropriation bills passed by the end of this year, not by January 31 of next year; and that we have so amended the resolution, and that the House could consider it on Friday.

Mr. PASTORE. Those at the other end of the Capitol Building could not care less.

I subscribe to some of the things the Senator from Pennsylvania has said; but he knows very well that the House would not act upon a measure of that sort. In the second place, what would we be holding up? The foreign aid bill? Most of them would hope we would do something that would give them an excuse not to report such a bill.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my friend, in all good humor, that I do not share his low opinion of the other body.

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, my goodness gracious. Only a moment ago the Senator from Pennsylvania said the House customarily puts a gun at the temple of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Rhode Island said they could not care less about the public welfare.

Mr. PASTORE. Some would care less about passing a foreign aid appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK. But we put up our hands and say, "Yes, Mr. House, take our money, and we will take your bill. But just spare our life."

I suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island that this is a good time to say to the House that we want to do what the President called for a few minutes ago when he spoke at the other end of the Capitol Building; we want action taken now.

At this time I yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who, I believe, has concluded his research in the dictionary.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield first to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. The House scheduled this joint resolution last Monday; and but for the death of the President, the

Senate would have acted on it last Monday. If the resolution were amended, there could not be a conference before next week.

Mr. CLARK. Why not on Friday?

Mr. HAYDEN. Sunday is December 1, and the bill necessarily should become law before the 1st of December, because we must remember that this is the bill which provides also for our payroll. The Senator from Pennsylvania may have vast wealth and may not need his pay, but I need mine. However, if the joint resolution is not passed in the way recommended we shall all be in the same boat.

Mr. CLARK. Why could not there be a conference this Friday?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because I understand many of the House Members will not be in the city.

Mr. CLARK. The House will be in session on Friday. Why do not its Members come back?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know; I have no control over the Members of the House. All I know is that they will not be here then.

Mr. HART. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the dictionary which the staff kindly brought to me provides many definitions of the several words which were so strongly emphasized a few minutes ago by the President of the United States. I assume that, in fairness, we should request that the full definitions of the words "act," "now," and "action" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my brief remarks. I so request, Mr. President.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have made excerpts from these definitions. The full definitions will be found in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I find that the first of a series of definitions of the adverb "now" is:

At the present time; at this moment; at the time of speaking—

which, by the clock, was less than 1 hour ago, in the case of the speech by the President of the United States.

I read further from the definition—

as, he is busy now.

There is a second definition, which I take it is by way of illustration:

In the time immediately to follow; forthwith. \* \* \* At the time immediately before the present.

Then appears what I believe is an extreme definition, and one with which we could not possibly comply:

a moment ago.

Then there is a reference to a passage from Isaiah, I believe, as a further example:

Come now, and let us reason together.

One who reads Isaiah would not think the suggestion "Come now" meant that a month or so later we should reason together.

Let me explain that I advance these definitions, not so much in the nature of

participation in the debate on the pending motion and amendment, but rather, in order that early this afternoon we have before us definitions which will give meaning and understanding to the basic theme of the message of the President. That message, as I read it, urges us to recognize that the time is now; that this body should remain and should consider and act on specific enumerated legislation. It relates to more than this appropriation joint resolution; and if the mechanics of appropriation action would be too difficult, then let us now reason together with respect to the litany of problems which the President of the United States recited to all of us less than 1 hour ago.

None of the problems he cited is new. None of us is so startled by the suggestion as to be caused to go home and get out the books and study them. President Lyndon Johnson has today told us what President John F. Kennedy urged us to do many months ago, but which we, until this moment, have only talked about and studied. I suggest that as we read these definitions, and then reread, as I know we must, the message of the President, we accept as a fact that when the President of the United States said:

Our most immediate tasks are here on this Hill—

And then listed the civil rights bill—and there is no obscurity as to the bill he was talking about—and then said:

The civil rights bill for which he—

The late President Kennedy—fought.

I believe it is time that we understand, as he understood, the dictionary meanings of the words "now" and "act" and "action"; and I point out that it is time to act now on the tax bill, and it is time for our action to be taken on the other measures that yet remain, here at the end of November, from the list which President John F. Kennedy sent to us many months ago.

I do hope that the message of the President will be interpreted to mean what the dictionary says its terms mean. It does not mean tossing a coin on three or four appropriation bills, going home, and returning in January. I could not find the eloquence to suggest, as did the President, that the proposal happens to be one way that we can show that while they can kill a man with a bullet, they cannot destroy the things he stood for.

#### EXHIBIT 1

Act (äkt), n. [F. and L.; F. "acte," fr. L. "actus" a doing, and "actum" a thing done, fr. "agere" to drive, do. See Agent.]

1. That which is done or doing; the exercise of power, or the effect whose cause is power exerted; a performance; a deed.

His little, nameless, unremembered "acts" Of kindness and of love. —Wordsworth.

Jurisprudence is concerned only with outward "acts." An "act" may therefore be defined \* \* \* as "a determination of will, producing an effect in the sensible world." The effect may be negative, in which case the "act" is properly described as a "forbearance." The essential elements of such an "act" are three, viz., an exertion of the will, an accompanying state of consciousness, a manifestation of the will. —T. E. Holland.

2. The result of public deliberation; the decision or determination of a legislative body, council, court of justice, etc.; a decree, edict, law, judgment, resolve, award; as, an "act" of Parliament, or of Congress. Properly a legislative "act" is the complete formally declared will of the legislature, the final step in which is usually the signature of the proper executive officer; and it is properly to be distinguished from a "bill," which is strictly the draft of a proposed act, and is properly so called prior to its final enactment as law. "Act" and "statute" are generally used synonymously, and "bill" and "law" are also often used in the same sense, "law," however, being a term of much wider application, and therefore inexact in this use. Under the common law an act took effect by relation as of the first day of the session at which it was enacted, but by statute it is now provided in England (by 33 Geo. III, c. 13, 1793), and generally in the United States, that except when otherwise provided a statute shall take effect only as of the date of the actual completion of its enactment. Acts are broadly divided into "general," or "public," and "special," or "private." See under Public and Private.

3. A formal writing stating or evidencing that something has been done; as, an "act" of sale. Cf. Instrument, n., 5.

4. Process of doing; action. "In act," in the very doing; on the point of (doing). "In act" to shoot. —Dryden.

This woman was taken \* \* \* in the very "act." —John viii: 4.

5. [cap.] pl. (a) Short for "Acts of the Apostles;"—used syntactically as a singular, usually with "The." See NEW TESTAMENT. (b) The Apocryphal Acts. See APOCRYPHA.

6. Originally, a performance of part of a play; now, specif., one of the principal divisions of a play or dramatic work in which a definite part of the action is completed; hence, one of the parts, each complete in itself, of a vaudeville or circus program, or the like.

7. [cap.] Formerly, in Oxford and Cambridge Universities, but now only at the latter, a thesis publicly maintained by candidates for certain degrees.

8. Metaph. A state of reality or real existence as opposed to a possibility or possible existence. See ACTUS, 2; ENTELECHY.

The seeds of plants are not at first in "act," but in possibility, what they afterward grow to be. —Hooker.

9. Psychol. (a) Any motor performance leading to a definite result. (b) Any dealing with objects, as by moving, perceiving, or desiring them.

10. [usually cap.] R.C.Ch. A short prayer of profession, as of love for God or sorrow for sins. The best known are the "Acts of Faith, of Hope, of Charity," and "of Contrition."

Syn.—See ACTION. Ant.—See NEGLIGENCE.

Act (äkt), v. [L. "actus," past part. of "agere" to drive, lead, do; but influenced by E. "act," n.] "Transitive:" 1. To perform; execute; do; as, to "act" one's will by force; to "act" the commands of another. "Archaic."

2. To move to action; to actuate; animate. "Obs."

Self-love, the spring of motion, "acts" the soul. —Pope.

3. To perform as an actor; as "acting" the rôle of Ophelia; to represent dramatically, esp. on the stage.

4. Hence: (a) To play the part of, as if in a play; to assume the office or character of; to personate; as, to "act" the hero or the child. (b) To behave as befits (a specified status); as, to "act" one's age.

5. To feign or counterfeit; to simulate. With "acted" fear the villain thus pursued. —Dryden.

—, Intransitive: 1. To perform on the stage; to represent a character; as, the dramatist "acted" in his own play.

2. Hence, to simulate or dissimulate; to behave as if acting a part.

3. (a) To conduct oneself or behave, as in morals, private life, or public offices; to bear or comport oneself; as, to "act" with becoming modesty; to "act" handsomely (that is, generously);—often used in colloquial comparisons to express disparagement; as, to "act" like one possessed. (b) Specif., with adjective complement, to comport oneself as if possessing certain characteristics or qualities, or being in a certain state or condition; as, to "act" rich, wise, or intoxicated.

4. (a) To perform actions; to put forth energy; to move, as opposed to remaining at rest; to carry into effect a determination of the will; as, ready to "act" at a moment's notice. (b) To perform or fulfill functions; as, the emergency brake failed to "act." Cf. WORK, v.

5. To exert power; to produce an effect;—followed by "on" or "upon;" as, the stomach "acts" on food.

6. Of plays, to admit of being performed or acted; as, this play "acts" as well as it reads. Syn.—Perform, represent, play, impersonate; pretend; function, work.

Act'ion (ăk'shūn), n. [OF., fr. L. "actio," fr. "agere" to do. See ACT.] 1. The act or process of acting or doing; the doing of something; the exercise of activity by an agent; distinguished from "passion;" as, an emergency requiring "action."

2. The effecting of an alteration by means of force or some natural power or virtue; as, the "action" of water on rocks.

3. Process of change or alteration considered as a natural condition; activity; as, intervals of "action" and repose.

4. The progressive alteration of mental states, or of mental and physical states coordinately; as, volitional "action;" automatic "action;" specif., bodily movement; behavior.

5. An act; thing done; deed; enterprise; also, enterprise or efficiency in a generic sense; as, a man of "action." In pl.: Habitual deeds; hence, conduct; behavior; demeanor.

6. The deportment of an actor or speaker, or his expression by means of attitude, voice, gestures, and countenance.

Suit the "action" to the word, the word to the "action." —Shak.

7. The event or series of events, either real or imaginary, forming the subject of a play, poem, or other composition; hence, the unfolding of the events of a drama.

8. The acting of a play; hence, a play. Obs.

9. Transactions, proceedings, or records, as of a court. Obs.

10. Com. A share of stock, as in a joint-stock company; hence, pl., stocks; as, the "actions" of the East India Company. "A Gallicism." Obs.

11. Eccl. A religious ceremony; specif. [cap.]: Obs. exc. Hist. (a) The Canon (of the Mass). (b) After the Reformation, the Communion service; the Lord's Supper.

12. Law. A legal proceeding by which one demands or enforces one's right in a court of justice; a judicial proceeding for the enforcement or protection of a right, the redress or prevention of a wrong, or the punishment of a public offense;—usually disting. from "special proceeding." Also, the right to bring or maintain such a proceeding. See SUIT.

13. Mech. A mechanism; as, the breech "action" of a gun. Specif., the mechanism in an organ, piano, or similar instrument by means of which the impulse of the player's finger is transmitted to the strings, reeds, pipes, etc. See PIANO, ORGAN.

14. Mil. & Nav. Combat in war; also, an engagement between troops in war, whether on land or water; a battle.

15. Paint. & Sculpt. Attitude, or position, esp. of the human figure or any of its parts, as suggestive of movement or as expressive of the sentiment or passion depicted.

16. Physics. The integral,  $\int (p, dq_1 + \dots p, dq_n)$ , of a sum of terms each of which is the generalized momentum corresponding to any position co-ordinate multiplied by the differential of the co-ordinate, the  $q$ 's being the position co-ordinates and the  $p$ 's the corresponding generalized momenta. In the motion of a particle this reduces to  $\int m v ds$ , in which  $m$  is its mass,  $v$  its velocity, and  $ds$  an element of its path. Action has the dimensions of energy multiplied by time. For a natural dynamical system, the action between two configurations of the system is twice the time integral of the kinetic energy of the system.

PHRASES (esp. in sense 13) are: action bushier, action filer, action finisher, action forger, action freer, action jointer, action machiner, action regulator, action viewer.

Syn.—ACTION, ACT, DEED. "Action" refers primarily to the process of acting; "act" and "deed," to the result, the thing done. An "action" is usually regarded as occupying some time, and involving more than one step; an "act" is more frequently thought of as momentary or instantaneous, and as individual; as, the rescue of a shipwrecked crew is a heroic "action;" the launching of the lifeboat a brave "act;" a course of "action," the springs of "action," an "act" of vengeance, caught in the "act." But the distinction cannot always be made. In the plural, "action" has frequently an ethical connotation, and is loosely synonymous with "conduct;" as, "by him [the Lord] 'actions' are weighed" (1 Sam. ii. 3); "Only the 'actions' of the just smell sweet, and blossom in their dust" (Shirley). "Deed" refers to a thing as "done;" it frequently connotes an act as illustrious or as an achievement; as, "The 'deed' is worthy doing" (Shak.). "What are my 'deeds' forgot?" (Shak.). DEED is frequently opposed to "word," as "act" to "thought;" as, "I'll endeavor 'deeds' to match these 'words'" (Shak.); "Be great in 'act,' as you have been in 'thought'" (Shak.). See BATTLE; cf. FEAT.

Give thy thoughts no tongue, Nor any unproportion'd thought his "act." —Shak.

The attempt and not the "deed" confounds us. —Shak.

Then boast no more your mighty "deeds." —Shirley.

Ant.—Inactivity, rest, inaction; speech, statement, talk.

Now (nou), adv. [ME. "nou, nu," fr. AS. "nū;" akin to D., OS., & OHG. "nu," G. "nu, nun," ON. "nū," Dan., Sw., & Goth. "nu," L. "nunc," Gr. "ny, nyn," Lith. "nu," Skr. "nu, nū." See NEW.]

1. At the present time; at this moment; at the time of speaking; as, he is busy "now;" also, in or under the present circumstances; as, what alternative "now?"

2. Hence: (a) In the time immediately to follow; forthwith; as, I shall write "now." (b) At the time immediately before the present; very lately; a moment ago; as, he was here but "now;"—in modern use chiefly in the phrase "just now." (c) At the time spoken of or referred to;—indicating the historical present, as, peace "now" ensued.

3. With the sense of present time weakened or lost, indicating a point in the thought to which there has been a sequence or simply marking transition of thought.

Come "now," and let us reason together. —Is. i. 18.

Then cried they all again, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas. "Now," Barabbas was a robber. —John xviii. 40.

COMBINATIONS are: now-accumulated, now-being (noun), now-big, now-borne, now-dead, now-existing (adjective), now-fallen, now-full, now-known, now-lost, now-neglected, now-waning (adjective).

Now (nou), conj. Since, at, or by, this time; seeing that;—often with "that;" as, "now" that the snow was melting.

Why should he live, "now" nature bankrupt is? —Shak.

Now, n. The present time or moment; the present; also, a present moment or point of time; as, from or ere "now."

Now, adj. Existing at, or pertaining to, the present time.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida, provided that in doing so I will not lose my right to the floor.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I wish to say two things.

First, the learned Senator from Michigan has quoted part of the President's message. He has left out an important part of it, which reads as follows:

I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch.

I am glad that the President has that belief. I am sorry that some of our brethren in the Senate do not share that belief.

If Senators will look at the catalog of appropriation bills on the back page of the calendar of business for today, they will see, among many other items, that the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, which passed this body on September 30, remained on the desk of the Speaker of the House and did not go to conference until November 14—more than 6 weeks afterward.

I wish the RECORD to show that since that time we have been struggling almost daily in conference. There were 47 differences, many of them major differences, between the two Houses. I happen to be chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate. Our committee has held five meetings. There will be another one at 2:30 p.m. today. If the distinguished Senators, neither of whom has ever served in the Appropriations Committee, do not know that this long give-and-take in conference between the two bodies is a worrying, soul-searching sort of business, as indicated by the Senator from Rhode Island but a few minutes ago—

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to resume the floor for a moment so that I may reply to that statement? Then I shall be happy to yield again to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to do so.

Mr. CLARK. I wish the Senator from Florida to know that I, too, have been engaged in some pretty wearisome conferences with the House. I do not believe the Appropriations Committee has a monopoly on having trouble with House conferees. The Banking and Currency Committee, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, on which I have served for 7 years have had pretty rough times with the House, too. I do not believe any Member of this body is really very much in order when he says he has had a harder time in conferences with the House than has anyone else.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield again?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator from Pennsylvania is beginning to recognize that there is some independence in the Senate, that we do have to stand up in conference and fight for what we have enacted, and that the process takes a long time. We are opposed by skillful and dedicated men who have belief in what they have done, as we do.

I come back to the words of the President that he believes in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. We are not rubberstamps. I believe in the independence and the integrity of the legislative branch. I am trying to carry out my duty in conference, and I know perfectly well that unless the Senator expects the conferees on the part of the Senate to yield on every point to the other body, there is no prospect for having the remaining seven or eight appropriation bills reported overnight. It is a long, wearying, and difficult task. We are trying to perform it. We are being hindered in it by all this child's play in the Senate in which the good faith of the Senate is being attacked.

I shall not permit it to be attacked in my presence any more.

I have listened to the Senator from Pennsylvania hour after hour in this session. Apparently he wishes to tear down the temple in which he lives. I do not share that feeling.

Mr. CLARK. I call the attention of my friend to rule XIX, section 2, and ask him to be careful.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know the meaning of rule XIX very well. I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I share the feelings of the President, who, having served here, has the deep conviction that this body—and Congress as a whole—must be independent, must have integrity, and must stand for what it believes in.

Unless we do, we are not worthy of being here.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I now yield, first to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and then to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I shall re-read carefully my comments to discover if there is any passage that I should like to strike out. If there is any suggestion that I seek to tear this temple down, I shall correct it.

It occurs to me that if any tearing down should occur, it will be by reason of our failure to act.

Perhaps, in fairness to all, at this point in the RECORD there should be inserted in full the President's message. Following the passage relating to the independence of the legislative and executive branches, the President said:

With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, vigorously and speedily when the need arises.

The need is here. The need is now.

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

this point the address of President Johnson to the two Houses of Congress today at 12:30 p.m.

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

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS, NOVEMBER 27, 1963

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the House and Senate, my fellow Americans, all I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today.

The greatest leader of our time has been struck down by the foulest deed of our time. Today John Fitzgerald Kennedy lives on in the immortal words and works he left behind. He lives on in the mind and memories of mankind. He lives on in the hearts of his countrymen.

No words are sad enough to express our sense of loss. No words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America that he began.

The dream of conquering the vastness of space—the dream of partnership across the Atlantic and across the Pacific as well; the dream of a Peace Corps in less developed lands; the dream of education for our youth; the dream of jobs for all who seek them; the dream of care for our elderly; the dream of an all-out attack on mental illness—and above all, the dream of equal rights for all Americans, whatever their race or color—these and other American dreams have been vitalized by his drive and dedication.

Now the ideas and ideals which he so nobly represented must and will be translated into effective action.

Under John Kennedy's leadership, this Nation has demonstrated that it has the courage to seek peace, and the fortitude to risk war. We have proved that we are a good and reliable friend to those who seek peace and freedom. We have shown that we can also be a formidable foe to those who reject the path of peace and who seek to impose upon us or our allies the yoke of tyranny.

This Nation will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin. We will be unceasing in the search for peace; resourceful in our pursuit of areas of agreement even with those with whom we differ; and generous and loyal to those who join with us in common cause.

In this age where there can be no losers in peace and no victors in war—we must recognize the obligation to match national strength with national restraint—we must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power—we must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest. This is the path that we shall continue to pursue. Those who test our courage will find it strong and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength—and the just can be strong in the defense of justice.

We will carry on the fight against poverty and misery, ignorance, and disease—in other lands and in our own.

We will serve all of the Nation, not one section or one sector, or one group, but all Americans. These are the United States—a united people with unity of purpose.

Our American unity does not depend upon unanimity. We have differences; but now, as in the past, we can derive from those differences strength, not weakness; wisdom, not despair. Both as a people and as a government we can unite upon a program which is wise, just, and constructive.

For 32 years, Capitol Hill has been my home. I have shared many moments of pride with you—pride in the ability of the Congress of the United States to act; to meet any crisis; to distill from our differences strong programs of national action.

An assassin's bullet has thrust upon me the awesome burden of the Presidency. I am here today to say that I need your help; I cannot bear this burden alone. I need the help of all Americans. This Nation has experienced a profound shock and in this critical moment it is our duty—yours and mine—as the Government of the United States—to do away with uncertainty and to show that we are capable of decisive action—that from the brutal loss of our leader we will derive not weakness but strength—that we can and will act and act now.

From the Chamber of representative government let all the world know, and none misunderstand, that I rededicate this Government to the unswerving support of the United Nations—to the honorable and determined execution of our commitments to our allies—to the maintenance of military strength second to none—to the defense of the strength and stability of the dollar—to the expansion of our foreign trade—to the reinforcement of our programs of mutual assistance and cooperation in Asia and Africa—and to our Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere.

On the 20th of January, in 1961, John F. Kennedy told his countrymen that our national work would not be finished “in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But,” he said, “let us begin.”

Today in this moment of new resolve, I would say to my fellow Americans, let us continue.

This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny history has set for us. Our most immediate tasks are here on this Hill.

First, no memorial oration or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought. We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. Yes, it is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in books of law.

I urge you again, as I did in 1957, and again in 1960, to enact a civil rights law so that we can move forward to eliminate from this Nation every trace of discrimination and oppression based upon race

or color. There could be no greater source of strength to this Nation both at home and abroad.

And second, no act of ours could more fittingly continue the work of President Kennedy than the earliest passage of the tax bill for which he fought—a bill designed to increase our national income, our Federal revenues, and our insurance against recession. That bill, if passed without delay, means more security for those now working and more jobs for those now without them.

In short, this is no time for delay. It is a time for action—strong, forward-looking action on the pending education bills to help bring the light of learning to every home and hamlet in America—strong, forward-looking action on youth employment opportunities, strong forward-looking action on the pending foreign aid bill, making clear that we are not forfeiting our responsibilities to this hemisphere or to the world, nor erasing executive flexibility in the conduct of foreign affairs—and strong, forward-looking action on the remaining appropriation bills.

