"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 restrospect, 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 negligent 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 Lubyianka 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 there 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."

TRIBUTE TO ANOTHER HERO

We remember, too, in this moment of sorrow Officer J. D. Tippit of the Dallas Police Department. I attempted to convey some of the feeling of the people of Dallas in the following telegram to his family:

"In this hour we would like you to know that you have our deepest sympathy. May God be with you and give you strength and courage. It may comfort you to know that an entire nation recognizes the bravery and dedication of your husband and that in his death he will become an inspiration to others that we may all meet our challenges with the same courage he did whenever duty calls."

STATEMENT ON PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

President Johnson said what had to be said. He presented his plan, his beliefs as embodied in the legislation to which he has given his support. He will continue the program of the New Frontier. We admire his forthrightness and his decisive action in enunciating his program:

The tragic event of the past few days will not be forgotten by any who lived in this time, but as President Johnson stated so eloquently, the country must move forward. The legislative process must be pursued and those of us charged with the responsibility of representing the people in the Congress of the United States must make an effort to guard the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Some of us will continue to oppose the encroachments on the freedoms of the individual by big government. To abandon our convictions would be a mockery of our system and all that elected representatives of the people should be.

It is a basic part of our constitutional form of government that opposition to stated programs be expressed. Through the give and take of debate, then, we arrive at legislative conclusions in the interest of the whole Nation and all of its people.

Opposition is not hatred. Holding of views contrary to the leadership on given legislation does not make those who hold such views disloyal or accessories to murder.

Should opposition on principle be subdued because of fear of criticism, then the American concept of government will be lost and our late President will then truly have lived and died in vain.

I have faith, however, in the goodness and the stability of the American people, in the honor and judgment of our elected representatives, and I am certain we will move forward, a united nation, each of us dedicated to preserving it and the principles for which we stand in a climate of freedom in which all of us believe.

In this spirit I shall continue to point out the dangers I see in some of the specific legislation now pending. I shall continue to do my best to preserve fiscal responsibility and the soundness of the dollar and will, as I have always done, apply to each piece of legislation the acid test of its constitutionality and whether or not it is within the framework of the amount of money the taxpayers can afford to spend.

I do regret President Johnson's emotional appeal, asking for support of legislation in memory of our late President. We who believe in government of law, not men, endorse or oppose legislation on merit alone, and should not be asked to evaluate legislation on taxation, civil rights, education, and other areas on any other basis.

Also, I share the view expressed by some who sensed the inconsistency of President Johnson's avowal of belief in independence and integrity of the legislative branch just after having appealed as President, in the name of our late President, that we pass all pending administration legislation.

NOW WE LOOK AHEAD

The week has now ended and the events have been recorded in the book of history. Our duty demands that we look to the future. Our national purpose, our national character have been sorely tried, but in the magnificent response of the American people our country withstood the test. We will continue to have our differences of opinion on what means should be used to achieve the common good, but we have proved to the world and, more importantly, to ourselves that we are one people, a united people, able to band together in time of crisis and to openly express our deepest feelings when any neighbor or any fellow human being needs comfort and strength.

Looking toward the future our national purpose is unchanged—to protect and preserve this free Nation and in the words of the Constitution, "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalms 84: 11: *No good thing will the Lord withhold from them that walk uprightly.*

O Thou who art the source of every needed blessing, we beseech Thee to clarify our minds and cleanse our hearts as we face the duties and responsibilities of this day.

Show us how we may strengthen and safeguard the freedom and integrity of our Republic and make her truly great.

May we be assured that Thy continued favor toward us is to be found in obeying Thy will and in following Thy leading.

Fill us with a longing to hasten the dawning of that glorious day when all nations shall be united in the bonds of brotherhood.

Grant that in times of peril and danger we may sustain one another and in times of suffering and sorrow may we minister to one another's needs.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SENDING TO CONFERENCE INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, EVINS, CANNON, OSTERTAG, and JONAS.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 214]

Abele	Gibbons	Pepper
Ashbrook	Gill	Powell
Ashley	Glenn	Rivers, Alaska
Barry	Hall	Robison
Becker	Harsha	Roosevelt
Bennett, Mich.	Hoeven	Roush
Bolling	Jennings	St. Onge
Bolton, Oliver P.	Johansen	Selden
Brooks	Kelly	Senner
Byrnes, Wis.	Keogh	Shelley
Cameron	Kilburn	Sheppard
Celler	Lindsay	Siler
Chelf	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Colmer	McLoskey	Thompson, N.J.
Curtis	Mailliard	Thompson, Tex.
Dawson	Matsunaga	Trimble
Diggs	Milliken	Tupper
Dowdy	Monagan	Van Pelt
Dulski	Moss	White
Evins	Murphy, N.Y.	Widnall
Fraser	O'Brien, Ill.	Winstead
	Passman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 6518, AN ACT TO IMPROVE, STRENGTHEN AND ACCELERATE PROGRAMS FOR THE PREVENTION AND ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6518) entitled "An act to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution," with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, ROBERTS of Alabama, RHODES of Pennsylvania, O'BRIEN of New York, ROGERS of Florida, BENNETT of Michigan, SCHENCK, NELSEN, and BROTZMAN.