In this new spirit of action the Congress can expect the full cooperation and support of the executive branch. And in particular I pledge that the expenditures of the Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. I will insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. The Government will set an example of prudence and economy. This does not mean we will not meet our unfilled needs or that we will not honor our commitments. We will do both.

As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones. With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize

our Nation, to act—to act wisely, vigorously, and speedily when the need arises.

The need is here. The need is now. I ask your help.

I know we meet in grief; but let us also meet in renewed dedication and renewed vigor. Let us meet in action, in tolerance, and mutual understanding.

John Kennedy's death commands what his life conveyed—that America must move forward. The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and respect one another. Let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream.

I profoundly hope that the tragedy and torment of these terrible days will bind us together in new fellowship, making us one people in our sorrow. Let us here highly resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain. And on this Thanksgiving eve, as we gather together to ask the Lord's blessing, let us unite in those familiar and cherished words:

America, America,  
God shed His grace on thee,  
And crown thy good  
With brotherhood  
From sea to shining sea.

Mr. HART. In my book, the action President Johnson says is needed now does not relate to our closing down and going home until January. It is to this point that I principally address myself. When we define "integrity"—the integrity of this body which the distinguished Senator from Florida mentioned—in my book that term suggests an obligation on our part not to lock up and go home until January. I feel this would dismay the Nation and harm the Congress.

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

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois, but before doing so I wish to express my strong conviction that it is a little out of order for Members of this body to suggest that those of us who would like to act when a majority is ready for action are tearing down the pillars of this body. I, for one, have no such intention. I do not believe that is what we are doing. I believe that what we are trying to do is to resuscitate this body and make it, once again, the fine adornment of American government which once it was, before we fell into these evil ways.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois. Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania provides that, instead of giving added time until the 31st of January to pass specific appropriation bills, for the current fiscal year which is now almost half over the time, be extended only to the 31st of December?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. That is the purport of my amendment which is now before the Senate and on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. The Senator from Florida properly called attention to the last page of the current calendar. I wish to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to look at that page. Perhaps the rest of us may do similarly.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in order that this colloquy may be well understood when read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the last page on the calendar of business of the Senate for Wednesday, November 27, which is page 16, and is entitled "Status of Appropriation Bills, 1st session, 88th Congress," may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Status of appropriation bills, 1st sess., 88th Cong.

No. of bill	Short title	Passed House	Received and referred in Senate	Reported in Senate	Passed Senate	Sent to conference	Conference report agreed to in—		Date approved	No. of law
							Senate	House		
H.J. Res. 284	Agriculture supplemental, 1963.	1963	1963	1963	1963	1963	1963	1963	1963	
H.R. 5279	Interior, 1964.	Feb. 27	Feb. 28	Feb. 28	Mar. 4	X X X	X X X	X X X	Mar. 6	88-1
H.R. 5366	Treasury, Post Office, 1964.	Apr. 2	Apr. 3	May 22	May 28	July 10	July 18	July 17	July 26	88-79
H.R. 5517	Supplemental, 1963.	Apr. 4	Apr. 8	May 3	May 8	May 15	June 4	June 4	June 13	88-39
H.R. 5888	Labor, H.E.W., 1964.	Apr. 10	Apr. 11	Apr. 24	May 1	May 3	May 15	May 14	May 17	88-25
H.R. 6754	Agriculture, 1964.	Apr. 30	May 1	Aug. 1	Aug. 7	Sept. 23	Sept. 26	Sept. 26	Oct. 11	88-136
H.R. 6868	Legislative, 1964.	June 6	June 10	Sept. 12	Sept. 30	Nov. 14				
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, 1964.	June 11	June 13	June 25	June 26	Nov. 8		Nov. 13		
H.J. Res. 508	Continuing, 1964.	June 18	June 19	June 25	June 25					
H.R. 7179	Defense, 1964.	June 25	June 25	June 25	June 25	X X X	X X X	X X X	June 29	88-55
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia, 1964.	June 26	June 27	Sept. 17	Sept. 24	Sept. 26	Oct. 8	Oct. 8	Oct. 17	88-149
H.J. Res. 667	Continuing, 1964.	July 11	July 15	Nov. 6	Nov. 18	Nov. 26	X X X	X X X	Aug. 28	88-109
H.R. 8747	Independent offices, 1964.	Aug. 27	Aug. 27	Aug. 27	Aug. 27	X X X	X X X	X X X	Oct. 30	88-162
H.J. Res. 782	Continuing, 1964.	Oct. 10	Oct. 11	Nov. 13	Nov. 20					
H.R. 9139	Military construction, 1964.	Oct. 28	Oct. 28	X X X	Oct. 28					
H.R. 9140	Civil functions, 1964.	Nov. 18	Nov. 19							
H.J. Res. 809	Continuing, 1964.	Nov. 19	Nov. 20							
		Nov. 26	Nov. 26							

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to follow me as I read. As of today, the 27th of November, only four major appropriation bills have been passed; namely, Interior; Treasury, Post Office; Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare; and Defense—is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. He has omitted a supplemental bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are two supplemental bills—the Agricultural supplemental, 1963, and the supplemental, 1963. There are four continuing appropriation resolutions, but I am referring to the basic bills.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the agricultural bill was in conference as of November 14?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. My understanding is that the senior from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], is the

chairman of the Senate conferees. Is that correct?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the Chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Many fine Senators serve on that conference committee on the part of the Senate, including the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

There has been no neglect of duty of any sort by any member of that conference. We are straining every nerve we can to come to a reasonable agreement with conferees from the other body, and to bring to the Senate a bill in final form.

I repeat that there are 47 substantial differences between the 2 bodies. I add that we are working now on the last four or five of those differences.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that the bill went to conference on the 14th of November. I ask my friend from Florida how many times the conferees have met.

Mr. HOLLAND. The conferees have met five times in conference with the other body; and we have had a long conference among ourselves to try to determine a policy on these last and most substantial matters.

It is no child's play to handle in conference a bill which carries with it some \$7 to \$8 billion, as to which there are 47 differences.

I see in the Chamber the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is confronted with a similar duty, except that the bill with which he must deal is about twice as big—as I remember, involving some \$13 to \$14 billion, affecting the independent offices of the Government.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is not possible, if Senators try to do their duty and if the members of the conference committee from the other body try to do their duty—and I assure Senators they do—to compose all the differences relating to such huge sums of money in a day, or oftentimes within less than weeks. We are doing the very best we can, within our power, to move as rapidly as we can.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his comment. I am sure that everything he says is 100-percent correct. I should like to note, however, that in my opinion none of the activity of a Senator of the United States is child's play, and I hope the Senator from Florida did not mean to imply any part of it was.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida was talking about the particular duties he is performing.

I have seen some things happen, on the part of certain Senators, which I thought might be so characterized, but I am not talking about them now. I am talking about the work of the Appropriations Committee.

I heard the Senator from Pennsylvania inveigh against an important chairman

of a subcommittee on appropriations the other day in the Senate. I tried to bring to the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania the added duties which have been imposed upon that Senator by reason of the joining of two bills which have heretofore been separate bills. Apparently even yet the Senator from Pennsylvania does not realize the heavy obligations which fall upon those who represent the Senate in conferences upon these important measures.

As late as we have been getting into conference, due to no fault of this body at all, we are confronted with this problem. It will not be settled overnight. I hope it may be settled by December 20. It can be settled, I believe, in the committee of which I spoke a while ago, handling the agriculture bill.

There are several bills which have not yet been reported to the Senate, due to no fault whatsoever on the part of Senators who will handle them. The important public works bill came over from the House on November 20. I am a member of the subcommittee which, under the guidance of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] as chairman, handles that bill. The Senator completed the hearings of our subcommittee, insofar as they could be completed, months ago, waiting for House action.

The Senator from Louisiana is in the Chamber now, and I am sure he can give a closer date than I for consideration of that bill.

Members of the Senate who serve on the Appropriations Committee have been exerting themselves in every way they know how to complete their duty, because it is important duty. The fact that we are doing exactly that should be recognized. There should be no querulous complaints by those who do not know anything about what is going on in the appropriations conferences.

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

Mr. CLARK. I shall yield to my friend from Illinois in a moment.

I am quite unaffected by the rather extreme comments which my friend the Senator from Florida just made; a part of which, perhaps, when he looks at the RECORD, he may want to delete.

I now yield to my friend from Illinois. Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am sorry. I have yielded to the Senator from Illinois. I shall be happy to yield later to my friend the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am not making any charges against anyone. I merely point out that today is the 27th of November. Nearly 5 months of the fiscal year have passed.

A proposal is now before the Senate to make it possible to postpone action on appropriation bills for 2 months more. If this plan is carried out, appropriation bills may not be passed until 7 months of the fiscal year have passed. I believe it is unprecedented in the history of the U.S. Congress to have such slow action on appropriation bills.

The Senator from Florida is taking this situation altogether too much as

a personal charge. I merely point out what has happened.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I believe it should be noted that the agriculture appropriation bill passed the House on the 6th of June and was received in the Senate June 10. It was reported to the Senate on September 12. It passed the Senate reasonably promptly after it was taken up by the Senate. The question is, What was happening between June 10 and September 12? What was happening between September 30 and November 14, when the bill went to conference?

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Since the Senator asked a question, I believe it should be answered.

Between the time the Senator mentioned, June 10, when the agricultural appropriation bill was received in the Senate, and September 12, when it was reported, lengthy hearings were held upon the matters contained in that bill, involving appropriations of between \$7 and \$8 billion.

The Senator from Florida does not know what happened between September 30 and November 14. Perhaps there were difficulties in the other body in having the bill go to conference.

After the Senate passed the bill on September 30, no conferees were appointed by the other body until November 14. Ours were appointed September 30.

While I cannot explain that delay, I say the earlier delay was because of long hearings and of many considerations by the committee as to what should be included in the bill and in the report, which was a very lengthy one, as the Senator will remember. No time was wasted in that regard.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is aware, is he not, that both Houses of Congress are bound by law—by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—to pass all appropriation bills and other legislation by the first of July of each year?

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida knows that the act so provides.

I know also, though, that if it is appropriate for a committee in the other body to consider the agricultural appropriation bill from January 9 to June 10, facing that same responsibility, it is no abuse of our responsibility to take from June 10 or shortly thereafter, when the bill came to our subcommittee, to September 30 to fulfill the same obligation here. That is about half the time which was taken in the other body.

I know that this particular bill has been aggressively handled and has been handled with all possible speed. I know with reference to some other bills in which I have had a part—for instance, the public works bill, to which I have already referred, and others—long and hard and exhaustive work has been done in hearings, in formulating reports, and

in arriving at what should be recommended to the Senate and, since that time, in conference.

The Senator from Florida is not at all prepared to say that there is any bill in the consideration of which he has had any part that has been subjected to abusive delay or dawdling with the public business.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt that what the Senator from Florida has said is entirely correct.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I promised some time ago, I now yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other Senators as soon as I have completed yielding to the Senator from Illinois, as I promised to do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Again, Mr. President, I am making no charges. I am calling attention to the fact that the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill was passed on the 18th of June, and was received and referred in the Senate on the 19th of June; and that it has not yet been acted on 5 months after being referred to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. What bill is that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will look at page 16 of today's calendar, he will see that H.R. 7063, the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill for 1964, passed the House on June 18, and was received and referred in the Senate on June 19. I find no record that it has been reported to the Senate.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have the floor. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am making no charges; I am merely reading the record.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arkansas in order that he may engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Illinois, without my losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator very much. I have no desire to participate in this harangue about the way the Senate conducts its affairs. I think it would be well to proceed to the business on the calendar and the business pending, and get on with our work. This debate is not contributing to anything but is causing more delay.

With reference to the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, I point out that this year the appropriation bill has had added to it the appropriation for the Commerce Department. Long hearings were held on the bill. We could have shut them off, but we must go to conference with this bill. If we increase any of the amounts recommended by the House, we must have time to weigh the items carefully and try to do a thorough job in determining what the departments need. A record must be made, and it is necessary to make a pretty strong record

to sustain our position when we meet in conference with the other body.

The committee has worked diligently on this bill. It will be ready to be reported just as soon as it is marked up. After we heard from the Government witnesses, there were a number of citizens who wished to be heard on certain items in the bill. That was done. These measures are not easily handled.

This year the chairman of that subcommittee had an unusually heavy workload as my colleagues all know. I believe I have worked as many hours a day as other Senators have. I have never for a moment delayed action on the bill purposely, but have at all times worked diligently to expedite it. It will be on the floor in a few days. I hope, after the Senate passes it, we shall be able to expedite a conference and get a report back to the Senate.

I for one want to remain in session until the appropriation bills are passed. I think it is imperative that we do so.

However, I remind my colleagues of one fact: We are dealing with a \$100 billion a year Government. We are no longer dealing with trifles. If we are to be proper stewards of the resources of our people, in supporting Government, and in making these expenditures, it is very necessary that the appropriation committees undertake to conserve the tax resources of this Nation. It cannot be done with indifference to the testimony and evidence that comes before the committee. Nor can that be done in haste and without proper consideration and deliberation.

I make no apology. I am going to do the best I can.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is making no charges. He is merely pointing out what the situation on the calendar is, and what is the situation that confronts the Congress and, in a sense, the country.

Continuing with my discussion of the calendar, the Senate passed the defense appropriation bill on September 24 and it is now law.

The District of Columbia appropriation bill passed the House on the 11th of July, and was received and referred in the Senate on the 15th of July. It was not reported to the Senate until the 6th of November, and was passed by the Senate on the 18th of November. I think that is correct.

The independent offices appropriation bill was not passed by the House until the 10th of October. It was reported to the Senate on the 13th of November, and passed by the Senate on November 20. There is no record on the calendar that it has been sent to conference.

The military construction appropriation bill was not passed by the House until the 18th of November.

The civil functions appropriation bill was not passed by the House until the 19th of November. These bills were received and referred in the Senate on November 19 and 20, respectively.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can do so only with permission of the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Louisiana, without losing my right to the floor, so that he may engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Illinois.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

The subcommittee which I head held hearings for 2½ months on the civil functions appropriation bill before it was received in the Senate and came to the committee on November 20. On the 21st we concluded hearings by listening to the Corps of Army Engineers. I hope to spend tomorrow and Friday preparing a report that I shall submit to the subcommittee on December 2. It is impossible to go any faster.

The subcommittee which I head could not take any action on the bill until it was received from the House. Why the House kept the bill so long, I do not know.

The bill contains appropriations not only for flood control, rivers and harbors, and navigation, but also for atomic energy, the TVA, and reclamation.

I am glad to state that I hope we shall be able to mark up the bill on the 2d or 3d of December, and 2 days thereafter have the full committee act on it, and try to present the bill to the Senate not later than the 8th, 9th, or 10th of December for debate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. I can personally testify to what every Member of the Senate knows—that the Senator from Louisiana is an exceedingly hard worker, who devotes himself to his tasks with all his strength and vigor. I was merely pointing out that the civil functions bill did not come to the Senate from the House until the 20th of November.

I am not, and I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania is not, indicting individual Members or simply indicting the Senate as a whole. It is the congressional system which brings us almost to the very end of calendar 1963 with a large number of the appropriation bills still not passed, and a considerable number not having been even reported to the Senate.

That is what the Senator from Pennsylvania is talking about. I do not understand why anyone should take umbrage at these statements of the facts.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Illinois is correct. I am not referring to any individual specifically. What the Senator from Illinois says is correct—the system is wrong. We must change the rules, or congressional government will break down.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

There remains the problem of foreign aid. The appropriation for that program has not come to the Senate from the House. No one knows when it will, although I understand there is an encouraging statement from the chairman of the committee in the House.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield, the difficulty with the foreign aid appropriation bill is that it cannot be started on its way in the House until the authorization bill is passed; and in

the Senate we took our own sweet time about passing the foreign aid appropriation bill. I do not complain about the debate on it. I thought it was helpful and meaningful. But I wonder a little why the bill could not have been brought up on the floor perhaps 3 months earlier.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it that what the Senator from Pennsylvania is getting at is that the unfinished and vital business of the Senate is clogged with appropriation bills which, in the ordinary course of events, would have been passed months ago.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. I should like to make a correction of what I said earlier. My friend the Senator from New Mexico called my attention to it. I said the law required that the appropriation bills and all other matters be concluded by the beginning of the fiscal year. That was incorrect. They must be concluded by the end of July of each year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even on that basis, we are 4 months overdue, and have a great deal of work to do. Is it not correct to say that if the appropriation bills pile up, it will be very difficult to obtain action on the two burning measures, which both President Kennedy and President Johnson have urged, namely, the civil rights bill and the tax bill.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The more the calendar is clogged with these appropriation measures, the greater will be the delay in dealing with those two bills of civil rights and taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. Inevitably, and without regard to motive.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Is it not true that President Kennedy sent the civil rights bill to Congress in June of 1963?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it is not yet on the floor of the House.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Similarly the tax bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senate acted promptly on the civil rights bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have no complaint to make of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We worked night and day for 4 months.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator refers to the public accommodation section of the civil rights bill that is to come out of the Commerce Committee. But I understand it is the policy of the leadership to hold up action on this bill and instead to bring the House bill on the floor and to try to pass it. That is my understanding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In connection with the tax bill, the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in February with the administration's program. The Ways and Means Committee of the House took until the end of September to act. If my addition is correct, their consideration took 7 months. The bill has been under consideration in the Finance Committee since then. Our esteemed chairman has scheduled hearings which will continue

until the 13th of December, unless plans are changed.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Illinois is an able member of the Committee on Finance. How long does he think it will take, after hearings have been completed, and the testimony is printed, for the committee, in executive session, to mark up the bill and report it to the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should say several weeks. What is likely to happen is that the tax bill will not reach the floor until January, at the earliest, possibly not until February.

As to the civil rights bill, it is not known when that will reach the floor, because it has yet to run the gauntlet of the Rules Committee in the House. The Rules Committee in such matters has been very dilatory in the past.

Mr. CLARK. At that point, we shall be faced with the necessity, unless we are to violate the law again, of passing 12 more appropriation bills for fiscal 1965. Is that not correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. If the Rules Committee does schedule hearings, I suppose it will grant the right of Members to appear before it to testify on the bill; therefore, no one knows when the bill will pass the House, and no one knows when it will be before the Senate for action.

In the meantime, the appropriation bills will be piling up, and it will be said that we cannot act on the civil rights bill or on the tax bill, because we should consider the vital appropriation bills.

I take it that what the Senator from Pennsylvania is saying is that we should get down to work and work until the end of December, and at least clean up the appropriation bills, instead of putting them over until the end of January. Is that not what the Senator is trying to do?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I wish to set a deadline. I believe that at least one or two of our colleagues have the same feeling. We should try to meet a deadline. We may not be able to meet it, but at least we should try to do so. So let us set down a self-imposed deadline of not January 31, but December 31.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Far from pulling down the columns of the temple, the Senator from Pennsylvania is trying to strengthen the columns of the temple. If we continue with the present process, we shall make ourselves the laughing-stock of the country. I do not blame anyone. I merely say that by some slip, either of machinery or scheduling, or something else, we have plunged ourselves into a legislative jam which will hold up not only the appropriation bills, but also the tax bill and the civil rights bill, with incalculable damage to the future of this country.

I do not say it has been planned to come out that way, but I do say that if it had been planned that way it could not have been done more expertly. We are moving into what looks like a calendar filibuster.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be very brief. In many respects I agree with the

Senator from Pennsylvania. On October 28, when the last continuing resolution was before the Senate, and when we extended the provision for 1 month instead of 2 months, I said this:

As I said to the distinguished chairman of the committee, for whom I have the utmost respect, I believe that we should not have to pass another joint resolution of the character of the one now before the Senate. It does not help Congress to have appropriation bills that were due to be passed before July 1 of 1963 pending for 5 months after they became due, so that we are asked to act on resolutions that would authorize the various departments of the Government to spend money on the basis of last year's appropriations or on the basis of the recommendations of the President, whichever amounts are lower. I do not believe that action gives us an opportunity to operate our Government as efficiently as possible. So I say that the Senate cannot do otherwise than to pass the joint resolution. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], for whom we all have the utmost regard, agrees with me that that is not a process which helps the prestige of the Congress.

I still feel that way. However, we are up against a practical, realistic situation. At the present time four appropriation bills are in conference. Three appropriation bills remain to be acted on. For one of these the authorizations have not yet been made. It is not realistic to believe that we can do this before December 20, when we shall recess for Christmas.

On principle I agree with what the Senator from Pennsylvania is trying to do. We should have passed those bills in July. We have not done so. It is realistic to believe that we cannot do so before December 30, if that is what is provided in the continuing resolution. It will mean that we shall have to pass another resolve before December 20, or whatever date is set for the Christmas recess. We shall then have to adopt a resolve to continue our action until January 31.

Some of the bills which are in conference will have become law prior to that time. Three bills will have to be acted upon. The military construction bill will take a little time to debate. The civil functions appropriation bill will take a little more time. The appropriations for State, Justice, and Commerce should not take more than a few hours of debate.

Therefore by December 15 or 20, when we recess for Christmas, there will be only the foreign aid bill outstanding.

There may be one other, but I would hesitate to believe that there would be.

I believe that what the Senator from Pennsylvania is trying to accomplish will be accomplished, but I do not believe it is practical to make the date December 31 in the resolve, because I do not believe it can be done by then.

In principle we should have done it; in practice, we have not. In practice, the Senator's resolution is not realistic, and it is not advisable because it is not realistic.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. CLARK. I shall comment in a few moments on what the Senator from

Massachusetts has said. I shall now yield to the Senator from Wyoming. So far as I am concerned, when no other Senators ask me to yield to them, I can conclude my remarks in not more than 10 minutes, and the Senate will then be ready to vote.

I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding and commend him for bringing a number of these questions not only to our attention, but really to a position of priority in our conscience. I believe that some things ought to be made clear as a result of the discussion that has been taking place, and I wish to comment on them.

I do not believe that the really central point is the continuing resolution, for example. I shall support the continuing resolution as a housekeeping necessity under the circumstances which confront us now. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I feel strongly about guaranteeing the continuity of precision in this regard.

Likewise, I hesitate to agree that the basic issue at stake is the rules of the Senate. The champion of the modification of those rules, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], occupies a most noble role.

What is at stake in the discussion is the whole spirit of the Senate itself, the atmosphere that pervades this body. We all have a task to complete, because a great backlog of business is staring us in the face. Extremely tortuous conferences are taking place and will have to be resolved. Many of these problems will still be with us in January. Therefore, as a body we ought to make it clear to the country that instead of going home until January, after the 20th of December or the 14th of December, or whenever it is proposed we should go home, we will continue the sessions of Congress through the holiday recess, so that whatever progress mortal man can make with the combined wisdom of the legislative process will be accomplished by our being continually at work on those questions from now on. It seems to me that this is really at the heart of the apprehension raised today.

I would hope that we would not let our differences concerning methods of procedure involved in the continuing resolution, or even the fundamental resolution in terms of the rules of the Senate, blind us to what I think is really a sense of spirit, of attitude, a matter of conscience as to points of view.

The President called us to action today. He said the time is now. He stressed that. I think we would not only discredit the high office of the Presidency; we would not only inhibit the role of the new Chief Executive; but we would cast a sorry reflection on the guidelines already laid down by his immediate predecessor if we were to shut the door, go home, and observe our traditional seasonal rites under these circumstances.

These are trying times. We have been through trying times in the past 4 days. I dislike to think that the collective leadership of this body and of the other body could not manage to adjust itself and

accommodate itself to the needs that the times now call for.

I hope serious thought will be given to grinding away at the business at hand, under whatever procedures are available to us, without the interruptions available to us at a time like this.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his comments, with which I am in complete accord. I believe there are three problems before us. The first is the procedural one, as to why we are so far behind with the appropriation bills, and what we can do to assure that this situation does not happen again. The pending amendment is merely a convenient way of calling that matter up for attention.

My second point is that in the quickest way we should determine how we can prevent this situation from happening again. In my judgment, it will be necessary to change a great many of the rules of the Senate and of the House. Probably the most important changes we should consider would be with respect to the handling of appropriation bills. Why do we have to let the House start them all? Nothing in the Constitution requires that. Why can there not be joint hearings? Why is it not possible to expedite the appropriations process? What can be done to expedite it more quickly?

The third matter, and perhaps the most important, is the one which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] so eloquently raised. That is the matter of spirit of the Senate. It concerns our obligation as Senators to remain here and do the work that the President who died last week and the President who spoke to us today have asked us to do.

I share the strong conviction of the Senator from Wyoming: Let us stay here and get our work done.

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

Mr. CLARK. I promised to yield first to the Senator from New York. After that I will yield to the Senator from Washington. I shall be happy to yield at any time to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and President pro tempore of the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. It seems to me to be most unfortunate that November 30 has come so quickly. I can appreciate the necessity of acting this week on the joint resolution. The time provided in the previous continuing resolution will expire on November 30.

I am trying to put myself in the position of someone who sat in the gallery to hear the President address Congress a few minutes ago, and who might happen to be sitting in the Senate gallery now to hear this wrangle.

The President said that our most immediate tasks are here, on this Hill. He said this is not the time for delay or postponement, but the time for action. The need is here; the need is now—now.

Yet when we returned to our Chamber, the first order of business in the Senate was to put off the consideration of all appropriation bills, or at least permit

them to be put off, until January 30, 1964.

No word of mine is intended to be critical of any member of the Committee on Appropriations. We are all aware of the amount of work in that committee. No committee is more diligent, or requires more effort. All the members of that committee are members of other committees, as well—and they are important committees. All of us should understand the magnitude of the task which the members of the Committee on Appropriations have.

But it seems to me that the amendment suggested by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, which as I understand provides only that the continuing resolution shall extend not to the end of January, but to the end of December of this year, is an eminently reasonable one. There is no reason on earth why, if appropriation bills are still not enacted, we cannot, toward the end of December, act on another continuing joint resolution which would extend into January.

But to walk straight across the Capitol into this Chamber, immediately after the President has said, "I want action, and I want it now," and agree to a resolution which provides, in effect, that so far as appropriation bills to operate the Government are concerned, we will put them off until January 30 of next year, seems to me not to be in support of the President. It would not be in fulfillment of our duties as Members of the Senate.

To relegate the remaining appropriations bills for fiscal year 1964 for consideration next session is to traffic with a double danger; first, the danger of delaying civil rights and taxes for an intolerable length of time, and second, to actually waste the Government's money. As to the latter, any budgetary expert knows that continuing money resolutions breed nothing but false economy out of half-finished projects and staffing uncertainties. With respect to unfinished projects which could create income and tax revenues, the Government is put in the position of a shipper of goods who is losing the equivalent of interest he would be making on the capital tied up in inventories sitting inside a boxcar on a railroad siding.

If this amendment is adopted, it will still permit remaining money bills and bills still in conference to be disposed of in December before we receive and digest the major January messages of President Johnson setting forth his legislative program in far greater detail than was possible today. As we all know to be the case, however, commitments on civil rights and tax—commitments to the people of the United States and to the memory of the late President they revered so deeply—must be met as early as possible. In my judgment, this resolution, if adopted, would plainly defeat such early consideration, and for that reason I shall support the Senator's amendment.

While I appreciate the fact that the civil rights and tax bills are in such a state that the chances of their enactment do not look good at this time, it seems to me there is a possibility that their consideration might be expedited. It

would be much better if we agreed to a continuing resolution until December 15, or some period of a few weeks, and acted on as many appropriations as possible. We might then reconsider the situation, and approve a continuing resolution then, but not on the very day when the President had said, "I want Congress to act, and act now."

I feel a hesitancy in supporting a resolution to extend appropriations until the end of January under these circumstances, and I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from New York. I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to talk about the joint resolution, and I do not wish to talk too much about the Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe any member of the Committee on Appropriations needs to stand here and defend himself with respect to the work of that committee and the amount of the work in that committee.

Mr. CLARK. I agree completely with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The President, today, was talking about two bills.

Mr. CLARK. He was talking about two legislative bills and the appropriation bills.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mainly two bills.

Mr. CLARK. He mentioned appropriation bills, too.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He was really talking about two bills. One of them is stuck in a Senate committee; the other is stuck in the House Rules Committee.

We can finish the appropriation bills; but even if we remained here until New Year's Eve, no Members of the Senate, except the members of the Finance Committee, could do anything about the tax bill, and no Members of the House except the members of the Rules Committee could act on that bill.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. But if we pass the appropriation bills, and if the other bills mentioned are still stuck in the committees, I would not object to having the Senate then take a recess. All I am saying is that we should pass the appropriation bills.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me point out that the appropriation bills—I do not have the figures before me, but I shall place them in the RECORD—take up less of the time of the Senate sessions than do any other bills.

Mr. CLARK. Probably that is a shame.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That may or may not be; but the appropriation bills take up less of the time of the Senate sessions than do any other bills, even though it is true that the appropriation bills take up more of the time of the members of the Appropriations Committee. So the logjam is not due to the appropriation bills. This year, I waited until October to get one appropriation bill from the House. Last year, I believe, it was November when I got it from the House.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator got the public works appropriation bill on No-

vember 20 and the military construction appropriation bill on November 19.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and we have worked with due dispatch on them.

The Senator from Pennsylvania and I agree upon one thing which I tried 2 years ago; and if the chairman of the committee does not object and if no other Senator on the committee objects, I shall try it again.

Mr. CLARK. The chairman is here now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am referring to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CLARK. I was referring to the Rules Committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall refer to it in a moment.

I will start the hearings on this appropriation bill in February, if that is agreeable to them. Then we can "put the monkey" on the backs of the Members of the House—where it belongs. We are willing to work; but in this case we have nothing to work on.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Washington is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So when the Rules Committee gets through with some other business which it regards as important, I hope next year it will report either the bill I have introduced for about 10 sessions or a similar bill, because we are the only legislative body in the world that does not divide its sessions into legislative sessions and fiscal sessions. That arrangement would solve all of these problems, because once we get at the bills, they do not take much of our time. Only the committee hearings, where the witnesses appear, take up much of our time.

Last year, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] had to hear 989 witnesses, who came from all over the country, who wished to be heard.

So if we follow an arrangement of that sort we shall be able to make some sense in the timing of our consideration of these measures. Each individual Senator works hard and is willing to do so.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But when a committee ties up a bill, we can do nothing about it until the committee reports.

I do not think any practical person—and I see present the Senator from Illinois, who is on the committee—will come to the conclusion that in the next 15 days the Finance Committee will report the tax bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Early in October, I made a motion—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and it was defeated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I moved that we terminate the hearings by November 1. That motion was defeated by a vote of 12 to 4.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The other day the Senator from Indiana moved that we terminate the hearings and proceed immediately to take action. That motion was defeated by a vote of 12 to 2; the Senator from Indiana and I were the only ones

who voted for the motion. Some of us have made every possible effort to speed up the action on that bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I realize that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But we have not been able to have action on it speeded up.

Earlier in the session the Senator from New Mexico and I moved that joint hearings be held by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee or parallel hearings on successive days so that we could save time in the process of committee consideration of the bill. But that motion was also defeated.

I am not blaming anyone; but I say the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct, and that we have encumbered ourselves with all sorts of rules and precedents which make it very difficult to legislate, and that this is particularly the case when civil rights bills are in the offing and when delay will slow them up or derail them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; we are also talking about the civil rights bill. My committee got out one portion of the civil rights bill, and got it out with due dispatch. We heard many witnesses and worked at night. That bill is here now.

It is also important to consider the action taken by the House Rules Committee. It can act quickly; but I have some doubts that it will act within the next 10 days.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has the job of reporting the appropriation bills to the Senate. The committee is holding hearings now. The hearings being held by my subcommittee will end on Wednesday, and those being held on the other bill will be concluded on Tuesday.

I suppose some of the delay is due to the authorization bills. But part of the fault lies in the fact that, as a result of the committee system, two or three committees can hold up the work of the entire Congress. When that happens, it would appear that Congress is doing nothing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But I point out that I have never been busier at any time in my congressional service than I have been this year. I welcome the responsibility, and I think other Members do, too. But I think everyone should know what we are talking about.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. What brought me to my feet was the statement by the genial Senator from Washington that he and the other members of his committee worked hard and reported part of the civil rights bill; and he said they had done their best. However, I cannot find that bill on the calendar, and it has not been reported on the floor. Therefore, no Senator is in a position to call it up.

Those of us who feel that the leadership is wrong in waiting for the bill to be received from the House should then have had their "day in court," in determining whether the following of our suggestion would result in acceleration of the work of the session.

I thoroughly agree with my colleague from New York.

It is very interesting to note that most of the other Members who agree with him sit in the back rows, where the rank and file of the Members of the Senate are to be found.

Just as the Mundt bill touched off the debate on the wheat bill, so the Senator's suggestion is a start in connection with a very critical debate in the Congress. All of us know who are responsible for the situation. We know that the committee chairmen who have these bills on their hands are just as sincere and just as patriotic as are we who disagree with them. But we have no way to manifest our disagreement, except once in a while we are able to call to the attention of everyone in the country the consequences of the action or lack of action of the committees.

It is suggested that at this very late stage in the session we could not even take final action on the appropriation bills by the end of November, whereas year after year we have ended our session by this time, after having taken final action on all the appropriation bills.

So I could not agree more completely with the Senator from Pennsylvania. Let us get the heat turned on by the people of the country, who are the ones who are in a position to turn it on. That must be done if we are to take the action that is called for by President Lyndon Johnson.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his remarks, and I congratulate him on them.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania on his speech. I think this is a good time for us to serve notice on the House that if we have the major appropriation bills by June 1—in view of the fact that under the Reorganization Act we are supposed to end our session by July 31—we shall not only hold hearings on them, but we shall also act on them on the floor of the Senate.

There is no constitutional reason why we should not do so. The only justification for proceeding as we have done has been custom, which has worked out well. The accommodation has been a happy arrangement between the House and the Senate. But once a custom of that kind, which has no strength in law or in the Constitution, becomes a bad custom, I believe everyone in Congress must take action. We cannot go on believing that constitutional government will operate itself. What may, at one time, have been a good practice, a good rule, perhaps a bad rule never invoked, or a bad custom which was never honored, should be revised and restricted in action when the effect of it is not merely to discredit Congress, which is incidental, but to interfere seriously with the processes of government. That is our concern today—interference with the processes of government in the United

States. The least we can do is serve notice on the House regarding appropriations, and perhaps also with regard to other legislation.

Even though we could make a case for House action on tax bills, if they do not bring a tax bill to us until the month of October, and we are supposed to act on it before the end of the year—a complicated tax bill on which hearings should be held—we should say to them that we shall hold hearings in advance; or we may not even limit it to the holding of hearings. We will act on the tax bill.

The House has shown no particular hesitancy about going over to the field of foreign policy and foreign affairs, even if it is an area which the Constitution and tradition reserve to the Senate. The Senate has within its sphere the area of foreign policy and decision in that field, but the House has come into that area without apology. When the foreign aid bill was being considered 2 weeks ago, there were Members of the Senate who were urging us to surrender to the House—a rather strange disposition, I believe. In any case, it was the disposition. We have given ground and let them come in.

There is much more reason for us to act in the field of taxes ahead of the House, if need be, and certainly in the area of appropriations.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, unless other Senators desire me to yield to them, I should like to finish my remarks and get on to the vote. I am always happy, however, to yield to the genial Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was about to ask that the Senator yield to the acting majority leader with respect to the public works bill. We have been trying to arrive at some kind of arrangement with the necessary unanimous consent request, and I believe it can be worked out for the first day when we return after the Thanksgiving recess.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I had hoped the Senate could vote on my amendment, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered, within the next 15 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is only a request, but this afternoon Members will be moving out to take advantage of their transportation.

Mr. CLARK. Let me ask the acting majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], what he would like me to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator if he would permit me to propound a proposed unanimous-consent agreement relating to the public works bill—the rivers and harbors bill—which is Calendar No. 628, House bill 8667, which is the unfinished business.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request, provided that in doing so I do not lose my right to the floor.

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

# AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASINS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

## UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which has been discussed with the interested parties, including the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and others on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

*Ordered*, That, effective on Tuesday, December 3, 1963, at 1:00 p.m., during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8667), authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

*Ordered further*, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would hope that the request would be modified—otherwise I shall object—to provide that it take effect after the morning hour.

I should like to state the reason why. These are dangerous days. The Senate will be in a 4-day recess and would return to a limitation of debate under strictly controlled time. The genius of the Senate is that Senators shall express themselves. We do not know what may happen over the weekend. I want the opportunity to say what I may have to say when I return, and I do not wish to depend on Senators yielding time to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My hope is that the Senate will recess, and then return and be able to make adjustments to any Senator's request. If it would make the Senator from New York feel better, there can be the customary morning hour, to which I have no particular objection. Let me ask the Senator if he would be agreeable to a unanimous-consent agreement effective at a particular hour, say at 1 o'clock?

Mr. JAVITS. No; it would not. But might 2 hours of additional time be added to the agreement, and will the Senator state that he will yield to Senators 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us make it effective at 1 o'clock and have an additional hour on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I modify the unanimous-consent request to make it effective at 1 p.m. and the time on the bill to be 3 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator state that there will be time for Senators to speak?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is clearly understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the agreement, as modified, is agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield, that I may ask a question of the acting majority leader?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senator from Michigan present?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I discussed the subject with him and it is perfectly all right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We will vote on the bill when we come back after Thanksgiving, and the bill will then go to the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There must be a conference?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that most of the provisions are fairly well ironed out. I say this because of the great concern in the so-called river basin areas all over the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If this bill does not pass by the first of the year the authorization level will be reached and the Army Engineers may have to serve notice on contractors to cease their work, which will cost a considerable amount of money.

I shall be asked a great many questions when I return home this weekend. We can probably look forward to the prospect that the bill will be taken care of, so that contractors will not have to stop work the first of the year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The observations of the Senator are as I understand the situation.

Mr. President, I should like to make it clear that the distinguished Senator from Michigan wished to proceed with the bill today, but time is going by. It is not possible for us to arrive at a vote upon the bill today because of the amendments that would be pending and the speeches that certain Senators would like to deliver.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should also like to make it clear that following consideration of that bill, we will immediately proceed to the bracero bill which we had discussed with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from

Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and others. The bracero bill will come up late Tuesday or the first thing on Wednesday.

I should also add that before we leave tonight, Senators who wish to speak on Calendar No. 628, House bill 8667, which would authorize additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, should deliver them tonight so that we can expedite our work on Tuesday when we return after the Thanksgiving recess.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 809) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been very cooperative, that he expected we would vote in 15 minutes on the joint resolution, I wonder if we could not have an agreement to vote on the amendment at a specific time?

Mr. CLARK. Assuming I do not have to yield any more time.

Mr. PASTORE. That is true. I would hope that Senators would grant that indulgence.

Mr. CLARK. It would not take me 10 minutes. If I could have 10 minutes, I would agree to a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator agree to a proposal that the Senate vote at 3:30 p.m.?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, if my argument is so weak that no Senator wishes to reply.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator that his argument is compelling and appealing. I will leave it there. If the Senator would be willing to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement at 3:30 that the Senate vote on his amendment, he would be doing us a favor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue without interruption until 3:30, at which time I shall yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to modify that unanimous-consent request to provide that at that time we shall vote on the Clark amendment.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it, then, that no Senator will rise in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PASTORE. No, but just vote in opposition.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am willing to agree to almost anything, but I do not believe we ought to preclude ourselves from answering anything which might be said. I am perfectly willing to vote now. There are implications in some of the remarks about which I do

not intend to remain silent if they are repeated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator from Rhode Island gave a very succinct and concise answer.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my friend the Senator from Minnesota that I believe we will get along better if we go along without an agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do not intend to consent to be silent regardless of what may be said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is granted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered to House Joint Resolution 809 would substitute "December 31, 1963" for "January 31, 1964."

The purpose of the amendment is to require that all appropriation bills be passed before the end of this calendar year or that another continuing resolution be passed sometime in December.

I have offered the amendment because I believe it is entirely possible, if we follow the injunction of the President of the United States given to us only a couple of hours ago, that we can get through with the appropriations work, if we put our minds to it.

I wish to point out what remains to be done.

We must pass the agriculture appropriation bill, which is in conference.

We must pass the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill, which has not yet come from the Senate committee.

We must pass the military construction appropriation bill, which has not yet come from the Senate committee.

We must pass the public works bill, otherwise known as the civil functions appropriation bill, which has not yet come from the committee.

We must pass the foreign aid appropriation bill, which has not yet been passed by the House.

We must pass also the independent offices appropriation bill, which is presently in conference.

I believe those things can be done, if we put our minds to it.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who unfortunately has left the Chamber, suggested it was not realistic to believe we could pass the foreign aid appropriation bill before the end of this calendar year. The Senator felt we could pass everything else.

I suggest that his judgment is in direct conflict with the statement made earlier, as reported on the news wires, by Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee, who said:

It will be simply ridiculous and a disgrace if Congress puts off the passage of the foreign aid money bill until next year.

I continue to quote the Representative:

We should get these money bills behind us.

He said his group was ready to start to act immediately, as soon as the House and Senate arrive at a compromise on the authorization bill.

I suspect that we would do well to play it safe and continue the appropriations for only 30 days, in order to build a fire under all those concerned with prompt passage of appropriation bills. I believe that can be done.

This has been the precedent. This has been the custom previously.

I hope the amendment will be approved. Let no one think it cannot be approved by the House. The House is to meet on Friday. I believe the House could and should accept the amendment. There is no reason why the House should oppose it. I believe it is a perfectly feasible suggestion.

I close with the comments made to us only a few hours ago by the President of the United States. I quote from his message to the joint meeting of the Congress. He said:

In short, this is no time for delay. It is a time for action—strong, forward-looking action on the pending education bills to help bring the light of learning to every home and hamlet in America—strong, forward-looking action on a number of other bills, I now interpolate, including the civil rights bill, the tax bill, and these appropriation bills.

President Johnson also said:

As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones. With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, vigorously and speedily when the need arises.

The need is here. The need is now. I ask your help.

The Senate can help the President of the United States to achieve these objectives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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 further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the Clark amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us vote, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE (when his name was called). I have a live pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were pres-

ent and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] are detained on official business, and if present and voting would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is necessarily absent, has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 259 Leg.]

#### YEAS—22

Bartlett	Hartke	Nelson
Burdick	Javits	Pell
Church	Keating	Proxmire
Clark	McCarthy	Ribicoff
Dodd	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Morse	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Moss	
Hart	Muskie	

#### NAYS—63

Allott	Humphrey	Mundt
Anderson	Inouye	Pastore
Bayh	Jackson	Pearson
Bennett	Johnston	Prouty
Bible	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Russell
Brewster	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Scott
Cannon	Lausche	Simpson
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Dominick	Long, La.	Smith
Edmondson	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ellender	Mansfield	Stennis
Ervin	McClellan	Symington
Fong	McGee	Talmadge
Fulbright	McIntyre	Thurmond
Gore	McGovern	Tower
Hayden	Mechem	Walters
Hill	Metcalfe	Williams, Del.
Holland	Miller	Yarborough
Hruska	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.

#### NOT VOTING—15

Alken	Cotton	Goldwater
Beall	Curtis	Hickenlooper
Byrd, Va.	Dirksen	Morton
Carlson	Eastland	Neuberger
Case	Engle	Robertson

So Mr. CLARK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 809) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, can the majority tell us whether there will be any more votes this afternoon?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no more yeas-and-nays votes this afternoon. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has been waiting very patiently—and he has been very patient, and I appreciate it very much—to make the opening address on the rivers and harbors bill.

There are six or seven items on the calendar that will be taken up.

Then the Senate will go over until Friday.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY AT 9 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn to meet at 9 o'clock a.m., on Friday next.

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

#### ORDER FOR RECESS FROM FRIDAY TO TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. On Friday there will be a pro forma meeting; the Senate will meet and immediately adjourn.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of that brief period on Friday next the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon the following Tuesday, December 3.

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

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FIRST ADDRESS TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, President Johnson's first address to the Congress will live as one of the loftiest utterances in the history of American state papers.

It was noble in its concept, elevated in its vision, compelling in its urgency, and masterful in its presentation.

President Johnson has sounded a clear call to duty to which every true American will answer.