AGREEING TO SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 134, AN ACT TO PROVIDE THAT SEAT BELTS SOLD OR SHIPPED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE FOR USE IN MOTOR VEHICLES SHALL MEET CERTAIN SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 134), an act to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "vehicles" and insert "vehicles other than those of carriers subject to safety regulations under part II of the Interstate Commerce".

Page 2, line 11, after "Whoever" insert "knowingly and willfully".

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman from Alabama kindly explain if there are any fundamental changes or just what is involved in the Senate amendments?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that in my opinion these amendments improve the bill. They take from the operation of the bill those carriers who have to qualify with the ICC and they also add the words "knowingly and willfully" which would raise the degree of proof that would be required for the conviction of anyone who seeks to promulgate standards that are not adequate.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama whether all the amendments by the other body are germane to the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Yes, I think they are.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COFFEE PRICE INCREASE

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, on November 14, 1963, when the House of Representatives passed the International Coffee Agreement, I opposed it because I felt it would authorize the creation of an international cartel which would restrict world coffee production and raise coffee prices in America.

Well, the price increases are on the way. The Wall Street Journal of yesterday reported that two major coffee processors said they would join another major processor in increasing the wholesale price of ground coffee 2 cents per pound. Today, two more coffee processors joined the chorus. With a previous 2 cents per pound increase in October, wholesale coffee prices have increased 4 cents per pound within the last 6 weeks.

The mere prospects of the adoption of the International Coffee Agreement have been sufficient to increase the cost of green coffee to processors 4 cents a pound. By the time these price increases work their way from processor to roaster, distributor, and consumer, they will be substantially increased and the spiral has just begun. The 15-cent cup of coffee is practically here and the automatic vending machines may soon make it a quarter. Coffee has become a necessary stimulant to millions of Americans, who will soon stimulate Congress about the stimulated price.

As the world's largest consumer of coffee, it was folly for the United States to involve itself in price-fixing agreements which saddle such a tremendous burden upon the people of America.

A BILL TO CONTROL AND REGULATE THE SHIPMENT OF FIREARMS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. JOELSON. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to control and regulate the shipment of firearms in interstate commerce. This measure would require the seller of a gun which moved in interstate commerce to deliver it to local police officials rather than directly to the purchaser.

The bill further directs that the FBI should establish standards and regulations to assist local police departments to determine which purchasers are good risks, and to provide for periodical reporting by purchasers on the use and location of their firearms.

We certainly do not want to interfere with the rights of legitimate sportsmen to buy guns, and I believe that such persons would be glad to cooperate.

We do want to discourage the appallingly easy access to guns by juveniles, psycopaths, and hate groups. It is becoming alarmingly familiar to read of leaders of extremist political groups being found with arsenals, even including machineguns. The recent assassination of President John F. Kennedy proves that the need for this type of legislation is clear and urgent.

HERBLOCK'S CARTOONS

Mr. SIBAL. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the point of Herblock's cartoon in today's Washington Post, which shows the hatemongers crawling into their holes, is well taken but it comes very strangely from his drawing board. I recall numerous other cartoons of his which positively dripped venom against his targets and which, by being published, gave a measure of dignity and approbation to emotions of hatred

and personal vilification. Even the cartoon of today is guilty of this, in spite of its good intentions. It is sad to observe that the stream of vitriol still rolls on and that the extent of Herblock's charity seems to be "Hate All Hatemongers." I suggest he examine his own participation in the creation of the climate he apparently abhors.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the first bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN F. MACPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

BRYCE A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6182) for the relief of Bryce A. Smith.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

REVITALIZE THE AMERICAN COTTON INDUSTRY

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 464 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and, pending that, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 464 provides for consideration of H.R. 6196, a bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 4 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 6196 is to forestall the ruin of the American cotton industry and to revitalize the industry on which millions of our citizens depend for their livelihood.

The bill will end the two-price system for cotton. Domestic mills will be able to buy cotton at the world price. They now must pay approximately 8½ cents a pound more than the world price for the cotton that goes into goods sold in the United States. Cotton again will compete fairly with synthetic fibers.

Americans will enjoy lower prices for American-made cotton goods, at savings amounting to more than $500 million a year, according to competent estimates.

Farm prices will remain stabilized and protected. The legislation will protect the livelihood of millions of workers associated with cotton.