He has issued an appeal for help to which every patriotic heart will respond.

He has in one great bold stroke assumed the leadership of the Nation and I am confident that the Congress and the people will follow him.

**THE PENDING TAX BILL: HOW NECESSARY, HOW EFFECTIVE, HOW BENEFICIAL; AND TO WHOM?**

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in his stirring and moving address to the Congress, President Johnson gave us all inspiration and solid substance. One could comment at length and with enthusiasm on virtually every sentence of his vigorous declarations of purpose. I join in applauding them.

For the moment I want to say a word about his reference to one of the agenda, high on President Kennedy's program, which President Johnson wishes to see materialized. I refer to the tax bill.

Of course this is a controversial issue. And indeed it should be when our Nation is plunging deeper and deeper into debt and our debt ceiling has just been raised to the astronomical figure of \$315 billion dollars. Indeed there is doubt, and understandably and justifiably among many Americans whether there is need of a tax cut at this time. The country appears to be prosperous—at least on the higher levels. The stock market yesterday reached unprecedented highs. But we still have 5 million unemployed. That is our overshadowing domestic problem. None is more important in our so-called affluent society. It may well be doubted that a tax reduction will put an appreciable proportion of these 5 million Americans to work. Especially will this tax reduction not attain this desirable, and I might say essential, objective unless accompanied by other measures such as a vast public works program—a great increase in the appropriation for the accelerated Public Works Act. That act served a most useful purpose. It put people to work on good projects. It increased employment locally and back in the factory. But the funds provided for it were insufficient. The funds have now run dry, although thousands of desirable and needed projects throughout the 50 States are ready to go, but there is no money to let them be constructed.

Now we know that if a tax reduction is enacted, we will be told that we must cut other domestic expenditures, and the really needed legislation to put men and women back to work; namely, the authorization and appropriation of funds which will mean jobs and family income where there is now no income—will go by the board.

Moreover, there is much question whether the particular draft of the tax bill which came over from the other body and is now the object of hearings in the Senate Finance Committee, is one which will meet the needs of the great majority of the American people. It has been said of this draft that in its present form it is a bill to make the rich richer. I submit, Mr. President, that we should be vigilant to prevent that from being the case. Our rich are rich enough. The middle and lower income Americans are those who will need tax relief if it is needed anywhere. We had better look searching into the provisions of the draft of the tax bill when it emerges from the Senate Finance Committee.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. GORE. I have listened to the eloquent speech of the distinguished Senator from Alaska. Does he not think, in view of the inequitable situation to which the Senator has referred, that the single most imperative thing in the tax field is to bring about equitable reform?

Mr. GRUENING. I fully agree. Unless there is tax reform, we are making a mockery of the tax bill. What is the point of reducing taxes if large sums that should be taxed go untaxed?

Moreover some of us strongly believe that an effective tax bill should contain some elements of tax reform. It would appear that the glaring loopholes in our existing tax structure are not being plugged in the pending draft of the tax bill.

The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has pointed out that a number of recipients of incomes above \$5 million and of others whose incomes are in the lesser millions of dollars in the year 1959 paid no income tax whatever. Surely that is intolerable when the so-called little people, and indeed the overwhelming majority of the American people, pay their income taxes conscientiously.

Why do we not have tax reform along with a tax cut? The reasons are lucidly set forth in an illuminating article in the current—the December—issue of Harper's magazine, written by Philip M. Stern entitled "The Slow, Quiet, Murder of Tax Reform."

This is a realistic appraisal of the built-in obstacles found in the Federal edifice, as it really is, why tax reform is so difficult to obtain. But surely the effort should be made. We should make it here.

In any event the whole question of how important and how beneficial, and to whom, the tax bill, and in particular the pending tax bill draft, will be, should be fully discussed by this body. If there is to be a tax bill, let it both include some measure of reform and provisions which will be clearly recognizable by the American people as destined to help those levels of our society which need such help.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stern's article, "The Slow, Quiet Murder of Tax Reform," be printed at this point in my remarks. I hope it will be read by all my colleagues, and by others interested in the procedures of Government.

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

**THE SLOW, QUIET MURDER OF TAX REFORM**  
(By Philip M. Stern)<sup>1</sup>

(NOTE.—The case of a beautiful ideal, abandoned by her parents, surrounded by

<sup>1</sup> Philip M. Stern is a Washington writer who has served in the Interior and State Departments, as well as with Senators JACKSON, of Washington, and DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and was founder and publisher of the Northern Virginia Sun. This article is adapted from "The Great Treasury Raid," his book on tax loopholes, which will be published in February.

enemies, neglected by her friends—and finally cut to pieces behind the closed doors of a congressional committee room.)

On the morning of last June 6, the House Ways and Means Committee, plodding slowly through the administration tax-reform proposals, came, at last, to the hottest of hot potatoes: the oil-depletion allowance. But even before Treasury Department spokesmen could begin to explain their plan for a mild tightening of the special tax deductions enjoyed by the oil industry, a motion was made to bypass the entire subject without further debate. The motion—made, ironically, by California's CECIL KING, usually a loyal administration supporter with a pro-labor voting record—was quickly passed, the New York Times reported, "by near-unanimous voice vote." (Days later, after some unfriendly newspaper editorials, the committee did reconsider, and approved a token part of the original depletion proposal.)

Perhaps other Kennedy loophole-closing proposals were less summarily treated by Ways and Means. But whatever amenities were observed, the outcome was, in most cases, as dismal. By August, even before Ways and Means had finished its work, the tax-reform program was so badly battered that the administration threw in the sponge, electing to abandon the fight for tax reform in the hope of speedier passage of its tax cut pep pill for the economy.

Yet as of early November, with Senate hearings proceeding at a desultory pace, it appeared the reforms may have been sacrificed in vain, for the strong possibility loomed that the tax bill would not be passed until early 1964.

To veteran observers of the taxwriting process, the mauling of the Kennedy reform program was no surprise. True, there were in 1963 some special inhibiting factors, prime among them the President's own declaration last February that nothing—including controversial reforms—"should stand in [the] way" of a tax cut ("JFK Scuttled Own Tax Bill" was one headline). Yet, most past loophole-closing efforts have met the same fate as the 1963 Kennedy round; in fact, the tax laws today contain far more preferences, exceptions, exclusions, and special advantages than existed 5 years ago, or 10 or 20—this despite an occasional tax tightening here or there.

Judging by that evidence, the deck is heavily stacked against tax reform. Turning up a few of the cards in the deck discloses why:

The proreform forces: Diffuse, inarticulate, politically impotent (who ever heard of an antidepletion lobby?).

The antireform forces: Highly focused, intensely vocal, politically powerful.

The taxwriting power in Congress: Tightly held by two carefully chosen committees.

The complexity of the tax law: Supremely technical, it confounds many lawyers, perplexes most Congressmen, totally baffles the public.

The tax experts and lobbyists: Often they alone can find their way through the legal and verbal fog, which can shroud their actions from public understanding and scrutiny.

Each of these cards turns up not once but many times as a tax bill works its way through the legislative maze, and each played its part in the dismal defeat of the 1963 Kennedy reforms.

**SIXTY-SEVEN WITNESSES FOR OIL**

Hearings on the 1963 tax bill opened formally on February 6, when Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon took his seat before the 25 Ways and Means Committee members arrayed above him on a semicircular dais, and laboriously unfolded the "comprehensive tax reform" program the President had presaged 2 years earlier. It was, in scope at least, ambitious. Challenging many of the most

powerful business lobbies in Washington, the administration proposed stiffer taxes on oil, coal, real estate, timber, cattle, insurance, top corporation executives, and the privately owned corporations used as a tax shield by the very wealthy. It also risked the opposition of the labor unions' lobby by seeking to end, for example, the tax-free sick-pay privilege, which benefits working people. And by proposing a curb on tax deductions for such items as home mortgage interest and charitable gifts, the administration flung a disastrously unpopular challenge not only to middle-income taxpayers, but also to such strong and vocal groups as churches, charities, and the homebuilding industry, which would be indirectly affected.

Douglas Dillon must have known he faced an uphill fight. He was but the first of 195 witnesses the committee was to hear from in 27 tedious days of hearings, recorded in 4,035 pages of testimony, and after he left the stand few other proreform voices were heard. The remainder of the hearings were, as usual, dominated by spokesmen for this industry, that company, this labor union, cautioning against one administration proposal or another. For example, in the 4 days set aside for testimony on the oil-depletion recommendations, the committee heard from no less than 67 officials, individuals, and organizations, including 13 Governors and 10 Congressmen—not one favoring reform.

Washington's downtown office buildings are studded with listening posts for the various industries, ready to alert industry members to any dangers such as an adverse tax proposal. The ninth floor of the Commonwealth Building, for example, is occupied by the American Petroleum Institute, whose president—tall, striking Frank Ikard—can furnish the most authentic advice on how to pass or stymie tax measures; for 7 years, as a Texas Congressman, he was a member of the Ways and Means Committee. On the fifth floor of the modern Solar Building are the offices of the National Coal Policy Conference, headed by portly, bespectacled, soft-spoken Joe Moody, a 17-year veteran on the Washington scene. (Moody decided early in 1963 that the favorable tax treatment enjoyed by coal-royalty income was in no danger of repeal, as asked by the administration, and so mounted no extraordinary national effort.) The real estate industry has its National Association of Real Estate Boards, and the National Association of Life Underwriters was watchful of proposals for stiffer rules on the taxation of group life insurance.

There is, of course, nothing reprehensible in an industry's maintaining a Washington representative or in 67 proindustry witnesses bombarding the committee. But the general public has no such watchdogs; and tax hearings are so lopsided that, as one close observer put it, Congress has difficulty securing "a balanced view of what is in the general interest, what the public wants, or what the public would want if it were informed of the facts." True, at scattered points in the hearing, the administration's oil proposal did receive glancing support from Columbia Professor Roy Blough, from the American Veterans Committee, the National Farmers Union, and three unaffiliated witnesses; but as usual the Treasury Department's was the principal voice of tax reform.

Treasury, though, possesses little of the political power that Washington responds to. Unlike the Labor and Agriculture Departments, it lacks the political leverage of a constituency of its own, and, because it is chronically opposed to the special tax favors many lawmakers believe should be granted, it comes to be regarded not as representing the collective interests of all taxpayers, but as a stiff-necked, theory-minded bureaucracy insensitive to the real-life problems of flesh-and-blood taxpayers. Still, weak reed or strong, the Treasury is virtually all that the loophole closers have to lean on.

#### CAPTURING THE SWING VOTES

When the public hearings are finally concluded, the Ways and Means Committee descends from its dais and assembles around a U-shaped table to begin shaping the tax bill it will recommend to the House.

The commodious room in which it labors—by far the largest of the House hearing rooms—attests the fact that Ways and Means is the House's most powerful legislative committee. Looking down from the pale-green walls are the portraits of former Ways and Means chairmen, three of whom (Polk, Fillmore, and McKinley) later ascended to the White House. But as Chief Executives, their power on tax matters could hardly have been greater than they were in Congress. One portrait is that of Robert L. "Muley" Doughton, who once (1949) suffered the indignity of having his committee approve, by a one-vote margin, a bill inimical to his North Carolina tobacco constituency. Shaken but not downed, Mr. Doughton successfully insisted that the President of the United States not only reverse the official administration position on the measure but also telephone a proadministration committee member and request him to change his vote.

Ways and Means maintains a tight rein on all major tax, tariff, or social-security legislation; for its assent is required, by House procedure, for any amendments to such bills to be introduced during floor debate. This tight committee control is crucial, for it permits pressure-group spokesmen to concentrate on a limited target. If they can win the favor of a few "swing" votes on Ways and Means, they can, by and large, ignore the other 400-plus Members of the House. In 1963, when the 10 Republican committee members were generally arrayed solidly against the administration, as few as three Democratic defections could defeat any reform. Since any tax-tightening proposal was bound to touch the political nerve end of one Democrat or other, it required no special lobbying effort to put together a shifting antireform coalition to defeat one after another of the administration's recommendations. After all, how could JOHN WATTS, from Kentucky, permit his colleagues to vote for stiffer taxes on cattle and race horses? And how could such administration loyalists as AL ULLMAN, from timber-laden Oregon, or PAT JENNINGS, from a coal-rich Virginia district, support higher taxes on timber or coal?

One of the factors helping to solder the oil-depletion provisions so securely into the tax laws has been the careful selection of Ways and Means members. One recent candidate for committee membership was "approached" (he declines to say by whom) for a commitment in favor of oil depletion and was told that all the other contestants for the seat had declared themselves prodepletion, just as all prior-year candidates had. "If that's true," he replied, "the oil people certainly don't need my vote." He refused to commit himself one way or the other and was denied the Democratic leadership's blessing.

"Ways and Means is the strangest of all the House committees—and the hardest to understand," comments one reform-minded Democratic Congressman. "Judging by the voting records of its members on the floor of the House, the liberals ought to have darn near a working majority. But their public voting records and their 'operating' records in the committee, behind closed doors, are two different things."

A labor-union lobbyist confirms this. He cites statistics compiled by the AFL-CIO showing that 12 of the 15 Democrats on the Ways and Means vote "with labor" on major issues more than two-thirds of the time, 8 of them more than nine-tenths of the time. Yet, he disclaims angrily, few of them, in closed-door committee sessions, will vote to tighten loopholes against the well-to-do,

as organized labor would like them to (and as consistency with their usual voting pattern would lead one to expect).

#### STRANGLING IN THE CITADEL

While the pressure groups were active and vocal in opposition to the 1963 Kennedy reforms, the general public was utterly silent. If there was any proreform sentiment in the land, it was successfully concealed from Congress. Perhaps one reason was the very technicality of the proposed reforms which, in turn, was due to the complexity of the tax laws themselves. Consider this passage, chosen at random from the Internal Revenue Code:

"If the allowance of a deficiency dividend deduction results in an overpayment of personal holding company tax for any taxable year, credit or refund with respect to such overpayment shall be made as if on the date of the determination 2 years remained before the expiration of the period of limitation on the filing of claim for refund for the taxable year to which the overpayment relates."

Clearly, the tax code amply deserves its characterization, by tax attorney Louis Eisenstein, as "a remarkable essay in sustained obscurity," having "all the earmarks of a conspiracy in restraint of understanding." This complexity arms the experts and the insiders with unusual powers, and robs even the most vigilant Congressman or newsmen of his normal powers of scrutiny. What casual observer, for instance, would be able to spot a bill innocuously entitled "A bill to amend part III of subchapter O of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954" as being a bill to provide substantial retroactive tax relief to the Hilton Hotel chain (and, potentially, 19 other unsuccessful defendants in antitrust proceedings)?

So murky are tax measures that Congressman PATMAN, of Texas, has observed that they "are passed with the Members not knowing exactly what they mean"—an argument used by some to defend the no-amendment rule governing House debate on a tax bill. Because of this rule, tax bills are quickly passed by the House and sent to the tender mercies of the Senate Finance Committee.

Senate Finance has been variously called "the citadel of conservatism" and the "happy hunting ground" for tax pressure groups. At times, such as the early 1950's political liberals have had no representation on the committee; at best, they have been an impotent and frustrated minority. This is not entirely accidental: the two current windmill tilts, Senators ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee and PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, both say they had great difficulty gaining their Finance Committee posts. According to Robert Engler, in the Politics of Oil, at one point in 1955 a committee vacancy thought sure to go to DOUGLAS (a leading critic of the depletion allowance) was preempted by Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson, who later in the session handed on the seat to former Vice President Alben Barkley, thus again stymieing DOUGLAS. It was only on Barkley's death that DOUGLAS finally won his Finance Committee seat.

Whereas Ways and Means has, of late, been headed by two stanchly reform-minded chairmen (Jere Cooper, of Tennessee, and Wilbur Mills, of Arkansas), Senate Finance has for decades been dominated by a procession of men in whose hearts loophole-closing kindled no great flame: Reed Smoot (of Smoot-Hawley tariff fame) of Utah; Pat Harrison, of Mississippi; Walter F. George, of Georgia; Eugene Millikin, of Colorado; and Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia.

Like all congressional committee chairmen these men have possessed great power. For example, the fact that soft drinks were one of the few items that wholly escaped any excise tax during World War II, was not,

according to knowing observers, wholly unrelated to the fact that the giant of the soft-drink industry, Coca-Cola, has its headquarters in Senator George's home State. It is also said that the 3-percent limitation on medical deductions was waived for those over 65 shortly after the elderly Senator George found that he could not deduct his own medical expenses one year, since they came to less than 3 percent of his income. When this amendment (estimated revenue cost: \$15 million) came up in a closed-door Finance Committee session, one new staff member whispered surprise that the Treasury spokesman present did not speak up against it. "He can't oppose this one," was the reply. "This one is old man George's amendment."

Senate Finance sits as a court of appeals from the actions of the House. In theory, of course, the Treasury has an opportunity to appeal from Ways and Means' rejection of its tax-tightening proposals. But, as in the House hearings, the preponderance of pleas come from private-interest spokesmen, protesting such reforms as the House did enact (or seeking added tax concessions), and it is rare that a reform bill emerges from Senate Finance stronger, from Treasury's viewpoint, than when it passed the House.

Once Senate Finance has completed its work and a tax measure is placed before the full Senate for debate, the power of the committee and its chairman are on full display. Understandably, the Senate regards the Finance Committee as its expert in tax matters, and by tradition the committee chairman is the sole arbiter of the acceptability of outsiders' amendments. Consistency is not required in his screening. Senator BYRD, for example, once righteously rebuffed an effort by Vermont's Senator Ralph Flanders to bring tax relief to a particular Vermont citizen, on the ground that "this would establish a very dangerous precedent . . . attempting to pass a general law for one specific purpose"—while, on that same day, Chairman BYRD himself had shepherded through a measure tailor made to bestow up to \$4 million of tax relief on the estate of Mrs. Gerard Swope, wife of the former president of General Electric.

Frequently, loophole-closing amendments are either voted by the Senate or accepted by the chairman of the Finance Committee, only to perish shortly in the House-Senate conference committee. When, in 1959, a Senate repeal of the so-called dividend tax credit failed to survive the House-Senate conference, Senator DOUGLAS was prompted to liken the fate of such loophole-closing actions "to the fate of the two young princes of England who . . . went into the Tower of London under very good promises but were strangled by Richard III and never emerged from the Tower."

#### WE GET TO KNOW WHO COUNTS

Not only do tax bills usually fail to contain the reforms asked by the Treasury; they frequently contain individually tailored provisions which, while mentioning no names, are so deftly drawn that their benefits are confined to a lone taxpayer. In 1951, the Senate Finance Committee tucked into a major tax measure a provision bestowing \$2 million of tax relief on movie magnate Louis B. Mayer. And in 1956, the Senate appended to a House bill a provision reversing two court decisions and sparing an Oklahoma City contractor the unpleasantness of paying hundreds of thousands in back taxes and penalties.

Such special provisions are, by and large, the mark left on the tax laws by the Washington tax lobbyist. Typically, he is a lawyer, but he may be less sought after for his legal acumen than for his intimate knowledge of lawmaking and politics and, particularly, for his contacts on the Hill. Thus, he might well be an ex-Senator or Congressman or, perhaps a former congressional staff aid. One former Treasury official tells of

witnessing the Ways and Means Committee approve a tallor-made relief bill represented by a former Ways and Means staff member, on the ground that "we've got to do something to help out old . . ."

The Washington lobbyist is likely to be generously rewarded for his efforts—his fee may run into the hundreds of thousands if his assigned mission is special relief legislation—but this is not astonishing in view of the considerable tax savings involved. The \$2 million provision for Louis B. Mayer is by no means unique; one Washington lawyer matter of factly mentioned in a sidewalk conversation that his success in changing a single date in one tax measure meant a saving of \$3 million for one client, and the mere insertion of a parenthetical cross-reference in another statute brought comparable savings to another.

Given their special power, the chairmen of Ways and Means and Finance are clearly the most advantageous Hill contacts—both for the lobbyist and his client. No one, perhaps, has equaled the success, in this line, of Ellsworth C. Alvord, Mayer's personal attorney, who was known to be on the most cordial terms with Chairman George of the Finance Committee. Lest anyone doubt the intimacy of this relationship, those attending a Finance hearing frequently saw the impressive figure of Mr. Alvord appear in the private entrance supposedly reserved for Senators, stand poised in the doorway surveying the audience, and then disappear into the private recesses of the Finance Committee chambers.

The tax lobbyist is not likely to be found registered as such under the lobbying law—Alvord, for example, did not register as a representative of Mr. Mayer. (Many attorneys take the view that the vaguely worded lobbying statute does not apply to the particular activities in which they happen to engage.)

There is little talk in Washington of personal venality among the Senators and Congressmen who sponsor special tax amendments, but campaign contributions are another matter. One high-ranking Finance Committee member—asked by a reporter why he uncharacteristically sponsored several pro-insurance-company amendments—explained, in an unguarded moment, "This is the way we finance our campaigns. Hell, I wish there was a tax bill up every year."

The astute lobbyist seeks to minimize the Washington pressure and maximize the "back home" influences. Says one: "Over the years, we get to know who counts with a Congressman in his district." In 1963, for example, hometown insurance agents were effectively mobilized to protest to Ways and Means members the proposed restrictions on tax-free group life insurance. One committee member got an appeal on this subject from one of his most trusted political supporters at home, and also—on behalf of the oil-depletion allowance—from a friend and business associate who was the local representative of a major oil company. The latter acknowledged frankly that he was only calling at the behest of company headquarters in the State capital.

To bolster congressional support for a bill making an exception for Du Pont's court-ordered sale of all its General Motors stock, Du Pont and GM each sent letters to their millions of stockholders urging them to write their Congressmen and Senators. The response was impressive.

Ordinarily, mail from constituents has little effect on a legislator's vote. But when it comes in torrents, it can be decisive—as it was in the case of the mail blitz credited with the 1962 defeat of tax withholding on dividends and interest. This blitz had its origins in private dining room No. 4 of the Palmer House in Chicago, on March 26, 1962, according to James McCartney of the Chicago Daily News. There, the "legislative subcommittee" of the U.S. Savings & Loan

League—the trade association—resolved, after a 4-hour debate, to organize a massive letterwriting campaign by the 30 million users of savings and loan institutions.