It will encourage a healthy cotton trade and merchandising system. It will assist and promote an efficient, growing, and prosperous cotton textile industry, and the United States will enjoy a fair share of the world cotton market.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration here today, H.R. 6196, has had a rather lengthy history in this, the 1st session of the 88th Congress. This specific bill was introduced originally by the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HAROLD COOLEY, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, back on May 9 of this year. The bill was reported with amendments by the Committee on Agriculture to the House on June 6 of this year.

On July 30 of this year a rule was granted and reported to the House. Of course, here today on the 3d of December we have the bill before the House for discussion.

There have been a great many charges and countercharges made with reference to this particular piece of legislation. What we are seeking to do here today by House Resolution 464 is to adopt the resolution, permit the House to go into the Committee of the Whole where they will have 4 hours to discuss the merits or demerits of this particular piece of legislation.

At the conclusion of the 4 hours, of course, the bill will be open to amendment since it is a completely open rule and the House will be able to work its will to amend or to change this in any way, in the wisdom of the House, that it should be changed.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress representing a district which produces possibly as much or more cotton than almost any district in America, I am very much concerned about the future of the American cotton industry.

This bill has been branded by various opponents with a variety of names, but I think basically that those of us who are close to the cotton industry, whether it be producing cotton or processing it, and those people involved in the textile industry in sales or in the other peripheral industries which affect the cotton industry as a whole, are all concerned over the welfare of this great industry which has throughout the history of the United States been considered to be one of our most basic industries having to do with one of the most basic commodities in the country, and which has been considered to be the money crop for a large portion of American farmers since the very foundation of our Republic.

There is no question in the minds of anyone but what the cotton industry as a whole is in dire straits. I believe it cannot be successfully contested that there is a need for changes in our cotton program if we are to continue to sustain and to maintain a successful cotton industry in this country.

I do not have any of the textile industry in my district. I think we all know pretty well where the textile industry is centered. But, certainly, it is a very vital and integral part of the cotton industry in America. The maintenance of a healthy condition of the textile industry is just as important to the overall industry of the Nation as is the healthy condition of the farmers who produce this fiber and this commodity upon which America has so long depended.

We know when we look at the figures that we have lost a substantial portion of the fiber market in this country. We have lost it to imports of various types and kinds. We have lost it to synthetics.

Today we come here on this occasion to debate the merits of the bill, H.R. 6196, and to discuss the approach which we hope we will be able to carry forward in

the immediate future to improve the cotton industry and to improve the lot of the people who have over the years depended upon this industry and to increase the employment possibilities in the industry and to improve the lot of those who produce cotton in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I urge the adoption of the resolution, House Resolution 464.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I think the record of the Committee on Agriculture shows that at least 10 million American citizens derive their livelihood from the cotton textile industry in the production, ginning, processing, transporting, manufacturing of the cotton, and in the merchandising of cotton goods. That is a substantial segment of the people in the United States who have a direct interest in a healthy and progressive textile industry.

Mr. SISK. I agree with the gentleman. I appreciate his comments. They are certainly timely.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In your opening remarks you stated one of the purposes of this bill was to end the two-price system. Does not this bill actually create a three-price system for the producers of cotton?

Mr. SISK. No. I would not agree with my good friend from Missouri that it does. I agree that the bill has certain provisions pertaining to some of the producers in this country, looking in the direction of maintaining a system of family-size farms in this country. There is a very definite desire, I think, on the part of Members of Congress to try to make it possible for many of the small farmers of this country to continue to maintain as nearly as possible a decent income.

So there are some provisions with reference to the 15-bale-or-less producers to enable them to enjoy a little higher price support than would be available to growers growing larger amounts of cotton.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, I think you missed my point. I said, would this bill not permit a three-price system for even one producer of cotton? Under this bill would it not be possible for a person who produces more than 15 bales of cotton to be supported at one price for the first 15 bales he produces and to be supported at another price for the remainder of this crop? Then under one section of the bill he would be permitted to plant additional cotton for which he would pay an amount equal to the subsidy. So that in effect one producer could actually be selling cotton at three different prices if this bill is adopted.

Mr. SISK. Let me say this to my good friend from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Can you answer that?

Mr. SISK. Let me say this to the gentleman, because the question he asks, I think, does require some little elaboration. I agree with the gentleman that this bill does provide for the situation which the gentleman recites, but it still eliminates the two-price system so far as the mills are concerned, so far as the processing is concerned, and so far as the consumer of American cotton is going to be concerned. It makes it possible for our own domestic textile mills to buy cotton in competition on an even basis with what the world price is and what the textile industries in other parts of the world buy it at. I am referring to the elimination of what today, as the gentleman knows, is an 8.5-cent differential between what a local textile company has to pay as against what the cotton is sold for in the world markets.

I agree, under the price support system to the farmer, to the grower, that the situation which the gentleman recites can exist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman take some more time, please, and let me ask one other question?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, you mentioned the fact that it would make a one-price system, but as I read the bill, do you agree with me that the subsidy to the domestic mills or the subsidy that the domestic mill would profit by might not be the same as the 8.5 cents which we are now paying on the export cotton?

Mr. SISK. Of course, let me say to my friend it depends in the final analysis on what kind of a bill we write.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am talking about the bill we have before us.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate what the gentleman is discussing, but I do not necessarily say that that would be the results of the bill which we have under discussion. As the gentleman very well knows, there is an amendment which will be offered on the floor here and which I am supporting and which I understand basically the committee of which he is a member adopted, the McIntire amendment, the amendment of the gentleman from Maine, to bring about a reduction in these price supports which will certainly change that picture, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That was going to be my next question. Was it not understood by the Committee on Rules that the McIntire amendment would be offered to this bill and it would have the support of the House Committee on Agriculture and presumably was going to be accepted in the House? Was that the understanding of the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SISK. Let me say, as one member of the Committee on Rules, that it was my understanding that the McIntire amendment would be offered. As one who happens to believe that it is a good amendment and is supporting it, I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, I have one other question. In the title of the bill the committee says: "to maintain the income of cotton producers." If we reduce the support price and the producer is not permitted to expand or to increase his acreage, how is that going to maintain his income? It would, would it not, in fact, reduce the income of the cotton producer?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Missouri knows as well as I do that unless we do something here to increase the domestic consumption of cotton, there must be a continued decrease in acreage. Even if we are going to maintain a level of 16,200,000 acres, at which it is set today, it is absolutely essential that we do something to increase the consumption of cotton. Otherwise that figure is going to be substantially reduced. Therefore, his income certainly is going to be reduced. We will try to maintain this acreage. I would hope that we would be able to do something to increase consumption, to the extent that acreage might be increased but I think we would be foolish to go out and offer any substantial amount of immediate increase; but certainly to me it is essential that we try to maintain what we have now and increase it as soon as possible. This is imperative to the income of the farmer, just as imperative and just as necessary, I think, as the so-called high-priced support which I think today has become unrealistic, because there is an ever-increasing surplus piling up.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was only pointing out that the title of the bill contains the language "to maintain the income of cotton producers" and that the income will not be maintained under the provisions of this bill. I thank the gentleman for yielding and hope I will be able to get some time later.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the comments of my good friend from Missouri. He knows that I love him, but I have to disagree with him on this bill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from California agree with me that this is one of the side effects of the foreign aid program, under which we give and equip plants to various countries, that cost them nothing. Even if the House passed this bill, unless we stop that practice we are going to destroy not only this industry, as we already practically have destroyed it, but many other industries in this country.

Mr. SISK. Let me say to my good friend from Florida that I would have to agree with him that one of the side effects has been as he has noted here; there is no question about that, however, we believe that by improving their economy we will make it possible for them to become better cash customers for our products.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I noted the answer of the gentleman from California to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], with reference to the three-price

system. Is it not true that the incentive of a 10-percent additional price on the first 15 bales of cotton is not in fact a sale, but a certificated purchase on the part of the Government, under which the cotton never changes place or position; the Government, in other words, pays to each and every farmer for 15 bales of cotton a price 10 percent above the support price and immediately takes back from that same farmer a certificate for the cotton at the support price, which is an added bonus to every producer in the United States that produces cotton, of which there are some 800,000? Am I right or wrong?

Mr. SISK. As I followed my good friend in that rather involved question I think possibly he may be right. I would like him to direct that question to some member of the Committee on Agriculture who is far better qualified technically to answer it. It is my understanding that the intent here is to try to help basically the small farmers of the country, try to maintain them until at least such time as we are able to do something better for them. I think we appreciate that.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, to include a telegram from the Governor of California, the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
December 2, 1963.

The Honorable B. F. SISK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am asking all members of the California congressional delegation to support H.R. 6196, the cotton bill authored by Congressman HAROLD COOLEY and scheduled for debate on the floor on Tuesday, December 3. Both the California Department of Agriculture and the State board of agriculture have carefully studied this measure and join in support of it. The California cotton industry produces nearly $350 million at the producer level and generates approximately a billion dollars of total wealth for our State. This bill is of vital importance, not only to cotton but to our entire agricultural economy. I respectfully request your favorable consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

WHAT COTTON MEANS TO CALIFORNIA

In the State of California, 412,000 people live wholly or in very substantial part upon incomes earned directly from cotton. These include 56,000 people living on cotton farms and 49,000 others whose breadwinners are seasonal domestic workers on cotton farms. The remaining 307,000 consist of people whose income earners work in gins, oil mills, cotton mills, etc., plus cotton's pro rata share of those living on incomes from apparel manufacturing, farm supply stores, merchandising operations, etc.

This by no means tells the whole story because no way was found to compute the number of employees concerned with cotton in banks, insurance agencies, department stores, transportation services and many other fields.