Four days later, a mailing went out to the league's 4,800-member institutions, with sample "Dear Saver" form letters to send to their customers. Treasury officials recall with bitterness what they feel was an erroneous implication in these mailings, that the proposed withholding plan involved a new tax, and not merely a means of collecting a tax that had been due all along. Reports McCartney: "Soon the deluge began to fall on the Capitol, first in letters by the handful, then by the box, then by the cartload, then by the carload. Before it was over Senator PAUL DOUGLAS had received 75,000 letters, Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER got 60,000. Nobody in the Senate remembers anything quite like it."

At the time of the Palmer House meeting in Chicago, a savings and loan league expert estimated "we didn't have the votes in the Senate" to kill the withholding plan. But after the blitz, the vote in Senate Finance was 11 to 5 and in the Senate as a whole 66 to 20 against withholding.

Mail storms such as this operate in only one direction: they sometimes defeat but they never rescue a tax-tightening proposal; on the contrary, reform-minded Congressmen report they get almost no pro-reform mail to spur them on—another of the cards that help to stack the deck.

#### MY LOOPHOLE VERSUS YOURS

While the opponents of loophole-closing are single-minded and articulate, the forces of reform are divided and often mute. "You would expect us labor guys to have gone all out to tighten up on expense-account high living," says one top-ranking AFL-CIO official. "But we had Actors Equity and the hotel and restaurant and bartenders' union on our necks telling us that an expense-account crackdown would ruin the theaters and the restaurant and hotel business. So while we went on record for the tighter rules, we couldn't mount an all-out campaign."

The voice of the Treasury can also be muffled. Congress makes no effort to conceal its distaste for outspoken Treasury reformers. During World War II, Randolph Paul, the dean of tax reform and then a top Treasury official, took to the speech circuit to defend the Roosevelt tax program. This incurred the displeasure of the chairman of Ways and Means and the speechmaking came to a prompt halt. And President Kennedy's appointment of Stanley Surrey, Harvard law professor and apostle of tax reform, as top Treasury tax official, "spurred a vigorous effort by oil companies and other groups to block the appointment," the Wall Street Journal reported. Surrey was subjected to a merciless grilling by Senate Finance, and only an assurance by the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, that he, not Surrey, would decide tax policy, clinched Surrey's Senate confirmation.

Faced with a continuous uphill struggle, reform-minded legislators are likely to lose their zeal over the years. Minnesota's Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, who twice led the effort in the Senate to repeal the tax concession for corporate dividends, noted a severe attrition of his allies on the second go-round. His explanation: "A lot of Senators came to me and said, 'I took a lot of heat for my vote last time—and anyway,' they said, 'it's futile.'"

The quest for tax reform isn't entirely futile. Many efforts to enact new loopholes are rebuffed; and Congress does, from time to time, abolish or constrict tax preferences—as, for example, in the stricter taxation of life insurance companies in 1959 and of American businesses overseas in 1962. No one, moreover, should underestimate the staggering difficulty of the task confronting

congressional tax writers, for theirs is the toughest legislative job Congress undertakes.

Nevertheless, over the years, the exceptions and preferences in the tax laws have grown rather than diminished in number—largely, it would appear, because the general public either doesn't understand about tax loopholes, or doesn't care about them, or both.

One member of Ways and Means—the most vocally reform minded of the 25—thinks it's the latter. "The average American," he says, a bit regretfully, "doesn't mind other people having their own loopholes—he only cares about getting his. So you shouldn't blame Congress or the committees about what the American people don't want. If we don't vote tax reform, it's simply because there's no pressure for it."

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASINS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the bill (H.R. 8667), as amended and reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, is a realistic effort to reach accord in a difficult situation.

It provides authorization for appropriations to continue construction work on several comprehensive river basins, and for several new projects.

The committee in the Senate, and the House have spent much time this year in attempting to reach agreement on a level of authorizations.

In June, the House passed H.R. 6016, which provided only for a 2-year authorization for river basin construction for fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

The Senate Public Works Committee reduced the basin authorizations to fiscal year 1964 only, on the assumption that there would be ample time later to give proper review to the future needs of these basins.

The committee also added several new projects to H.R. 6016.

These projects had been adopted by the Senate in the omnibus bill of 1962, but were dropped in conference with the tacit understanding that the House would consider them this year.

However, the House did not do so, and the committee added them to the river basin bill.

The Senate concurred in this action by adopting H.R. 6016 on July 29 and sending it back to the House with a request for a conference.

For reasons best known to Members of that body, the time-honored traditions of the Senate and the House to reach agreement in conference were not followed in this instance.

In the meantime, an emergency situation has developed on a number of river basins awaiting authorizations for further construction.

Rather than meet this situation by settling our differences on H.R. 6016 in conference, the House chose to adopt a new river basin authorization bill, H.R. 8667.

The Senate Public Works Committee has always been ready to reach a realistic and meaningful accord, while still protecting the rights and prerogatives of the committee and the Senate.

As a result, the committee considered H.R. 8667 and has recommended several amendments. These would include the authorization of four new projects—three less than in the Senate version of H.R. 6016.

It is normal for Congress to consider an omnibus rivers and harbors bill in the even years—at 2- to 4-year intervals.

The last ones were enacted in 1960 and 1962. Additional basin authorizations were included in the 1962 act but were deleted in the conference on the bill.

That is the necessity for having legislation on this matter this year.

Since the time the committee considered the basin authorizations in H.R. 6016, almost 6 months of fiscal year 1964 have passed.

The House has passed the public works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1964.

It is the judgment of the committee that H.R. 8667 should be amended by increasing the river basin authorizations to an amount adequate to cover anticipated appropriations for fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

This procedure will allow plenty of time to consider the basin authorizations for fiscal year 1966 and subsequent years.

Unless we grant 2-year authorizations, we will have to introduce another bill right after the first of the year to cover fiscal year 1965.

It is the further judgment of the committee that the bill should be amended by adding certain of those projects adopted by the Senate last year and approved again this year.

The increase in basin authorizations recommended by the committee are shown in the following tabulation:

Basin	Amounts in H.R. 8667, fiscal year 1964	Senate amendments, fiscal years 1964-65
West Branch Susquehanna.....	0	\$2,000,000
Central and southern Florida.....	\$4,000,000	21,000,000
Brazos River.....	14,000,000	30,000,000
Arkansas River.....	31,000,000	157,000,000
White River, Ark.-Mo.....	1,000,000	8,000,000
Missouri River.....	0	80,000,000
Ohio River.....	47,000,000	150,000,000
Upper Mississippi.....	0	11,000,000
Los Angeles-San Gabriel.....	12,000,000	30,000,000
Columbia River.....	0	195,000,000
Missouri River.....	0	100,000,000
Total.....	145,000,000	784,000,000

The projects which the Senate added, with their estimated costs, are:

	Estimated cost
Cape Fear River Basin.....	\$25,143,000
Flint River, Ga.....	63,200,000
Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas.....	404,000
Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla.....	25,100,000
Missouri River bank stabilization.....	3,000,000
Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Mont.....	50,000,000
Total.....	166,847,000

This is a total of \$950 million, but only about \$167 million is new construction.

These new projects are:

New Hope Dam and Reservoir, Cape Fear River Basin, N.C., estimated cost, \$25,143,000, benefit-cost ratio 2.5. This project will provide needed flood control and will augment low stream flows along the main stem of the Cape Fear River, and provide a valuable water supply for municipal and industrial use.

The Flint River, Ga., plan provides ultimately for five reservoirs for multiple purposes in the basin. Only one, the Spewrell Bluff Reservoir, is authorized in this bill. The estimated cost is \$63,200,000, and the benefit-cost ratio 1.2. This reservoir is to be undertaken as the initial step in the development for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and allied purposes.

For the Dardanelle lock and dam modification, Arkansas, the estimated costs are \$404,000, to provide Federal payment for relocation of sewage facilities for the city of Russellville, Ark., necessitated by the construction of this multiple-purpose project on the Arkansas River.

The Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla., project, estimated to cost \$25,100,000, with a benefit-cost ratio of 1.9, is a multiple-purpose project for flood control, water supply, recreation, and other purposes semiarid area, with incidental irrigation features. Over 50 percent of the cost for the project will be repaid by local interest.

The Missouri River bank stabilization is estimated to cost \$3 million. This is a technical amendment to permit correction of severe bank caving below Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak., caused by degradation, caused by power releases from the reservoir, resulting in loss of valuable farmland.

For the Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont., the total estimated cost is \$247 million, and the benefit-cost ratio is 1.3. This bill authorizes an initial amount of \$50 million for partial accomplishment. This is a major unit of the plan for the Columbia River Basin, and is essential for development of the water resources of the basin.

These projects have been studied by the Corps of Engineers, who have found them feasible and have recommended them.

They have been studied by the Senate, which has found them feasible and adopted them twice.

They have been studied by the House Public Works Committee, but no action has been taken.

Mr. President, the committee believes that the course of action we are taking is more than reasonable.

I appreciate the patience and understanding of Senators who have these river basins in their States and who have been under considerable pressure because of threatened shutdowns.

We want to settle this matter quickly, but we want to do it fairly.

It is my hope that we can do so with this bill, and I urge its prompt passage.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The chairman and other members of the Committee on Public Works and the staff have performed magnificently in preparing the bill. They have shown much perseverance and patience in considering the entire river basin bill, especially with respect to the projects that were added this year.

Is it not true that the Senate has never tried to remove from a bill any projects that were included by the House? The Senate has never asked the House to remove any of its projects, has it?

Mr. McNAMARA. To the best of my recollection, the Senator from North Carolina makes a true statement.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. All that we have asked is that the House include projects which the Senate approved last year and again this year.

Mr. McNAMARA. Twice in the past 13 months, to be absolutely correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. This time, we have deleted three projects that were very expensive projects, but were also controversial. Senators from the States where those projects were to be located were generous enough to say that they would forgo asking to have those projects included this year. Is that not correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Committee on Public Works, of which I have the honor to be a member, together with the distinguished chairman and other Senators, has been generous. We are not trying to impose on the House committee or tell them what to do or what not to do. We have merely asked that they be as generous toward us by approving what we have asked for as we have been toward them.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct. We are taking this step following an informal conference with House leaders concerning the public works program. They suggested this step. We are going this far to try to accommodate them.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. If I am not mistaken, the Senator from Michigan had an off-the-record conference with the chairman of the House committee that was handling this particular bill, and an accord was reached.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I am certain that the bill will work to the good of both Houses.

Mr. McNAMARA. I agree.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. As I have said before, and as I believe the Senator from Michigan has said, we do not want to deny any State any project to which it is entitled, and which both Houses have approved. We would like to have the House accept the projects the Senate approves, and we ask that they show their willingness to do so.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is what they are trying to do at this time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the record of the projects and the hearings,

which have been outlined by the chairman of the committee, speaks for itself. At this late hour, I have no desire to engage in a discussion of the merits or demerits of the various projects involved. In my opinion the chairman of the committee has done an outstanding job in handling the hearings on the bill and in bringing it to the floor of the Senate. He has been patient and tolerant with both the members of the Senate committee and with those from the House, who at times have failed to keep the obligations which they solemnly pledged to the previous chairman in the last Congress.

I hope the chairman of the committee will understand that many of the Senators who have in their States projects which are dealt with in this bill or who have suffered because of the closing down of the work on them, as a result of the delay in the making of these authorizations, are grateful to him for his patience and his tolerance in handling this measure.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Montana for his generous remarks.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, several days ago I prepared a statement for delivery on the floor of the Senate, on the serious situation confronting us as a result of the inability of the House and Senate to proceed effectively in the traditional manner on legislation passed by one body and amended by the other. I refer specifically to the bill now being considered.

Prior to delivery of that statement, however, the Honorable PAT McNAMARA, chairman of the Public Works Committee of the Senate, together with the dedicated members of that committee reported H.R. 8667 on November 21. Since that prepared statement of mine covers the situation in some detail, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

I note that again the Senate Public Works Committee has amended the House version of the bill. With those amendments, I agree. The basin authorizations have been increased to 2 years, 1964 and 1965. The Senate committee version increases the number of basins from 7 to 10, and the authorization totals from \$145 million to \$684 million. It also adds the Missouri Basin—Department of Interior—for \$100 million, and six new or modified project authorizations amounting to \$166,847,000, for a grand total of \$950,847,000.

Mr. President, these amounts are not appropriations. This measure will simply provide the authority that is needed before any money can be appropriated for the construction of these projects.

I congratulate the distinguished chairman and members of the Public Works Committee and also the members of its efficient staff. I have many fond memories of my own service on that committee. I have observed through the years how this committee performs on a non-partisan basis. Its members put the development of the resources of this country ahead of politics. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is rendering great service to the Senate as chairman

of this committee, as is the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the ranking minority member.

Mr. President, I hope the House will, with dispatch, appoint its conferees and that this measure may be promptly transmitted to the President for his signature.

How regrettable it would be if the action of this Congress, or the lack of action, would cause work now underway on important projects to be shut down.

If work is stopped because of the failure of Congress to act, that will not only mean unnecessary delay in completion of the work, but it will also result in economic waste and extravagance. It will also increase the amount of expenditures that will have to be made to carry these projects on to completion.

Therefore, it would be most unwise to further delay action on this authorization bill.

I trust that it will be passed promptly and that it can be expedited to final enactment.

Mr. President, inasmuch as my prepared statement covers the situation in some detail, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a situation which may result in shutting down 58 public works projects in 24 States, thus affecting the territorial responsibility of 48 Members of the U.S. Senate and about 130 House Members.

This situation arises because of the inability of the House and Senate to proceed in the traditional manner on legislation passed by one body and amended by the other. There seems to be a stalemate in getting the two in a free conference to iron out the differences on a bill which was passed by the House, amended by the Senate, and sent back to the House.

Let me recite briefly for the record the situation as I understand it to exist.

By the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938, Congress approved comprehensive plans for the development of many of the river basins throughout the Nation in the interest of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and other allied water uses. Congressional approval was given to the entire plan in these cases, with authorization of funds limited to a portion of the entire cost to cover anticipated appropriations for a few years. This procedure gave the Congress an opportunity to examine the work that was being accomplished in the basins at periodical intervals, authorize additional projects found feasible, and make any modifications in the plans that might be desirable. When the authorized monetary limitation is approached, enactment of legislation is required to provide for additional increases in the monetary ceilings for these partially authorized basin plans.

At the present time there are 21 basin plans in this category. It is estimated that 7 of these will experience deficits between estimated appropriations and total authorizations for fiscal year 1964, and 10 will have such a deficit through fiscal year 1965.

It has been the policy of Congress to consider authorization bills at intervals of from 2 to 4 years. General authorization acts were approved in 1958, 1960, and 1962. These acts included increased basin authorizations and authorization for individual projects on which favorable reports had been trans-

mitted to the Congress by the Chief of Engineers.

During consideration of H.R. 13273 (Public Law 874) during the 87th Congress, the Senate Public Works Committee included increases in basin authorizations for 11 river basins totaling \$805 million, to cover appropriations for fiscal years 1964 and 1965. This amount was reduced in conference to \$4.7 million to cover the amount urgently needed for fiscal year 1963. If the amount approved by the Senate had not been eliminated, there would be no necessity for increased authorizations at this time. It would have been necessary, however, to consider during calendar year 1964 additional increases to cover the budget request for fiscal year 1966.

On May 15, 1963, the House Public Works Committee reported H.R. 6016, which included increased basin authorizations for fiscal years 1964 and 1965. This is the identical authorization contained in the Senate version of H.R. 13273 (Public Law 874, 87th Cong.) which was objected to by the House and reduced to the requirements of fiscal year 1963 only in conference. H.R. 6016 passed the House on June 24, 1963, and was sent to the Senate and referred to the Public Works Committee.

On July 18 the Public Works Committee reported H.R. 6016 with amendments, and on July 30 it passed the Senate and was returned to the House.

The bill as passed by the Senate differed from the House bill in that it reduced the basin authorizations to include that needed for fiscal year 1964 only and added nine projects formerly passed by the Senate and lost in House-Senate conference on H.R. 13273 (Public Law 874, 87th Cong.).

Normal procedure would be a conference. The Senate appointed their conferees, but to this good day the House has not appointed conferees.

May I point out here that every project added by the Senate has been approved by the Corps of Engineers, other Federal agencies, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Public Works Committee, and passed by the Senate on two occasions.

In lieu of a conference, the House Public Works Committee on October 1, 1963, reported out H.R. 8667, a bill which provides "for increased authorizations for the prosecution of river basin plans for flood control and related purposes." It carries monetary authorization for only 1 year (fiscal year 1964) for basins which lack adequate authorization for the full year. The House report carries the following language:

"The committee met in executive session on October 1, 1963, and ordered the bill reported. The action was in the nature of an emergency because of the fact that monetary authorization will be exhausted in the very near future on some basins and successively on others in the present fiscal year. This means that work will have to be suspended by the contractors at great cost. There will be disruption in the local area, loss of employment, and in some cases, actual creation of hazards in connection with flood control projects which are only partially completed. The reason for the emergency action is as follows:

"The situation regarding the basin authorizations has not been unrecognized this session. The committee on May 15, 1963, reported to the House H.R. 6016 (H. Rept. 299), which covered a total of 10 basins which, it was estimated, would have deficits during fiscal years 1964 and 1965. In other words, H.R. 6016 covered a 2-year period of authorization. H.R. 6016 passed the House on June 24, 1963. It passed the Senate on July 30, 1963, with amendments involving the inclusion of a number of specific projects not directly related to the basin authorizations. In passing the bill, the Senate asked for a conference. On August 6, 1963, the amended bill was brought up

on the House floor and unanimous consent was requested to disagree with the Senate amendments and to agree to the conference requested by the Senate. This was objected to. The inclusion of the individual projects by the Senate has brought up a number of controversial matters with respect to these projects. On most of these projects there is strong support and strong opposition. It appears that there may be considerable time required to resolve these questions. In the meantime, the situation with regard to the basins, which is noncontroversial, has become increasingly acute. In one case, funds have already been exhausted and the contracts underway are being carried on with an advance of funds from the local sponsoring unit. This device, however, is not practical for application to the other basins because of the fact that they are too large in area and the same situation does not prevail as it does in the basin which is being carried on with advance funds—the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin.

"Because of the extreme importance of providing sufficient authorization to prevent the curtailment or complete cessation of work, beginning in the very near future, the committee feels that it is of the utmost importance that this matter be considered separately and that swift action be taken, and that the resolution of problems regarding individual projects added by the Senate be left for future consideration.

"The committee recommends that the bill, H.R. 8667, be acted upon immediately to prevent the serious consequences that would otherwise inevitably result."

The House passed H.R. 8667 on October 21, 1963. No action has been taken by the Public Works Committee of the Senate, and I am advised none is expected since the Senate has passed a bill which awaits conference.

The seriousness of the present situation is best illustrated by the fact that the House Appropriations Committee has now reported the Public Works appropriations bill to the House. That measure contains 58 projects for which funds are recommended but for which no expenditure can be made without the necessary authorization. As a consequence, the House committee, to avoid a point of order, included in the appropriations bill (H.R. —) the following proviso:

"Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated."

Following is a short statement on each of the basins which will be forced to close down if remedy is not forthcoming:

#### CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

This project provides for modification and expansion of the works in the Lake Okechobee area, to the comprehensive plan for flood control in the upper St. Johns River area, the Kissimmee River Basin and related areas, and the Lake Okechobee-Everglades-east coast areas, all in central Florida. The project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, which authorized the appropriation of \$16,300,000 for partial accomplishment of the first phase of the plan. Subsequent legislation has increased the monetary authorization and expanded the project to include additional units.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan.....	\$263,000,000
Available monetary authorization.....	106,300,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963.....	95,373,000
Remaining monetary authorization.....	10,927,000

Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request.....	\$14,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization.....	-3,073,000

Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964.....	4,000,000
---	-----------

Projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Central and southern Florida project, Florida.

#### BRAZOS RIVER BASIN

The Flood Control Act approved September 3, 1954, adopted the basinwide plan of improvement in the Brazos River Basin and authorized the appropriation of \$40 million for partial accomplishment of that plan.

The Flood Control Act of 1960 authorized an additional amount of \$21 million. The plan includes reservoirs for flood control and allied purposes, and projects for local flood protection.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan.....	\$185,124,000
---	---------------

Available monetary authorization.....	61,000,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963.....	51,579,000

Remaining monetary authorization.....	9,421,000
---------------------------------------	-----------

Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request.....	23,045,000
---	------------

Deficit monetary authorization.....	-13,624,000
-------------------------------------	-------------

Additional monetary authorization request for fiscal year 1964.....	14,000,000
---	------------

Projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Proctor Reservoir, Tex.  
Somerville Reservoir, Tex.  
Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir, Tex.  
Waco Reservoir, Tex.

#### ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Arkansas River Basin was adopted by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, which authorized an appropriation of \$21 million for partial accomplishment of the plan. The plan has been further amended and modified and additional monetary authorization provided by subsequent acts.

The River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, authorized construction of a multiple-purpose plan for improvement of the Arkansas River Basin, Arkansas and Oklahoma, for navigation, flood control, and other purposes, and authorized the appropriation of \$55 million for partial accomplishment of the plan. This plan has likewise been modified by subsequent acts, and additional monetary authorization provided.

The Flood Control Act of July 14, 1960, incorporated the authorized flood-control plan and the multiple-purpose plan into a single plan of development, and provided that all authorizations made available for the Arkansas River Basin would be applicable to the combined plan of development.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan.....	\$1,334,116,000
---	-----------------

Available monetary authorization.....	529,773,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963.....	469,627,000

Remaining monetary authorization.....	60,146,000
---------------------------------------	------------

Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request.....

\$91,010,000

Deficit monetary authorization.....

-30,864,000

Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964.....

31,000,000

Projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Bank stabilization works, Arkansas and Missouri.

Blue Mountain Reservoir, Ark.

Dardanelle Reservoir, Ark.

Elk City Reservoir, Kans.

Eufaula Reservoir, Okla.

Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla.

Keystone Reservoir, Okla.

Navigation locks and dams, Arkansas and Oklahoma.

Minrod Reservoir, Ark.

Ozark lock and dam, Arkansas.

Arkansas River, snagging and plant, Arkansas and Oklahoma.

Short Mountain lock and dam, Oklahoma.

Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir, Okla.