The average annual cash receipts from cotton and cottonseed by California farmers during calendar years 1960 through 1962 was $328.5 million. This makes cotton the leading crop in the leading agricultural State, far surpassing its nearest rivals, grapes ($149.4 million) and tomatoes ($122.8 million). It provides a fifth as much cash income as all other crops combined and a fourth as much as all meat animals, dairy products, poultry and eggs combined.

The total value of petroleum and all other mineral production in 1961, the latest year reported, was $1,421 million. Cotton production alone yielded 23 percent as much as this.

Thus the inevitable conclusion: If the cotton economy is crushed, California will lose one of its big income producers, which will have a depressing effect on the State's whole economic structure. If cotton survives and goes forward, it will provide a stimulant to the industry and commerce of the State as a whole.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this House Resolution 464 so that the committee may proceed to discuss this bill on its merits.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has so well explained, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H.R. 6196 with 4 hours of general debate and an open rule, subject to amendment in the Committee of the Whole, and final actions, of course, in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is the time to look at facts and to look at the record, as Al Smith used to say, and find out just why we are here and where we are at the present moment and why we have this legislation before us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the brutal truth is that this legislation is designed to pay a subsidy to cotton cloth manufacturers of the United States because we have had a rather peculiar and, in my opinion, a very foolish foreign trade policy in this country whereby we have sold our products, our cotton for instance, to foreign countries cheaper than we have sold such products to American manufacturers. Cotton cloth manufacturers in other parts of the world can buy American cotton produced on American farms and subsidized by the American Government—the U.S. Government—at 8½ cents a pound less than American cotton textile manufacturers can buy it right here at home. Then, with cheap labor overseas they can manufacture cotton cloth and make it into garments in many instances, and under our so-called foreign trade policy, our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and so forth, ship these goods to the United States and undersell the products of American factories and American labor.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the foolish and I believe sinister program that we have had in connection with foreign trade, the cotton textile mills of this country face disaster and American workingmen are out of jobs.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we see that cotton is shipped to this country from foreign lands, where under just as foolish a program of so-called aid we have shipped our cottonseed, our know-how, our ability to produce, our technical skills, to other countries such as Brazil, for instance, and to some of the Mediterranean countries, so that they can produce cotton there cheaper than we can produce it in the United States.

That has been done also at the expense of the American taxpayers.

What you see here today is just more chickens coming home to roost. What is the answer? The only answer that these planners have, and if I wanted to be abrupt and rough I might say the social climbers have, is to spend more money, to wring more money out of the American taxpayers, to spend more money to pay for the mistakes of judgment, the failure to use good, commonsense in the past in setting up some of these programs. So the proposal is here now that we pay subsidies to the cotton textile manufacturers of this country and perhaps—I do not know how under this bill, I cannot understand it myself—perhaps maintain cotton prices to the American farmer. Seemingly that will not be accomplished, if I read the measure correctly. Instead of doing the simple and sensible thing, that is, to put an old-fashioned tariff on the importation of cotton goods from abroad to protect American labor and American industry from unfair foreign competition, we have the proposal to pay subsidies to the cotton mill manufacturers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. During the previous administration, the textile industry of America made a very diligent and a very expensive effort to do just what the gentleman has suggested. That is, they went before the Tariff Commission.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that.

Mr. COOLEY. And they lost.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And then again after a little trip through a rose garden recently. I know that also.

Mr. COOLEY. And they were rejected again. They went before the Office of Emergency Planning, and they were turned down. This legislation is the only avenue left.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Except the gentleman voted for the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and I did not.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has the right to vote as he pleases.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But I thought I saw the danger at the time, and the gentleman wakes up at the last minute and sees the danger now. At this time he has another cure for it. The cure should have been a preventative one not to make a mistake.

Mr. COOLEY. It was your President who signed that bill in 1956.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not agree with my President all the time, and I would have a much higher respect for the gentleman if he did not agree with his President all the time. If you want to talk politics we can talk politics. I will take care of myself.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. It has been suggested by the previous speaker that the Tariff Commission had rejected an appeal for

a tariff regulation which would equalize costs. Is it not just as much the prerogative of this Congress to pass a bill today establishing a tariff rate equitable to American producers as it is to pass this bill?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly, because we did the wrong thing in connection with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, that is no reason why we should go further afield.

Mr. DENT. I object to the gentleman's counting me in on that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman and I will stay out.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. There will be one difference, and that would be that the Japanese manufacturers would pay the tariff instead of the American taxpayers paying the subsidy. That would be the difference.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We must not do that because they would not like it. We have got to be sure that we keep a bright and shiny image abroad.

Let me refer to the bill for a minute, if I may. This bill is presumed—and I use the word "presumed" advisedly—to encourage the increased consumption of cotton, hence the income of cotton producers—I do not know about that—to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes. If we find any way of lowering the cost of production, we will export that immediately so that our neighbors to the south and to the east of us will get the benefit. Do not worry about that.

Here are the principal provisions of the bill, as I have tried to diagnose it or analyze it.

First, beginning with its enactment and running to July 31, 1967, the Secretary of Agriculture would make payments in kind to persons other than producers; that is, to the cotton textile mills, in an attempt to eliminate the inequity of the cotton cost differential between domestic and foreign mills. That is the kernel, that is the nut right there, that is the whole question.

Until August 1, 1964, the payment rate would be at a level determined by the Secretary of Agriculture up to 8.5 cents, but presumably 5 cents a pound. From August 1, 1964, to July 31, 1967, the payment rate presumably would be about 6 cents a pound.

Second, the Secretary would be directed to conduct a special cotton research program to reduce production costs as soon as practicable. For this purpose, up to $10 million annually would be authorized subject to the regular appropriations process.

Third, beginning with the 1965 crop of upland cotton, the Secretary would be directed to reduce the level of price support to reflect reductions, if any, in the cost of growing cotton. That would not increase the income of the farmer. It might maintain it, it is true, if it works out.

Fourth, for the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops, the Secretary would be authorized to provide up to 10 percent additional price support on not over 15 bales of each farmer's production. That is the matter the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] mentioned a while ago. But the level of price support could not exceed that for the 1963 crop, presumably about 32.5 cents per pound for 15 bales and minimum of about 29.5 cents per pound for the balance of the crop in the year 1964.

In an effort to keep cotton supported at the higher level in normal channels of trade, the bill provides producer payments through the legal device of "simultaneous purchase and sale." You understand that one, I am sure. The Government sells with one hand and buys with one hand, and so forth. It must not let either hand know what the other is doing, of course.

Fifth, beginning August 1, 1964, the minimum Commodity Credit Corporation resale price would drop to 105 percent of the current loan, plus reasonable carrying charges. Present law restricts such sales at 115 percent of current support price plus reasonable carrying charges.

Sixth, at such time when the national acreage allotment reaches 17 million acres, one-half of the acreage in excess of 17 million acres would be allocated to increases in the regular acreage allotments of farmers. The other one-half would be earmarked for cotton farmers willing to produce additional cotton at world prices. We have to take care of the rest of the people, you know. This extra or overplant acreage would be up to 20 percent in addition to the regular farm allotment. There are your three stages at different prices for cotton. In order to produce this extra acreage for export, farmers would have to pay an extra "export marketing fee" equal to the current export subsidy. These collections would then be earmarked for paying export subsidies.

In spite of the remarks I have made, I have no objection to the adoption of this rule. Unless I change my mind greatly in the next 4 hours, and I am sure the very distinguished linguist from North Carolina may be able to make me change my mind, but I doubt it, I do not expect to vote for the bill. I would be very happy to support a substitute measure that might be called old fashioned and also might be very realistic, and that would be to put a tariff on all foreign manufactured cotton textiles. This would bring in revenue to the Federal Treasury, would protect American industry, and would protect American labor from this unfair foreign competition that has been wrecking the cotton textile business in the United States and has been putting a great many thousands of people out of work. It would correct an inequity for which this Congress is just as responsible as any President, regardless of what his politics or political affiliation might or might not have been in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I ask if my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, knows of anything in the bill that will be of help or benefit to the poultry producers of this country who are getting it in the neck from the Common Market in Europe?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is an entirely different problem, but it is a wonderful example that the Common Market was not set up, as so many people in America believe, for the benefit of Americans, but rather for the benefit of the Europeans who believe in and who belong to the Common Market.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it has been my privilege to have spoken on this subject on numerous occasions under special orders of the House. I think I have said about all that can be said on the subject. But I would like to again point out to the Members of the House that I represent the largest textile producing district in the United States. I also have within my congressional district the second largest cotton-producing county in the State of North Carolina.

I am convinced that this legislation is in the best interest of both of these groups. All of us are aware of the facts that have been brought out in the earlier discussion of the legislation. None of us can do anything about the errors of the past. But it seems to me that we as Representatives of the American people have an opportunity today and tomorrow to look forward to the future and to do something for the economy of our country.

In the State of North Carolina 227,000 people who earn their livelihoods at the machines in the textile plants are looking to Washington today because they are aware of the gravity of the decision which we will make. These people are hoping that the Congress will eliminate the iniquitous two-price cotton system which has been permitted to develop, as has been well stated, by executive and legislative error, and by about every other kind of error that can be conceived by political parties on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this bill will do what the committee envisions it will do. In all candor I think it is regrettable that we are in a position of having to legislate in this manner. Had the Tariff Commission done what I believe the evidence dictated they should have done under the section 22 petition filed by the Secretary of Agriculture, we would not be concerned today about this textile import problem. But, unfortunately, by a vote of 3 to 2 the people of America lost that decision in the Tariff Commission to the foreigners who sat there in the room during those days of the hearings presenting evidence adverse to the people of this country. Without getting into the details, I say we should approve this legislation for those who earn their livelihoods in the textile industry and for those who work on the farm. We know from the record that in the last few years the cotton textile industry has been going downhill, resulting in the American cotton farmer

dropping from 94 percent of the raw material used by our textile plants to 67 percent. And this will continue.