Webbers Falls lock and dam, Oklahoma.

#### WHITE RIVER BASIN, MO. AND ARK.

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the White River Basin was authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, which included \$25 million authorization for appropriations. Subsequent legislation has authorized additional amounts for continuation of the plan, and included additional projects in the plan. The plan now includes nine reservoirs, of which four are for flood control only and five are multiple-purpose projects.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan.....

\$337,872,000

Available monetary authorization.....

276,000,000

Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963.....

262,184,000

Remaining monetary authorization.....

13,816,000

Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request.....

\$13,819,000

Deficit monetary authorization.....

-3,000

Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964.....

1,000,000

Project on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Beaver Reservoir, Ark.

#### OHIO RIVER BASIN

The Flood Control Acts of June 22, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, approved a general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin, consisting of reservoirs, levees, floodwalls, and drainage structures for protection of cities and towns. Those acts were amended and supplemented by subsequent acts, which also included monetary authorizations for further prosecution of the comprehensive plan. Additional authorization is needed at this time to carry the program forward.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan.....

\$1,235,600,000

Available monetary authorization.....

749,138,000

Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963.....

719,417,000

Remaining monetary authorization.....

29,721,000

Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based on approved budget request... \$76,156,000

Deficit monetary authorization..... -46,435,000

Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964..... 47,000,000

Projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa.

Beach Fork Reservoir, W. Va.

Evansville, Ind.

John W. Flannagan Reservoir, Va.

Monroe Reservoir, Ind.

Barren River Reservoir, Ky.

Shenango River Reservoir, Pa.

Summersville Reservoir, W. Va.

Brookville Reservoir, Ind.

Fishtrap Reservoir, Ky.

Lake Chautauqua, N.Y.

Mason J. Niblack levees, Indiana.

Green River Reservoir, Ky.

Rochester and McClearys Bluff, Ill.

Tripond levee, Illinois.

Turtle Creek, Pa.

Deer Creek Reservoir, Ohio.

Berlin Reservoir, Ohio.

Big Darby Creek Reservoir, Ohio.

J. Percy Priest Reservoir, Tenn.

Cave Run Reservoir, Ky.

East Lynn Reservoir, W. Va.

Paint Creek Reservoir, Ohio.

#### LOS ANGELES-SAN GABRIEL RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan of improvement for the Los Angeles County drainage area provides for improvements consisting of reservoirs, debris basins, flood-control channels, bridges, and related works along the Los Angeles and San Gabriel River, Rio Hondo, and Ballona Creek, and their tributaries. The Flood Control Act of June 22, 1963, authorized reservoirs and flood channels at an estimated cost of \$70 million. Subsequent acts authorized additional projects, expanded the scope of the project, and increased the monetary authorization. Additional authorization to cover contracts now in force is urgently needed.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan..... \$350,265,000

Available monetary authorization..... 289,741,000

Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963..... \$286,475,000

Remaining monetary authorization..... 3,266,000

Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request..... 15,000,000

Deficit monetary authorization..... -11,734,000

Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964..... 12,000,000

Project on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Los Angeles County drainage area, California.

#### COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, approved the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Willamette River Basin and authorized \$11,300,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the recommended plan. Individual projects were authorized in the Columbia and Willamette River Basins by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, and subsequent acts. The Flood Control Act of May 17, 1950, approved a general comprehensive plan for the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes and authorized the appropriation of \$75 million for the partial accomplishment of the plan.

This monetary authorization has been increased by later acts and additional authorization is needed at this time.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan..... \$1,849,348,000

Available monetary authorization..... 723,300,000

Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963..... 673,513,000

Remaining monetary authorization..... 49,787,000

Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request..... 85,739,000

Deficit monetary authorization..... -35,952,000

Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964..... 36,000,000

Projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Blue River Reservoir, Ore.

Bruces Eddy Dam, Idaho.

Boise Valley, Idaho.

John Day River, Ore.

Weiser River, Idaho.

Cougar Reservoir, Ore.

Dorena Reservoir, Ore.

Fall Creek Reservoir, Ore.

Fern Ridge Reservoir, Ore.

Green Peter and Foster Creek Reservoirs, Ore.

Jackson Hole, Wyo.

John Day Dam, Ore.

Johnson Creek, Ore.

Libby Reservoir, Mon.

Willamette River bank protection, Ore.

#### MISSOURI BASIN—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

This section provides an increase in the basin authorization for the portion of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. It has been customary to increase the monetary authorization for the Department of the Interior as such increase is needed, in the same manner as increases are provided for the Corps of Engineers for their portions of the Missouri River Basin plan. Information was received from the Secretary of the Interior which fully justified the need for increased authorization so that appropriations for the work already approved by Congress can continue to be made.

Section 9(3) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized the appropriation of \$200 million for the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the initial stages of the Missouri River Basin project. Subsequent authorizations have increased this limitation.

Annual appropriations by the Congress, including the appropriations for fiscal year 1963, have utilized all but \$64,900,000 of the authorized total. The fiscal year 1964 program that is contemplated for the Missouri River Basin project is in excess of the remaining ceiling. It is anticipated that as construction work progresses the fund requirements will average about \$80 million for the next several years. The committee believes that an increase in monetary authorization is necessary at this time.

The total estimated cost of the long-range ultimate program of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri River Basin is about \$3 billion.

The committee approves the language in H.R. 6016 with respect to new units. Under these provisions, each new unit will be recommended to the Congress for specific authorization or reauthorization, and the funds needed for the construction of such units will be authorized to be appropriated

along with the authorization for construction. This procedure will provide the Congress with proper surveillance and control over further development by the Department of the Interior in the Missouri River Basin.

Amount authorized to be appropriated:

Flood Control Act, Dec. 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887)-----	\$200,000,000
Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 641)-----	150,000,000
Flood Control Act, May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 170)-----	200,000,000
Flood Control Act, July 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 297)-----	200,000,000
Flood Control Act, July 14, 1960 (58 Stat. 891)-----	60,000,000

Total authorized to be appropriated to date-----	810,000,000
Less net allotments to projects as of June 30, 1962 <sup>1</sup> -----	-688,589,317

Balance available as of June 30, 1962-----	121,410,683
Less fiscal year 1963 appropriation-----	-56,421,409

Estimated balance June 30, 1963-----	64,989,274
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964-----	80,000,000

Deficit monetary authorization-----	-15,010,726
Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964-----	16,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Total Missouri River Basin project C. & R. for regions 6 and 7 and technical records.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes other Department of the Interior agencies.

How critical is this situation? You may judge by the fact that the Chief of Engineers has already given, or will soon give, written notice to contractors that funds for the continuation of works will be or have been exhausted and that they may choose whether to shutdown or proceed at their risk. The schedule for this action is as follows:

Basin	Date of letter to contractors	Date of estimated exhaustion of funds
Los Angeles-San Gabriel, Ohio-----	July 10, 1963	Aug. 10, 1963
Central and southern Florida-----	Oct. 24, 1963	Nov. 24, 1963
Brazos-----	Oct. 29, 1963	Nov. 29, 1963
Columbia-----	Nov. 1, 1963	Dec. 1, 1963
Arkansas-----	Dec. 9, 1963	Jan. 9, 1964
White-----	Dec. 15, 1963	Jan. 15, 1964
	Feb. 14, 1964	Mar. 14, 1964

What will shutting down these projects cost? The amount will vary, but it may run to \$500 million in stoppage, loss of time, idled equipment and manpower, claims against the Government, loss of benefits, and many other hazards.

The local communities where these projects are located will suffer greatly in loss of payrolls, rentals, and adjustment of business keyed to these construction jobs.

Also at stake is the reputation of the Federal Government as a party to a contract. Future public works will surely suffer when contractors are asked to bid. Will they add a factor for uncertainty of an opportunity to complete a contract as bid?

I urge the House and the Senate Public Works Committees to weigh the seriousness of the consequences of this situation and to act to break this stalemate so that we can appropriate funds to carry to completion these 58 projects—all of which Congress has approved.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from

Arkansas for his continued support in connection with this matter. I appreciate very much his kind remarks.

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

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

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, after the enacting clause, to insert:

"That the following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the provisions of 201 and 202 of Public Law 874, Eighty-seventh Congress (76 Stat. 1180), and to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this Act with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *Provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission: *And provided further*, That the monetary authorizations for the river basin plans, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, are hereby increased and additional projects authorized as follows:"

On page 2, after line 17, insert:

#### "WEST BRANCH SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

"An additional sum of \$2,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the West Branch of the Susquehanna River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of September 3, 1954."

After line 22, insert:

#### "CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN

"The project for the comprehensive development of the Cape Fear River Basin, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 508, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$25,143,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct joint investigations and surveys of the upper tributaries of the Cape Fear River in the interest of watershed protection and flood prevention, and the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, such surveys and investigations and the report thereon to be prepared and submitted in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 639, Eighty-seventh Congress, and said surveys and investigations are hereby authorized."

On page 3, line 15, after the word "of", strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$21,000,000"; after line 19, insert:

#### "APALACHICOLA RIVER BASIN, GEORGIA

"The general plan for the comprehensive development of the Flint River Basin, Georgia, for flood control and other purposes

recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, is approved and the construction of the Spewell Bluff Reservoir on the Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in said report at an estimated cost of \$63,200,000."

On page 4, line 6, after the word "of", strike out "\$14,000,000" and insert "\$30,000,000"; in line 12, after the word "of", strike out "\$31,000,000" and insert "\$157,000,000"; after line 16, insert:

"That the modification of the existing project for the Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas, in order to provide for the construction of a sewage outfall system for the city of Russellville, Arkansas, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1185), is hereby modified to provide that the United States shall assume the full cost of constructing said facilities, at an estimated additional Federal cost of \$404,000."

On page 5, line 1, after the word "of", strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$8,000,000"; after line 5, insert:

#### "RED RIVER BASIN

"The Waurika Dam and Reservoir on Beaver Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 33, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$25,100,000: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir."

After line 14, insert:

#### "MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

"An additional sum of \$80,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented."

"The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented, is further modified to include such bank protection or rectification works at or below the Garrison Reservoir as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army may be found necessary, at an estimated cost of \$3,000,000."

On page 6, line 5, after the word "of", strike out "\$47,000,000" and insert "\$150,000,000"; after line 9, insert:

"The proviso contained in the authorization for the project for flood control and allied purposes on Laurel River, Kentucky, authorized by Public Law 86-645, approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 496), is hereby modified to read as follows: *Provided*, That construction of the project shall not be commenced until the power marketing agency has informed the Corps of Engineers that the power generated by the project can be sold at rates which will insure repayment within fifty years, with interest, of all costs allocated to power."

After line 18, insert:

#### "UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

"An additional sum of \$11,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Upper Mississippi River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented."

On page 7, line 2, after the word "of", strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert "\$30,000,000"; in line 8, after the word "of", strike out "\$36,000,000" and insert "\$195,000,000"; and after line 14, insert:

"The Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Montana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House

Document Numbered 403, Eighty-seventh Congress: *Provided*, That such project shall be operated and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and the sum of \$50,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of said project.

"Sec. 2. In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$100,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan adopted by section 9(a) of the Act approved December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress), as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress, for continuing the works in the Missouri River Basin authorized to be undertaken under said plan by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by making the following statement:

Before the Senate adjourns for the Thanksgiving recess—I wish to make one or two comments in regard to H.R. 8667—which the Senate will vote on next week.

It is unfortunate, I think, that we were unable to complete action on this bill before the recess.

Projects of serious concern to many Senators are dealt with in this measure.

I refer particularly to the authorizations for continued appropriations for a number of river basin projects—some of which have, or are about to, run out of funds.

I wish to have the RECORD show very clearly that the Senate Public Works Committee and, so far as I know, the majority have been ready to act on this bill since we reported it to the floor on November 21.

Action now would permit us, it is hoped, to go to conference with the House early next week.

Actually, this is not a new measure before the Senate; and I fail to understand why there is a sudden effort to delay the bill's passage.

These projects have been dealt with twice by the Senate in the past 13 months—the latest occasion being July 29.

Indeed, this version of the measure deals with even fewer projects than those covered by H.R. 6016, which we passed on July 29.

Technically, we do not even need to pass this bill, since H.R. 6016 can still be sent to conference by the House—as asked for by the Senate.

But in an effort to meet the House more than half way and in an effort to help colleagues who are vitally concerned with expiring funds for river basins, the Senate Public Works Committee agreed to act again on a compromise measure.

That is what we have in H.R. 8667; and it is very unfortunate that we are unable now to take final action on this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Ohio, who is a member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I desire to associate myself with the remarks made by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished senior

Senator from Michigan. I agree with his expressed desire that the projects proceed without further delay. The Senator from Michigan is rendering a needful public service, and I hope that Senators will pay heed to his urgent wishes and that we will consider the question without further delay.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

#### SENATORS SHOULD DISCLOSE THEIR FINANCIAL HOLDINGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate concerning the problem of conflict of interest about which we have been hearing quite a bit in recent weeks. An investigation is now being conducted into conflict-of-interest allegations involving Senate employees by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN]. The chairman of the committee is proceeding with that investigation with fidelity, zeal, intensity, and impartiality. This investigation has caused comment on the entire question of conflict of interest, which has been raised from time to time in recent months by many newspapers, editors, and citizens in regard to Senators and Members of the House of Representatives themselves.

This is always somewhat of a problem. No lawmaker should allow himself to be placed in a position of weighing his own private interests against the general public welfare on any issue whatever.

In 1958, when I was seeking election to the office I now occupy, I went throughout the State of Ohio, appearing in 86 of the 88 counties in Ohio. I put a great deal of energy into the effort at a time when I was entirely lacking in financial backing. I made two promises to the citizens of Ohio and to all who were good enough to come out and listen to me. At that time, in 1958, I stated that if elected Senator, I would make public all the financial holdings that I had acquired over the years. In addition, I would discontinue the private practice of law. By doing both of those things, I would assure the citizens of my State that, if I were chosen as their Senator, they would know that no question of conflict of interest could involve me.

Both promises have been kept. I recall distinctly on or about December 15, 1958, when my name was removed from the law office door in Cleveland, Ohio, where I had practiced for approximately 40 years, and during which time I had served as president of two bar associations. I recall that the editor of one of the Cleveland newspapers asked if I would pose in front of that door and appear to be removing my name from my law office door.

To that question I stated, "No, indeed. I will not perpetrate any Calvin Coolidge

stunt and have an Indian bonnet on my head. I have already directed the office of the National City Bank Building to remove my name."

My name was removed from the door.

The facts are that I felt like weeping, because I had been practicing for so many years in Cleveland.

Regarding my financial holdings, I point out that all of my holdings were disclosed in a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Senate in March of 1959. I took the oath of office as Senator in January. Perhaps there was hesitancy on my part to disclose my entire financial assets. But I did so. In my lengthy letter to the Secretary of the Senate, I told him that he could make that information public.

In addition, since I have been appointed to serve as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I sold stock that I owned in Pan American World Airways and various sugar companies.

There is no use crying over spilled milk. I believe that my action in selling those stocks and taking a financial loss at that time might have been unnecessary, for if a Senator or a Member of the other body fully discloses his financial holdings to the people of his State, they know what he has and can judge for themselves whether he is voting to further his own private interest or voting in accord with his judgment and conscience in the public interest.

Nevertheless, I did disclose my financial assets in March of 1959, to the embarrassment, I understand, of some members of my family. Since that time I have annually written to the Secretary of the Senate and cataloged the list of securities I hold.

It is amusing to recall some of the reaction to my action. In 1959 the president of a leading bank in Cleveland is quoted as having said, "I did not know that the little so-and-so had so much money." The truth is that, according to some standards, I did not have so much after all, and I have less now. But the facts are that when I wrote that letter to Secretary of the Senate in March of 1959, that was the very first time that such action had been taken by any Senator or Representative in Congress. Since that time the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and other Senators have followed suit and have publicly disclosed their financial holdings.

Such disclosures may be embarrassing, and are embarrassing, to members of families of legislators, but I feel they are proper. I invite attention to what I did in connection with this matter, neither because I have waged a crusade on the subject nor because I intend to, but because I want the citizens of my State to be able to judge whether I, as their Senator, consider the public welfare paramount to my own selfish interests.

Some Members of Congress actively practice law while they are on the public payroll and, in my opinion, are subject to criticism. I made the promise, to the people of Ohio not to practice law, because my opponent in that campaign was

the active head of a law firm, and for many years his salary as a Senator went directly from the Disbursing Office of the Senate to the law firm. He drew from that law firm \$2,000 a month, so he said. While I do not believe he said it, the fact is that he drew a dividend from the earnings of the firm, when they were split up at the end of the year, or, as some law firms do, twice a year.

In the course of my campaign I was critical of my opponent because his law firm represented the Pennsylvania Railroad and other railroad corporations. Those corporations and officials of those corporations were opposing the great St. Lawrence Seaway before the committees of the Congress and speaking out against it in public.

As the present Presiding Officer, who comes from Indiana (Mr. BAYH in the chair), knows, the St. Lawrence Seaway was considered a great thing for all States of the Middle West, as it is proving to be. Every Democrat and every Republican Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate from Ohio supported the great St. Lawrence Seaway, except my opponent. For this reason I claimed that private influences rather than the public welfare, actuated his vote. I made a promise at that time. I fulfilled it.

Some Members of Congress who actively practice law while on the public payroll perhaps never think of the fact that, as a result of going before the electorate of their district or of their State, of their own free choice they have sold their services, their talents, and their experience to the people of the United States and to no one else, when they draw their salaries as Members of Congress.

I make this statement because it is a matter of some pride. I was the first Member in either branch of the Congress to make such a disclosure.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator from Ohio for his statement, for his forthrightness, and for his fine record of public service in this body, as well as for his record of civic service throughout his entire life. He is a great asset to the Congress, and I have no doubt that he will continue to serve here for many years.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the distinguished deputy majority leader for his kind remarks.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committees of the Senate may be permitted to file reports during the adjournment of the Senate.

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

#### ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR SALEM MARITIME NATIONAL HISTORICAL SITE IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 640.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 976) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and add certain lands to the Salem Maritime National Historical Site in Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I desire recognition before the Senate votes on the measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I assure the distinguished acting minority leader that these measures were cleared with the appropriate committee personnel. I regret that I did not speak to the Senator about it earlier.

Mr. KUCHEL. Not at all. I see that they are cleared, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 976), which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 660), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 976, by Congressman BATES, is to provide for the acquisition of the 17th-century Narbonne House in Salem, Mass., and for its administration as part of the Salem Maritime National Historic Site.

#### NEED

The Salem Maritime National Historic Site was created pursuant to the acts of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), and May 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1374). It presently includes the old Custom House, Hawkes House, and Derby Wharf, all of them reminders of the day of sailing ships when the American flag was carried from Salem to all quarters of the globe. The Narbonne House, which is located on the same block as Derby House, will be a valuable addition to this collection. It is one of three houses in Salem known to have been built before 1675, and was, during a long part of its life, intimately associated with Salem's seafaring life. It is also an important example of the architecture of the period during which it was built.

#### COST

The Narbonne property can be acquired for the \$18,000 authorized to be appropriated, according to the Park Service. Additional annual operating costs of the site will be nominal.

#### ALASKA MINERAL LANDS SELECTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 641.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1878) to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into

the Union in order to extend the time for filing of applications for the selection of certain lands by such State.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1878), which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (h) of section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union", approved July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339), as amended, is amended by striking out "five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "ten years".*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 661), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

#### PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of S. 1878 is to give the new State of Alaska an additional 5 years from January 3, 1964, in which to select lands under Federal mineral lease. The right of such selection was granted to the State in section 6(h) of the Alaska Statehood Act (act of July 7, 1958; 72 Stat. 339), which provided a 5-year period in which such selections must be made. Alaska became a State by Proclamation 3296, signed by President Eisenhower on January 3, 1959, and published in the Federal Register on January 5, 1959 (24 F.R. 81; 73 Stat. c16). Thus, unless legislation extending the selection period is enacted, the State's rights under subsection 6(h) with respect to lands under mineral lease will terminate shortly.

#### NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The Statehood Act granted Alaska more than 103 million acres out of the 378 million acres of Federal lands in the then territory. These grants, which were in the historic tradition of land grants to newly admitted States, were for the purpose of enabling Alaska to carry out the responsibilities and functions of State Government and to provide for economic and population growths. For the most part, the State was given a 25-year period in which to make its selections of these lands. With respect to lands under Federal mineral lease, however, the selection period was limited to 5 years from the date of admission. The intent of the grant of the right of selection of mineral lands was primarily to avoid the confusions which would result from differing ownership in geologic units. Unity of ownership with its consequent uniformity of leasing or other disposition clearly is in the interest of efficient, economical development of mineral resources.

At the hearings, testimony by both Alaska Senators and by officials of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior, established the fact that the Alaska selection program had been subject to a series of unforeseen delays which were not the result of lack of diligence and initiative on the part of the State. Regulations for putting the program into effect were not promulgated until some 18 months after statehood. Other time-consuming problems arising out of withdrawal policies and cadastral surveys have caused further delays.

As a result, only approximately a million acres of the 103 million acres granted have

been patented to the State thus far. Further time is essential if the intent of Congress as expressed in the Statehood Act is to be fulfilled.

Accordingly, your committee urges prompt approval of S. 1878.

#### PHOSPHATE RIGHTS IN CERTAIN LANDS IN FLORIDA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 642.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 167) to provide for the conveyance under certain conditions of the phosphate rights in certain lands in the State of Florida.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "patents", to insert "or other instruments of conveyance"; in line 5, after the word "issued", to strike out "to entrenchmen"; in line 6, after "(38 Stat. 509)", to insert "as amended (30 U.S.C. 121-123)"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "that", to strike out "such" and insert "the land is to be utilized for urban, suburban, or other intensive development and that the"; in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "the sum of \$200" and insert "a sum to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior", and in line 17, after the word "of", to strike out "the sum of \$200" and insert "such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior"; 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 in cases where patents or other instruments of conveyance for public lands in the State of Florida have been issued under the provisions of the Act of July 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 509), as amended (30 U.S.C. 121-123), reserving to the United States the right to any phosphate deposits therein, the Secretary of the Interior shall, upon (1) application and proof that any such land is either non-phosphate in character or not prospectively valuable for phosphate, (2) proof that the land is to be utilized for urban, suburban, or other intensive development and that the reservation is impeding development of such land, and (3) payment of a sum to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse the United States for administrative costs, convey such phosphate right in such land to the record owner or owners of the surface rights in such land.