If we today fail to take up the cause of the cotton farmer and to protect his domestic market, we will have failed to serve his interest. The people of the Nation generally have a great stake in what we do, because the textile industry is the second largest employer of people of any industry that we have in America. To permit it further to be injured by these inequitable programs will not be to the best interests of the people of the Nation because of the disastrous effects that further retrocession will have on the economy generally.

So, as we approach this legislation, I hope we can do it without partisan considerations and without selfish local considerations. We must realize that the vote which we cast will be one that may well be the most important economic step we will take in this Congress. I say this because the textile industry is not just something which affects the people I am privileged to represent. It affects all of the people of the United States.

I know that you ladies and gentlemen of the House realize how important it is that we, as we legislate on this subject, bear in mind the opportunities that we have to serve the cause of America.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I do not believe it necessary to address myself further to what is in the bill because I think it has already been fully described and explained to the Members present here today. I feel there is a greater need to talk about what is not in the bill than what is in the bill.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the committee upon which I have the honor of serving, the Committee on Rules, has been maligned in most of the Nation's press the last few days for not passing out rules fast enough to accommodate certain interests; that we are called obstructionists and all of the other descriptive words that are acceptable in the public press. However, I would like to point out that here is a bill upon which we granted a rule on July 30, and for some reason that has not yet been explained—why this bill should only now be debated in the closing days of the 1st session of the 88th Congress here in the month of December.

I wonder why we are taking up a cotton bill today, with the very obvious neglect of a bigger industry, namely, the wheat industry. I have not been able to get an explanation from the gentleman from North Carolina on this procedure.

I think the statistics will reveal, Mr. Speaker, that there are about 850,000 cotton farmers—but there are 1.8 million wheat farmers. Yet suddenly it has been decided—and for what reason we have not yet been told—that there is now an emergency on cotton. Even though the bill has been before the House since July, we are told that there is an emergency now and we must take direct and positive action this afternoon to bail out the cotton industry. But yet nobody seems to be concerned with what is going to be the fate of the almost 2 million wheat farmers throughout the Middle West. If you want to talk politics a little bit, there was some discussion of politics, I believe, when my distinguished senior minority member of the Committee on Rules [Mr. BROWN] was addressing the House; there was some reference to politics between him and the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina. As to the politics of this I am just a little undecided. I cannot come to a clear decision. Actually, politically I think it is better for the majority party just to keep on ignoring the wheat industry. I think that would work out very well. I think we, the minority, would do very well in 1964 in the Middle West if they continue to look the other way as apparently they have done for the last year.

But from a position of responsibly representing one of the largest industries in America I feel that those of us from the Middle West have no other choice than to plead with you this afternoon to give us some assurance that at least you will consider our problems and attempt to take some action, probably not this year, but when we come back in the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the very distinguished gentleman from Kansas and congratulate him on the great interest he has shown in the wheat producers of the Nation in all the years that I have known him here in the Congress. But he must be mindful of the fact that at least our committee has labored and did bring out a bill and provide a program. It was submitted to a referendum and the wheat farmers rejected it.

Let me say to the gentleman that we have not abandoned the wheat farmers. I have had the wheat subcommittee working constantly, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL]. They have been holding hearings. We are aware of the fact that something must be done to relieve the desperate situation of the wheat farmers. I should like to conclude by saying that the wheat farmers must be willing to help themselves, as the cotton producers and producers of other commodities have indicated their willingness to help themselves in these nationwide programs. And before I close I would like to say to the gentleman that any time he wants to be heard—he has been in our committee room many times—I will provide him a forum to be heard before an interested audience.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. But let me continue by saying this. The gentleman referred to hearings that were held. Hearings were not held day after day and week after week. I have a copy of the hearings. There were 3 days of hearings held. Nineteen Members on this side of the aisle introduced an identical bill and they could not even get a report on it from the Secretary of Agriculture, whether he was for it or against it or whether he has even had the time to read it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to send him a message this afternoon and ask him for a report.

Mr. AVERY. I think the gentleman will find that he has already had that request made of him.

Mr. COOLEY. I will be glad to get in touch with him by telephone, if that will help.

Mr. AVERY. Well, I think we are making some progress at this point. This is the first tangible progress we have made, if we can expect a report from the Secretary of Agriculture on a bill that 19 Members have introduced.