Sec. 2. In any case where the right to any phosphate deposits has been reserved to the United States as described in the first section of this Act and such right is determined by the Secretary of the Interior to have a market value, the Secretary is authorized to sell such right to the record owner or owners of the surface rights in such land in return for the payment of such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse the United States for administrative costs plus an amount equal to the fair market value of such right, as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary.

Sec. 3. Amounts paid to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this Act shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 662), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 167, which is sponsored by the senior Senator from Florida, the Honorable SPESSARD HOLLAND, is to authorize the conveyance to the surface owners of phosphate rights reserved to the Federal Government in certain lands in the State of Florida. These phosphate rights were required to be reserved by the United States under the provisions of the act of July 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 509), as amended (30 U.S.C. 121-123). In the half century since the reservation, the surface of many of these Florida lands has become of great value for developmental purposes, but in a large number of instances, the lands have no value for phosphates—or at best only nominal value. Nevertheless, the Federal mineral reservation constitutes a cloud on title, interfering with financing and thus hindering development through private enterprise.

#### HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

Over a period of many years, private bills have been introduced in successive Congresses to authorize sale and conveyance of the reserved phosphate rights in individual tracts to the named surface owners. Such private legislation is a cumbersome and expensive way of attaining the socially and economically desirable purpose of encouraging private enterprise without loss or cost to the Federal Government. Enactment of S. 167 will make such private bills unnecessary, and will place responsibility for determining the facts in each case on the proper administrative officer who is in a position to obtain and judge such facts.

#### EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS

Under the terms of S. 167, as amended, where the lands are shown to be non-phosphate in character or not prospectively valuable for phosphate, and where the reservation is impeding urban, suburban, or other intensive development, the reserved mineral rights are to be conveyed by the Secretary of the Interior to the owners of record of the surface of the land at a sum adequate to reimburse the United States for the costs of such conveyance. Where the Secretary determines that the phosphate rights do have a market value, then the conveyance is to be made for an amount equal to the fair market value of the reserved rights, plus the administrative costs.

Thus, under S. 167 the Federal Government will be fully reimbursed both for the fair market value of any property it is conveying and for the administrative costs of such conveyance. The surface owners will be enabled to remove the cloud on title to their lands and to proceed with development.

#### THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amended the bill in accordance with the recommendations of the Department of the Interior which are set forth in detail and explained in the report of the Department on S. 167, dated March 19, 1963. They are designed to give Federal interests still greater protection, and to lay down more specific guidelines for administration of the proposed law.

The committee notes that the Department of the Interior has testified with respect to previous legislation authorizing transfer of phosphate rights that in many instances the administrative costs of the conveying will be less than the \$200 amount proposed in the bill as introduced.

#### EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION OF WRECKED MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 644.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2906) to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2906), which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 664), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

#### I. INTRODUCTION

H.R. 2906 would amend subsection (b) of section 203 of the Interstate Commerce Act by adding a new paragraph (10) which would exempt the emergency transportation of any accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing. Section 203(b) contains exemptions for various kinds of motor carriers from economic regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Public hearings were not considered necessary on this proposed legislation.

#### II. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Under the present provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, a person wishing to engage in the interstate or foreign transportation of accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicles by towing must secure operating authority from the Commission and must otherwise comply with its regulations. (See Hanavan Common Carrier Application, 72 M.C.C. 477 (1957).) This appears to the committee to be one of the aspects of transportation which could be removed from the "sphere of regulation," thereby enabling the Commission, to a limited degree, to devote more attention to matters of greater regulatory importance. Except for safety of operation, and qualifications and hours of service of employees, the continued regulation of this traffic does not appear to the committee to be justified because of its limited role in the national transportation system.

In addition, the committee notes that highway emergencies of the type contemplated by this bill frequently occur at irregular hours, inconvenient locations, and may well require immediate towing attention. It is anticipated, therefore, that the reported bill will benefit the public by permitting more rapid, efficient, and flexible service from tow truck operators. This is particularly true when the accident occurs just across a State border and the nearest tow

truck operator within that State is some distance from the mishap. At the same time ready service might well be obtained from just across the border. This out-of-State service could not be utilized, under existing law, unless that operator were certificated by the Commission.

The effect of this bill would be to relieve garages, service stations, and similar establishments from the necessity of obtaining authority and rate approval from the ICC in the towing of motor vehicles away from a wreck on the highways. This would not remove the controls on safety or hours of service, nor would it relieve other interstate towing services, such as the movement of motor vehicles or house trailers.

Concern was expressed to the committee that the rates charged by carriers in the absence of regulation might be placed at excessive levels. The committee, and, it is expected, the Interstate Commerce Commission, will watch this situation closely. In the event that excessive rates are charged, it may be necessary to pass appropriate legislation at a later time.

In the 86th Congress, 2d session, this committee reported and the Senate passed S. 2375 (S. Rept. 1343) which, with one technical change, is identical to the bill now before the committee. The House did not act. The present bill, H.R. 2906, embodies several amendments which have been made to the proposal during the last several years, particularly to define the vehicles which may be towed under this legislation. H.R. 2906 as passed by the House would provide an exemption from the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act for the emergency transportation of any motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing.

#### SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE SEAT BELTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 645.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 134) to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 134), which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "motor", to strike out "vehicles" and insert "vehicles other than those of carriers subject to safety regulations under part II of the Interstate Commerce Act", and on page 2, line 13, after the word "whoever", to insert "knowingly and willfully."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 665), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

#### SUMMARY OF THE LEGISLATION

H.R. 134 is designed to protect the public by providing for the establishment of minimum Federal safety standards for automobile seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce.

This would be accomplished by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe and publish minimum safety standards for seat belts manufactured for sale or offered for sale in interstate commerce, imported into the United States, or shipped in interstate commerce. Manufacture for sale, the sale or the offering for sale, in commerce, or importation into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, or for the purposes of sale, or delivery after sale, in commerce, of any seat belt which does not meet the standards prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce would be unlawful, and if done knowingly and willfully, be punishable by a fine of up to \$1,000, imprisonment for 1 year, or both. No hearings have been held by your committee.

#### NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The efforts to encourage the general use of seat belts by the motoring public could largely be nullified if a substantial segment of the public were to be furnished equipment which was improperly manufactured, and offered little or no real protection. With the rapidly growing public acceptance and demand for seat belts, there is a present danger that a good part of this demand may be met by the marginal operator offering an inadequate and unsafe product.

Automobile seat belts of inferior quality and design are being placed on the market in response to the growing public demand. There is no way to determine how many substandard seat belts are now being used by unsuspecting motorists, but the number will increase unless there is some means to establish adequate standards, such as this bill provides. The vast majority of seat belt manufacturers are maintaining high standards of quality. Unfortunately, however, a few manufacturers and dealers who are more concerned with profit than with public safety are placing on the market inferior and unsafe seat belts.

The States have traditionally exercised regulatory authority over motor vehicle safety features; however, as the President pointed out in his March 15, 1962, message on consumer protection and interest program, consumers have a right to be protected against the marketing of goods which are hazardous to health or life. The President made clear that the Federal Government has a responsibility to consumers in the exercise of this right.

In the 87th Congress, 2d session, the committee reported favorably H.R. 2446, a bill to provide that hydraulic brake fluid manufactured for use in motor vehicles sold or shipped in commerce must meet standards to be set by the Secretary of Commerce. This legislation became Public Law 87-637.

Safety standards for seat belts like safety standards for hydraulic brake fluid are a matter of Federal concern, and the committee believes would not depart from the traditional State exercise of regulatory authority over automobile safety. The seat belt is a unique item of personal safety equipment, originally derived from aircraft practice, rather than a safety feature which is exclusively automotive. Inasmuch as the bill deals only with the quality of belts and related hardware, rather than with such traditional State matters as installation and use, the committee anticipates that it would

furnish a new area for effective Federal-State cooperation.

Federal safety standards have been established with respect to aircraft equipment by the Federal Aviation Agency, and with respect to certain technical truck requirements by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Secretary of Commerce should have no difficulty in complying with the provisions of this legislation inasmuch as seat belt standards have been established by the Society of Automotive Engineers and by the General Services Administration.

The committee considers that the enactment of H.R. 134 would be in the public interest. The purpose of this legislation is to save lives, and to improve highway safety.

#### COSTILLA CREEK COMPACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 646.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5949) to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek Compact.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5949), which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 666), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

#### PURPOSE

H.R. 5949 would give the consent of the Congress to certain amendments agreed upon by the States of Colorado and New Mexico to the Costilla Creek compact. The amendments make minor changes in the allocations for diversion of the natural flow of Costilla Creek for beneficial use in the two States and in the schedule of deliveries of direct flow water to Colorado by New Mexico. The States of Colorado and New Mexico have already ratified the amended compact.

#### COST

The enactment of H.R. 5949 would not involve any cost to the Federal Government.

#### EXPLANATION AND NEED

Costilla Creek is a tributary of the Rio Grande. It rises on the west slope of the Sangre de Cristo Range in the extreme southeastern corner of Costilla County, Colo. The creek flows in a generally westerly direction, crossing the boundary between the two States three times before it joins the Rio Grande in New Mexico.

A compact providing for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of Costilla Creek was concluded in 1944, and Congress granted its consent to this compact by the act of June 11, 1946. The compact is administered by the Costilla Creek Compact Commission which is comprised of officials from each State. The U.S. Geological Survey collaborates with the commission in the correlation of water data necessary for the proper administration of the compact.

Among other things, the compact provides for the integrated operation of existing and

prospective irrigation facilities on the stream in both States. It also sets out the jurisdiction of each State over irrigation works and facilities diverting and storing water in one State for use in both States.

The Jarosa Mutual Ditch Co. of Colorado is served by the Cerro Canal which diverts water from the Costilla Creek in New Mexico and extends northwesterly to the State boundary. This company recently purchased 5.88 cubic feet per second of the water allocated to Colorado for delivery to the Acequia Madre ditch, one of the main irrigation canals crossing the boundary. The ditch company wishes to change the point of diversion and the point of delivery of this 5.88 cubic feet of water from the Acequia Madre ditch to the Cerro Canal. It was determined that, in order to effect the proposed change in point of diversion and changes in delivery, the Costilla Creek compact should be amended. Amendments have been made to the preamble, articles III 1(a), IV(c), V(b), and article IX.

Section 2 of the act of June 11, 1946, expressly provides that nothing in the original compact would affect the obligation of any of the parties to the Rio Grande compact. This disclaimer remains applicable to the amended compact.

#### AUTHORIZATION TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO MARKET POWER GENERATED AT AMISTAD DAM ON THE RIO GRANDE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 647.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4062) to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 14, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 2. The Act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255), is amended by adding a new section 4 to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. The release of United States water from the Falcon and Amistad Dams for the production of hydroelectric energy shall be such as not to interfere with United States vested rights to the use of water for municipal, domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes or with storage of water for these purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 667), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

#### PURPOSE

This legislation was recommended by the Department of the Interior and introduced by Mr. Rogers of Texas. The purpose of the legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to market electric power and energy from Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande. It further provides authority to construct necessary transmission lines to integrate the power facilities at the Falcon Dam and Amistad Dam projects if the interconnection of these two projects is determined to be financially feasible. All the provisions of the 1954 act relating to the Falcon project are made applicable by H.R. 4062 to the power operations of the Amistad project.

#### NEED

Construction of Amistad Dam and powerplant was authorized by the act of July 7, 1960 (74 Stat. 360). This authorization, however, made no provision for marketing the energy or for interconnecting the Amistad plant with the Falcon plant which is already in operation. Enactment of H.R. 4062 will overcome these omissions. It is necessary to a finding of feasibility with respect to electric power development at the Amistad Dam and is urgently needed so that the Secretary of the Interior will have authority to market the electric power and energy from Amistad Dam as soon as it becomes available.

#### COST

It is estimated that approximately \$10,000 a year will be required for marketing expenses. The appropriation of funds for the powerplant has been previously authorized. The entire cost of the power facilities, including the costs for operation and maintenance and any other costs required in connection with marketing the energy, will be repaid with interest under the provisions of the act of July 7, 1960, which authorized the construction of the Amistad powerplant on a self-liquidating basis.

#### BACKGROUND

The Falcon Dam and the Amistad Dam are both constructed under agreements between the United States and Mexico. The Falcon Dam was authorized by the act of October 5, 1949 (63 Stat. 701) and the Secretary of the Interior was designated to market the U.S. portion of the power and energy made available from the Falcon Dam project by the act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255). The construction of the Amistad project, including a powerplant if found feasible, was authorized by the 1960 act cited above. Construction of the project is by the International Boundary and Water Commission. Funds have been requested for inclusion in the fiscal year 1964 appropriation bill for initiating construction of the U.S. powerplant. The powerplant would have an initial generating capacity of 32,000 kilowatts and is estimated to cost \$10.8 million. The annual cost for amortizing the power facilities and for operation and maintenance is estimated to be \$567,000. Two electric cooperatives in the area have passed resolutions indicating their willingness to purchase the energy at rates which would repay the costs.

#### THE COMMITTEE'S CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

The committee concluded that this legislation is necessary in order to provide for marketing the electric energy from the Amistad project. There can be no feasible or self-liquidating power development at the Amistad Dam without this legislation. On the other hand, if marketing authority is

provided, testimony given the committee indicates that the development is feasible. During the committee's consideration of this legislation, the representative of the Department stated that the committee would be advised of any determination to construct transmission lines connecting the Falcon project and the Amistad project. The committee reaffirms its desire to have this notification and the study upon which such a decision is made. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends that H.R. 4062, as amended, be enacted.

#### PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today I released a statement concerning the remarkable address by President Lyndon B. Johnson to the joint meeting of the Congress.

This statement conveys my respect and esteem, not only for the message, but also for our new President. As I said, it was a message that exemplifies the qualities and character of the President of the United States.

This message carries on the spirit and the philosophy of President Kennedy, and expresses a new determination to breathe life into the effort to put that philosophy into practice.

Those of us who knew President Johnson as majority leader of the Senate know that he insists on performance and action. His message today demands just those qualities.

President Johnson has asked Congress to build a memorial to President Kennedy through a program of legislative action. President Johnson pledges his administration to the Kennedy objectives and to a continuation of the policies and programs initiated by our late and beloved President.

This is a message calling for action, a message which condones no delay. It is a message which places emphasis on the two great issues facing the Nation—equal opportunity and a guarantee of civil rights for all Americans, and a tax program designed to give our economy greater power, greater prosperity, and more job opportunities.

Those in other lands should be reassured that there will be no faltering in our policies, no hesitancy in our will to fulfill our commitments, and no retreating from the responsibilities of leadership.

I happen to believe that this message was a sort of clarion call to the Congress and the people of this Nation to fulfill the tasks that lie yet uncompleted, to do the job we were elected to do, and to see to it that this Nation grows not only in its economic strength, but also in its unity, its sense of purpose, and its moral strength.

I again want to join my colleagues who have spoken publicly and privately in commending President Johnson for his message. In doing so he has given this Congress a great lift and inspiration. I know he has given the people of the United States a sense of competence and assurance which was so desperately needed in these critical times.

## HE HAD THAT SPECIAL GRACE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, those of us who want to perpetuate in our hearts the memory of John F. Kennedy can find special assistance from a rare and beautiful tribute paid to him by one of his closest and most devoted friends.

I ask unanimous consent that an article in Newsweek Magazine, "He Had That Special Grace," by Benjamin Bradlee, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

## HE HAD THAT SPECIAL GRACE

History will best judge John F. Kennedy in calmer days when time has made the tragic and the grotesque at least bearable. And surely history will judge him well—for his wisdom and his compassion and his grace.

John Kennedy was a wonderfully funny man, always gay and cheerful, never mean—but historians are prone to stifle laughter in formality. You could see a laugh coming in his eyes before you could hear it from his lips. His humor was often most appealing when he directed it against himself. One summer night in a Georgetown garden, candidate Kennedy was preparing for the first of many critically important appearances on "Meet the Press."

"You be Kennedy and I'll be Spivak," he suggested to his guest with relish, and the first question was already spilling forth: "All right, Horatio Alger, just what makes you think you ought to be President?"

Only days ago, his thoughts turned to the farewell party for a White House aid who had been memorialized in print as "coruscatingly" brilliant. "Those guys should never forget," he said with a smile, "50,000 votes the other way and we'd all be coruscatingly stupid."

John Kennedy was a forgiving man, far more forgiving than his friends. He forgave many the excesses of their ignorance—many men who hold high positions today because of this forgiving. He forgave quickly and for good, and soon found new quality in the forgiven.

## AN APPETITE FOR LIFE

John Kennedy was a hungry man, ravenous sometimes for the nourishment he found in the life he led and the people he loved.

This was both literally and figuratively true. He could eat 10 bowls of specially prepared fish chowder without succumbing either to indigestion or embarrassment, and though he smoked only rarely, he could chain-smoke three cigars when the spirit moved him. His ability to devour the written word was legendary, and he could unwrap presents faster than a 5-year-old.

John Kennedy was a graceful man, physically graceful in his movements—walking, swimming, or swinging a golf club—and had that special grace of the intellect that is taste. He never told a dirty joke. He could not bring himself to be "corny" at a time when "corniness" is a hallmark of American politics. On his next to last trip, to the American wilderness, this complete and urbane man was uncomfortable in the clothes of a conservationist; and he laughed loudest of all at the "Paul Bunyan" or "Johnny Appleseed" nicknames he quickly collected. During the 1960 campaign he used the phrase "Jackie and I" only once, and that was enough to embarrass him. He was a student of graceful expression, and had been since he started collecting rhetoric in a small, black leather book before the war.

## A PALMER IN POWER

John Kennedy had a Walter Mitty streak in him, as wide as his smile. On the golf course, when he was winning, he reminded himself most of Arnold Palmer in raw power, or Julius Boros in finesse. When he was losing, he was "the old warrior" at the end of a brilliant career, asking only that his faithful caddy point him in the right direction, and let instinct take over.

John Kennedy was a restless, exuberant man, always looking forward to the next challenge. For a year now, it had been "Wait till '64" more and more often. And for a long time he had wondered—at first in fun but increasingly in seriousness—what he would do after his second term. He wondered if he might become the editor of a newspaper. He had no real doubt that he would be reelected—hopefully with the mandate that he missed so much after the 1960 election, the kind of mandate that would let him do what he thought the country needed done.

He wanted to run against GOLDWATER (though he liked GOLDWATER personally more than he liked Rockefeller), and settle forever the dangers he saw in standing still. John Kennedy was a blunt man, sometimes profane, when it came to assessing rivals. But in his judgment, no man was all bad who had run for political office, and by the

same token, every man would be better if he ran for political office. He bore no man lasting grudge or envy, and his readiness to love was instinctive.

For John Kennedy was a loving man, lately come to lasting love. And historians are too far removed from love.

## A LAUGH WITH LOVE

John Kennedy reveled in love for the Irish patrimony that he had left so far behind. He laughed with love at the rogues of his grandfather, Honey Fitz, and his trip to Ireland was a pilgrimage to that love.

He loved his brothers and sisters with a tribal love. All Kennedys were born gregarious, but under siege it could be the Kennedys against the world.

John Kennedy loved his children with a light that lit up his world. He discovered his daughter when election brought them finally under the same roof, and he delighted in her pride and in her performance. His heart leapt up when he saw his son, careening through life as if there were no tomorrow, and he lit up the hearts of all who saw them enjoy each other.

And John Kennedy loved his wife, who served him so well. Their life together began as it ended—in a hospital—and through sickness and loneliness there grew the special love that lights up the soul of the lover and the loved alike.

John Kennedy is dead, and for that we are lesser people in a lesser land.

## ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock a.m. on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m., under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Friday, November 29, 1963, at 9 a.m.

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate November 27, 1963:

## DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Navy.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Independence of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on November 28, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and on this occasion we wish to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, Moktar Ould Daddah; and His Excellency, the Mauritanian Chargé d'Affaire to the United States, Mohamed Nassim Kochman.

On November 28, 1960, the last of France's African colonies attained her independence. Mauritania, which stretches over the sands of the Sahara on the northwest coast of Africa, is somewhat larger than our State of Texas but has a total population which has been estimated at roughly 650,000. Observers questioned whether this small and scattered population could carve a viable 20th-century nation state out of Mauritania's desert sands.

Mauritania has achieved remarkable progress in the 3 years which have now passed since independence. Its success has been due in measure to the dynamism of its youthful President and Premier, Moktar Ould Daddah. Even before independence Premier Ould Daddah was off to Paris and Washington in search of funds to develop Mauritania's one important resource, iron ore, the key

to the country's development. He returned with a \$66 million World Bank loan and a promise from MIFERMA, a French-controlled mining company including British, Italian, and German interests to mine the ore, transport it to the sea, and market it abroad, splitting profits 50-50 with the Mauritanian Government. The agreement included the development of port facilities. Thus Premier Ould Daddah set out to forge a modern nation from ancient Mauritania.

The territory of Mauritania received its name from the Romans, who subjugated two kingdoms inhabited by the Mauri people, or Moors. For centuries before the Europeans arrived in Mauritania its desert sands were the scenes of much of West Africa's bloodiest history as empires rose and fell. Its population is a combination of Moorish and

Negro. The large majority, in fact, are Moors, nomads of the north who move their flocks of sheep and goats from waterhole to waterhole. About one-fifth of the population is Negro, a sedentary population settled in the south of the country.

Because of this racial mixture and of its geographical location Mauritania's largest hope is to become a bridge between black and white, the connecting link uniting Africa into one continent. If Mauritania can accomplish this it will have achieved an indelible landmark on the pages of African history.

Of more immediate, if less global concern, is the internal development of Mauritania. Mauritania has become a land of striking contrasts as it has begun to move, swiftly, into the mid-20th century. Although much of the country's population still moves from place to place, taking their tents with them as they go, three new cities have sprung up from nothing in little over 3 years' time. In Nouakchott, the capital, neat modern buildings have risen where a small desert village of mud huts stood 4 years ago; all houses in the capital of 10,000 inhabitants have running water and electricity. Telephone lines link some 15 oases and towns. A 400-mile railroad is under construction along the frontier of Spanish-held Rio de Oro. Planes land at 21 airstrips. Most important, exploitation of the country's iron ore deposits holds promise of an increasingly optimistic future.

We congratulate you, President Ould Daddah, and the people of Mauritania for the progress you have achieved during 3 short years of independence in transforming your country into a modern nation state.

### The Attack on Halleck

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRED SCHWENGEL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago, a leading legislator from a Southern State made some very unfair and unconstructive comments about our minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the chairman of our national committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

In view of the serious problems facing the people of our country in the civil rights field, it is indeed most unfortunate that this type of personal vendetta is carried on against Congressmen HALLECK and MILLER who have heavy responsibilities for constructive civil rights programs.

Mr. HALLECK deserves, and has justly received, praise and recognition for the statesmanlike and realistic attitude which he has taken to move toward a unified Republican position on the civil rights front.

BILL MILLER's voting record also indicates a strong civil rights position. Certainly as chairman of the Republican National Committee, the gentleman from New York certainly shoulders a great responsibility in seeing that the Republican Party is constantly moving forward.

To Congressman HALLECK and Chairman MILLER go a well-deserved pat on the back for their constructive role in obtaining a settlement in the first step of the long path ahead for the civil rights bill. I certainly hope that we Republicans can progress in this area of civil rights without our leaders being subjected to petty criticism.

### Assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. DON L. SHORT**

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of November 26, puts into frank perspective the question of where, if anywhere, the guilt should be established—or blame laid—for the tragic assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th man to hold the highest office in the land as President of the United States of America.

I commend this editorial to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives, and the public, and under unanimous consent, I include the editorial with my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At this same time, I would also like to include a copy of my public statement, made shortly after this tragic event took place:

#### NO TIME FOR COLLECTIVE GUILT

In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

Anyone who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, Members of our Congress, and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

A Senator said that the responsibility lay on "the people of Dallas" because this is where the events took place. A spokesman

for one group of our people said the Nation was "reaping the whirlwind of hatred." One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the "hatred and malevolence" that are "eating their way into the bloodstream of American life." A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that "none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence." And these were but a few among many.

Such statements can only come from men who have not been abroad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In retrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligence of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowds of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

It was most certainly a terrible negligence on the part of the local police authorities which permitted one man to take vengeance into his own hands. It was an outrageous breach of responsibility for them to have moved a man accused of so heinous a crime in so careless a fashion. It was outrageous precisely because all the American people were themselves so outraged by the crime of assassination that anyone who knew these people ought to have known that one among them might be deranged enough to do exactly what was done.

Yet the opportunity for negligence came because here the accused was being treated as any other accused, his detention in the hands of local police, the procedures those followed for the ordinary of murders. In another land he would have been efficiently buried by a secret police in a Lubyanka prison, never again to be seen or heard of until his execution.

One might say, we suppose, that some of this negligence could be laid to all of us. It is, after all, the eager interest of the people in the persons of their leaders that brings them into open caravans, and it is the desire of the people to follow the normal ways even in murders of State that left the accused to bungling local police.

In sum, there is in all of this—let there be no mistake—much to grieve, to regret, to blame. We can't escape remorse that there are madmen in our midst, that a President is dead, that we have been denied the right to show in open court the virtue of a free society. Now we pay the price of all sorts of negligence.

But this is something different from the charge in the indictment. It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious.

Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people.

STATEMENT RELEASED BY CONGRESSMAN DON L. SHORT, REPUBLICAN, OF NORTH DAKOTA, IMMEDIATELY AFTER LEARNING OF THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

All sane-minded Americans are shocked at the tragedy of the assassination of the President of the United States.

Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, people of all races and creeds, deplore this tragic happening on what will be recorded as a dark day in our Nation's history.

This is the work of a demented person, as similar attempts on the lives of former Presidents and high Government officials have been in the past. Americans believe in, and have accepted since our Nation was founded, the principle of rule by law.

Forceful overthrow of government is completely un-American, and this shameful incident in our history is completely contrary to the principles by which this Nation, under God, was founded—to give men a new and permanent opportunity for freedom.

Our President has truly laid down his life in the service of his country.

### The President and a Former President Write

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, 1963, President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower wrote letters to Mr. Paul Roy, editor of the *Gettysburg Times* (Gettysburg, Pa.)

Three days later the pen of the President was forever silenced by a bullet, triggered by the finger of a conscienceless madman.

Little did the President realize he was writing prophetic words when he wrote of "the uncertainties of the future." Nor did he realize when he admonished "All rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of those ideals of which Lincoln spoke so luminously," that this was to be one of his last messages to the American people.

It appears fitting that this letter and that of Mr. Eisenhower, be made a part of the permanent Record, at this time.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, D.C.

PAUL L. ROY,  
*The Gettysburg Times,*  
Gettysburg, Pa.

From the past man obtains the insights, wisdom, and hope to face with confidence the uncertainties of the future. Abraham Lincoln was keenly aware of this when, a century ago, he journeyed to Gettysburg to make a few appropriate remarks.

Today, as we honor Lincoln's immortal eulogy to the dead on Cemetery Ridge, let us remember as well those thousands of American patriots whose graves at home, beneath the sea and in distant lands are silent sentries of our heritage.

Lincoln and others did indeed give us a new birth of freedom, but the goals of liberty and freedom, the obligations of keeping ours a government of and by the people are never-ending.

On this solemn occasion let us all rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of those ideals of which Lincoln spoke so luminously. As Americans, we can do no less.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

GETTYSBURG, PA.,  
November 19, 1963.

Mr. PAUL L. ROY,  
Editor, the *Gettysburg Times*,  
Gettysburg, Pa.

DEAR MR. ROY: On the 100th anniversary of his immortal Gettysburg Address, the Nation pays tribute to one of history's towering figures, Abraham Lincoln. Of all our great national leaders, Lincoln was most typically American. His achievements from the humblest beginnings to the final crowning years of his life stand as a lasting inspiration to every citizen to respect and defend the fundamental principles on which our governmental system of personal liberty and individual opportunity was founded.

The Nation calls on us now for the same faith and devotion so deeply felt by Lincoln as he stood here amid the havoc of Gettysburg to memorialize our way of life as a government "of the people, by the people and for the people." More than ever we need the example of Abraham Lincoln to guide, influence and uphold us.

The wise, compassionate, challenging words of his Gettysburg Address should be etched on the minds and hearts of every American. They will ever be one of the brightest jewels in the Nation's rich heritage.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Remarks of Lt. Col. Paul A. Fino at Memorial Services for Lt. Col. Clifford W. Johnson, Lt. Col. Jacque Segal, and Capt. William Gibson

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, on November 16 the Civil Air Patrol, an auxiliary of the U.S. Air Force, was saddened by the loss of three of its officers who were killed in a Civil Air Patrol plane which crashed in North Lindenhurst, Long Island, shortly after takeoff.

The three CAP officers attached to the New York wing were Lt. Col. Clifford W. Johnson, Lt. Col. Jacque Segal, and Capt. William Gibson.

On Sunday, November 24, memorial services were held in New York City. My distinguished colleague, Congressman PAUL A. FINO, who is a legal officer and holds the rank of lieutenant colonel was the main speaker at these services. I am privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Congressman FINO's sympathetic and understanding remarks on this sorrowful occasion:

(By Lt. Col. PAUL A. FINO, Member of Congress)

In this solemn moment, we gather to pay honor and tribute to three members of our organization who died because of love of country, dedication to a cause, and enthusiasm for aviation.

No question or controversy can disturb the tranquillity of this occasion.

It is indeed fitting and proper that we pause in the quiet and serenity of our garden of memories and reflect upon the lives of our departed brothers.

We are conscious that we are pausing under the shadow of a great loss. Although the certainty of death and the uncertainty of life are ever with us, these memorial services bring upon us a new sorrow and humbles us in our struggle toward the fulfillment of our ambitions.

These men who died in line of duty, have built temples of honor and virtue and unselfish devotion to the everlasting good of the Civil Air Patrol.

To the members of the bereaved families, we extend our deepest and profound sympathy. We ask them to seek consolation in the fact that their loved ones' lives were filled with service to mankind.

The friendship and brotherhood found in the Civil Air Patrol have few parallels in life. Each member of the CPA, young and old, men and women, from all walks of life, all creeds and all religious denominations, is a dedicated public servant. We are grateful, indeed, for the lives we honor on this occasion.

Our departed brothers had a part in the concrete expressions of the ideals of our organization. Our memorial to them must include the continued projection into the future of our accomplishments.

What better course can we of the Civil Air Patrol take than to dedicate our lives to perpetuating the strength of these memorial services? We must accept this challenge and weave the highest good of the past into the fabric of the future.

Dedication of New Office Building, National Capital Region, National Park Service

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, about 900 people attended a special program dedicating the new three-story office building of the National Capital region, National Park Service, on the grounds at Ohio and Buckeye Drives, SW.—Hains Point—on Thursday, November 14, 1963.

The program, which was presided over by T. Sutton Jett, Regional Director, National Capital Region, began at 2 o'clock with a concert by the U.S. Navy band. Following the invocation by Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, and presentation of colors, Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, introduced a number of guests including Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall; Assistant Director of the National Park Service, Clarke Stratton; District of Columbia Commissioners Walter N. Tobriner and John B. Duncan; Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia; Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, Mrs. James H. Rowe; executive director of the Washington Convention and Visitors Bureau, Clarence Arata; Superintendent Milo Christiansen, and Assistant Superintendent Joseph Cole,

of the District of Columbia Recreation Board; Architect William Haussman, formerly of the National Capital Region Design and Construction Office, who designed the building; and Victor R. Beauchamp, contractor for the building.

A short address was given by Secretary Udall, and a new composition, "National Capital Region March," by Lt. Anthony A. Mitchell, director of the U.S. Navy Band, was dedicated to the park system and played to an audience for the first time by the band.

The dedication ceremony ended with the retirement of colors, after which an open house was held.

An interesting fact about this new building is that for the first time in a history covering a 175-year period of continuing operation, this organization now has its own headquarters building.

By authority of the Resident Act of July 16, 1790, President George Washington appointed three Federal Commissioners to lay out a district, 10 miles square, for the seat of the Federal Government. Later, Pierre Charles L'Enfant was chosen to plan the new Capital. In his plan, the character of the Capital was formed by its parks. The parks were developed to provide settings for the Government buildings. In the beginning, these three Commissioners were, with broad powers, in control of all public buildings and grounds in the Federal City, but as time passed and the Government grew, certain functions of the original Federal Commissioners were given to other Federal agencies.

In 1849, the parks of Washington were assigned to the Department of Interior for administration. From 1867 to 1925, the Chief Engineer of the U.S. Army was responsible for the National Capital Parks, and in 1933, control of the parks was returned to Interior, as they became an important unit of the farflung national park system.

National park areas of the Capital at first included such areas as the Mall, the Washington Monument grounds, Franklin, and Garfield Parks, and the "President's Park." Eventually, however, 301 park reservations were established on lands acquired from the original landowners in 1791. A most significant addition to the Washington park system was the establishment of Rock Creek Park in 1890, one of the largest and most beautiful natural metropolitan parks in the world. Number of units in the National Capital Region at the present time is 771, covering an area of 39,500 acres. Visitation in 1962, in the parks of the Nation's Capital was over 15 million. This does not include the national memorials which received another 7 million. The following figures are for the year 1962: Lincoln Memorial, 2,672,294; Washington Monument, 1,758,287; Jefferson Memorial, 1,251,251; Custis-Lee Mansion, 446,473; Lincoln Museum, 261,513; House Where Lincoln Died, 163,886.

The new three-story office building for the National Capital region staff has 26,000 square feet of floor space, and was built at a cost of approximately \$1 million. The steel frame, fireproof building is of modern contemporary design, faced with Indiana limestone and brick.

There are Vermont marble window spandrels.

A U.S. Park Police headquarters building now under construction on the grounds is scheduled to be completed in March of 1964. This building, two stories in height will have 11,000 square feet of floor space, and will serve as the headquarters for the 250-man force.

Landscape features of the 11-acre area, when completed, will include a number of linden trees, flowering shrubs, and a parking area.

For the first time in many years, the principal administrative offices of the park department will be housed in one building, and it is anticipated that this move will increase efficiency of operations of the park department, which traces its legal origin to the Residence Act of July 16, 1790.

### A Nuclear Submarine in Honor of John F. Kennedy

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the late President Kennedy's love for the U.S. Navy is well known. So is his bravery and the record of his gallant service in the Navy during World War II.

Several very worthy proposals have been made in the Halls of Congress and elsewhere to pay tribute to his memory and to immortalize the man and his deeds. In the 3 years that it was destined for him to lead our Nation, he was instrumental in building up our fleet of nuclear-powered submarines for the security of our country and of the free world.

I am, therefore, proposing that we name one of these nuclear-powered submarines, now under construction at Electric Boat, Groton, Conn., in honor of the late great President. I feel that this would be a very worthy tribute to him. Consequently, I am this day writing a letter to Acting Secretary of the Navy Paul B. Fay, Jr., suggesting that the U.S. Navy name one of its submarines the U.S.S. *John Fitzgerald Kennedy*.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of my letter to the Secretary of the Navy. I am also inserting several editorials from newspapers in my district in Connecticut commenting on the tragic and untimely death of our beloved President and its meaning for the Nation. These editorials are from the Norwich Bulletin, the Middletown Press, the New London Day, and the Rockville Leader. They are as follows:

HON. PAUL B. FAY, JR.,  
Acting Secretary of the Navy,  
Department of the Navy,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: All of us are deeply grieved and stunned by the sudden death of our beloved President and many of us in

Congress are thinking of ways to perpetuate his name and to honor his memory.

In view of the late President John F. Kennedy's great love for the U.S. Navy and his gallant service in the Navy during World War II, I propose to you that the next nuclear-powered submarine to be completed at Electric Boat, Groton, Conn., be named the U.S.S. *John Fitzgerald Kennedy*. I believe this would be a most fitting and appropriate manner of paying tribute to the memory of our late President and at the same time it would also be a signal honor for the U.S. Navy to have one of its ships bear this illustrious name.

In recent months, I proposed that nuclear-powered submarines be named in honor of the Revolutionary War patriot, Haym Salomon, and the early American inventor, David Bushnell. I believe, however, that the present suggestion should take precedence over my earlier proposals for very obvious reasons.

I further suggest that when this submarine is completed and ready for launching, the courageous widow of our late President, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, who bore up so graciously under the strain of this great tragedy, be invited to christen the new ship.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,  
Member of Congress.

[From the Norwich Bulletin, Nov. 26, 1963.]

IN HIS HONOR

Amid solemnity that was hushed, yet vibrant, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, yesterday was laid to rest in a martyr's grave in historic Arlington Cemetery. The words that John F. Kennedy spoke in his inaugural address some 34 months ago, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country" will be engraved on the pages of history. They were prophetic words—and John F. Kennedy fulfilled them to the last degree. He gave his all to his country.

Even though John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead, struck down most foully by an assassin's hand, the cause he championed as acknowledged leader of the free world lives on. We who survive him can best honor his memory by doing all in our power to advance that cause which he held so precious, which is the very cause for which this Nation was founded—the liberty and dignity of all mankind.

As we thumb through the pages of history for guidance in a troubled time perhaps the best guidance for the difficult time ahead may be taken from the immortal words spoken by Abraham Lincoln on that solemn occasion at Gettysburg almost exactly 100 years ago. For President Kennedy died in defense of freedom as truly as did those who fell on that historic field of battle. In these days of profound national sorrow it is appropriate to recall and reflect on Mr. Lincoln's exhortation to his fellow Americans "that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

To resolve thus and to act thus—that is the task to which we must now turn our minds and our efforts. This is so even though grief and a deep sense of loss will far outlast the period of stunned and outraged shock of the past few days at the murderous acts that have occurred in Dallas. We cannot sink ourselves in a sea of heedless sorrow. The forces that work against the realization of man's highest dreams of liberty and dignity remain strong and malignant. Those are the forces which must now be countered with a new dedication of devotion so that John F. Kennedy's martyrdom in the fullness of life shall indeed not have been in vain.

All that was mortal of John F. Kennedy lies in Arlington Cemetery overlooking the banks of the Potomac for which he had such love, but his spirit of devotion to his country will remain forever with us as an inspiration to carry on the cause which he held so dear. The heaviest burden now falls upon Lyndon Baines Johnson, who became President of the United States at the moment John F. Kennedy's thread of life was cut by an assassin's bullet.

But all citizens of these American States in some measure must share the burden that now rests on the shoulders of President Johnson. In his first public utterance as Chief Executive, President Johnson said this to the people of America and the world: "I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask your help—and God's." His words were a commitment, and a challenge, worthy of the best that is in all of us.

The Nation must go on. The threads of the fabric that was so rudely torn apart that day in Dallas must be gathered and reweaved into an even stronger fabric of freedom and dignity. We must wear it with renewed consciousness that the entire world is watching us. We must so wear this garment of liberty and dignity so that in years to come the entire world will be wrapped in its folds. That is the best we can do to honor this man who gave so much that freedom should never perish from the face of the earth. That is our task and the task of future generations. We must not fail.

[From the Middletown Press, Nov. 25, 1963]

#### THE PRIDE AND THE SHAME

Unto the land he so dearly loved, President Kennedy was committed today. The last drum roll has dirged, the last caisson has rolled, the last 21-gun salute has echoed across Pennsylvania Avenue and the green hills of Arlington. The last chords of "Hail to the Chief" have drifted away, and now the land has hushed.

There were kings and queens, and princes, and prime ministers and presidents today in Washington, the largest assemblage of foreign dignitaries ever at once on our shores. And there were thousands of common people too, coming from near and far of this uncommon land where young men, many young men, have grown up to be President.

The pageantry and dignity of it all brought us closer to the national fabric and made us proud.

Steadfastly, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy has proved an example to us all. As her husband was a courageous man—which Ernest Hemingway once described as grace under pressure, so she has again proved to be a gallant lady. With her tiny children, she has borne with bravery the awful hours that began for her near noon on Friday. The ring she placed in her husband's dead hand, the kiss she bestowed upon our flag so proudly

draped, are moments none of us will soon forget.

Would it be that this was the whole story. But yesterday in Dallas the terrible hours continued. In the police station of the city that formerly saw Vice President Johnson spat upon, Adlai Stevenson attacked by pickets, and our President murdered, the prisoner charged with assassinating the President was murdered in the full view of the Nation.

And Dallas is worried about its image.

Whatever may be said about the wisdom of President Kennedy having gone to Dallas, or the security precautions taken there, what can be said about murder in the police station? What can be said about a nation that harbors so many people so conscious of its image, so oblivious to its laws, so willing to disregard its legal and moral precepts? Somewhere we are all failing, and not just in Dallas.

If the majesty of a young President who gave his life for his country cannot be obscured by such horrible events, the least we as citizens can do is to rededicate ourselves to all that is uniquely great about our country—that man does not take the law into his own hands, that man does follow the law of the land whether he likes it or not, that man should care for his substance and not his image. It is in the support of these ideals that we must persist.

[From the New London Day, Nov. 25, 1963]

#### NO ONE'S ABOVE THE LAW

"Why is everybody going around shooting each other?" the 8-year-old boy asked. Knowing only of the small world around him in which he is occupied chiefly with school and play, he is innocent of complex adult emotions. Perhaps because of this, his reaction is uniquely objective. After the starkness of the weekend's reality has softened and the Nation is able to consider more fully what has happened, many of the boy's elders must try to find the answer to his question.

The shocking developments in Dallas culminated yesterday in the slaying of the President's alleged assassin, even while he was under heavy police guard. This deed was done by a man who walked unquestioned into the Dallas city jail and to within a foot of his quarry, still undergoing questioning as the prime suspect in the slaying of Mr. Kennedy.

As a result, we might well ask whatever became of the principles of law and order in America, or, with the little boy, "Why is everybody going around shooting each other?"

The breakdown seems to have begun long before the assassination. It had been evident not only in Dallas but in hamlets and metropolises in many parts of the United States. It is apparent in contempt for the

minor laws as well as in the studied disregard for basic concepts of human dignity and rights embodied in the Constitution.

Lee Harvey Oswald didn't act for humanity in his heinous crime on Friday. Jack Rubinstein, the Dallas nightclub operator who slew Oswald, didn't act for Americans. Both took the law into their own hands.

As a result of Rubinstein's shot there may always be doubt as to the origins, and the possibility of others being involved, in the tragedy of Friday. It did not avenge Mr. Kennedy or the American people. There can be no sympathy for those who place themselves above the law.

The terror of the past weekend can be answered only in one way: The American people must renew their belief in law and order, in small matters and large. Freedom is based on principle and has its limits. The sober aftermath of the events in Dallas is the time to give deep thought about whether the Nation can afford to encourage or even tolerate those who would live above its laws.

[From the Leader, Rockville, Conn., Nov. 25, 1963]

#### A DAY OF MOURNING

Today is a day of mourning, not only for the Kennedy family, but for all the people of the United States and indeed the whole world.

Word Friday that President Kennedy had been assassinated spread quickly and stunned everyone. Certainly nothing has happened in the United States since Pearl Harbor that has come with such a shock.

To be sure, leaders have been assassinated in other countries of the world, and indeed three previous Presidents of the United States have died at the hands of assassins. However, most Americans have felt that we had reached a degree of civilization where such things could not happen.

President Kennedy was the youngest man ever to be elected to the Presidency. During his less than 3 years in office, he was called upon to face problems of a magnitude that few peacetime Presidents have had to face. He did this with initiative and courage.

Certainly at 46 his potential for many years of productive, useful service was great, and he most certainly would have found ways to continue his public service after his years in the Presidency were over.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy said: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." His own life was a personification of these words for his contributions in war and peace were many, including the greatest contribution of all—his own life.

The whole world is sorrowing with Mrs. Kennedy, the two Kennedy children whose relationship with their father was an ideal one, other members of his family, and his close associates.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1963

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., November 29, 1963.  
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from

CIX—1444

the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

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

#### AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, during the recess the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and the Pre-

siding Officer is authorized to sign bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

#### RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1963

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate, under its order of Wednesday last, will now recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order of Wednesday, November 27, 1963, until Tuesday, December 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.