The Secretary, in a speech to the Future Farmers of America at Kansas City, Mo., on October 17, made the statement that at least four out of five farmers favor a wheat program. It would seem to me that there is more agreement there than we have on this cotton bill that we have before us this afternoon. I think every Member who has spoken on the cotton bill has offered a different point of view. They are either for it or against it or for it with certain changes. I submit that those of us who attempt to speak for the Middle West have reached at least a larger area of agreement than has the cotton industry with reference to cotton.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his contribution and I thank the Members of the House for their indulgence. May I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying merely that we are relying upon assurances that we have had this afternoon that the Committee on Agriculture with the commitment of the chairman today, will take expeditious action on wheat legislation when we reconvene in January. And that that legislation may also be brought to the floor of the House for debate and final disposition.

Mr. Speaker, we will abide by the judgment of the House, but at least, I submit we have the right to be heard, as well as the 850,000 cotton farmers and the related industries that are being heard this afternoon.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] indicates that he has no further request for time. I have no further requests for time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to raise a point of order against the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that House Report 366, accompanying H.R. 6196, "a bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton growers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes" does not comply with the requirements of clause (3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives.

Clause (3) of rule XIII, the so-called Ramseyer rule, provides as follows:

3. Whenever a committee reports a bill or a joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof it shall include in its report or an accompanying document—

(1) The text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and

(2) A comparative print of the part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

In other words, a committee report must faithfully set forth among other things, changes in laws as provided in the accompanying bill, to comply with the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. Speaker, the committee report accompanying H.R. 6196, shows clearly near the bottom of page 25 the repeal of existing provisions of law dealing with feed grain price supports and acreage allotments. Specifically does it show repeal of section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Nowhere in H.R. 6196 is there the slightest reference to section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Nowhere in H.R. 6196 is there the slightest reference to section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Under paragraph 2, clause 3, of rule XIII it is stated that "under the rule the committee report on a bill amending existing law by the addition of a proviso should quote in full the section immediately preceding the proposed amendment."

In this connection I call the attention of the Chair to the language in the bill, H.R. 6196, page 2, line 22, section 3, which states that "section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows" and it then sets forth a new research authority for upland cotton.

This amendment is to be found in italic in the middle of page 26 of the report and is subsequent to and therefore dependent upon wholly unrelated provisions of law for which there are no provisions for repeal in H.R. 6196.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my contention that H.R. 6196 does not repeal and does not even seek to repeal section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; that therefore House Report No. 366, showing repeal of these provisions, is not in compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII.

I respectfully ask that the point of order be sustained.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] desire to be heard?

Mr. COOLEY. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to page 22 of the report, and I read from that, as follows:

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

If the gentleman from Iowa will read the report I think he will find that his objections are not meritorious. He referred to section 330 on one occasion in his speech. On page 25, near the bottom of the page, he will find this language:

SEC. 104. Not later than December 15, 1958, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of producers of corn—

And so forth. That whole paragraph deals with section 104.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman be kind enough to point out to the Chair that both sections 330 and 105 to be found on page 25 are bracketed as being repealed.

Mr. COOLEY. I just pointed out 330 is bracketed in black.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman advise the Chair wherein in this bill, H.R. 6196, there is to be found any reference whatever to either of these two sections?

Mr. COOLEY. Section 104 embodies section 330 the gentleman has referred to. He will note that section 330 is in quotations. This is because it was a part of section 104, which is rewritten in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman is saying is that H.R. 6196 does repeal the feed grain and acreage allotment provisions of existing law?

Mr. COOLEY. That was repealed by the referendum provided for in section 104.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, this does comply with the Ramseyer rule just as meticulously as it could apply. I am surprised the gentleman from Iowa has submitted a point of order, because the very sections that the gentleman named are referred to in this Ramseyer rewrite of existing law.

I submit that the point of order should not be sustained, but should be overruled.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on this because I consider it a very important piece of legislation and a very important point of order.

As the gentleman from Iowa has mentioned, the report on pages 25 and 26 purports to show the repeal of several provisions of law dealing with feed grain price supports and acreage allotments.

This apparently reflects the language on page 2, line 22, in section 3 of H.R. 6196 which states that "section 104 of Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows." and then sets forth a new research authority for upland cotton.

Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, was added by section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1958—Public Law 85-835, approved August 28, 1958. Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1958 provided as follows:

REFERENDUM

SEC. 201. Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of such title the following:

"SEC. 104. (a) Not later than December 15, 1958, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of producers of corn in 1958 in the commercial corn-producing area for 1958 to determine whether such producers favor a price support program as provided in subsection (b) of this section for the 1959 and subsequent crops in lieu of acreage allotments as provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and price support as provided in section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if less than a majority of the producers voting in the referendum conducted pursuant to subsection (a) hereof favor a price support program as provided in this subsection (b), the following provisions of law shall become inoperative:

"DISCONTINUANCE OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS ON CORN

"(1) The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

" 'SEC. 330. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, acreage allotments and a commercial corn-producing area shall not be established for the 1959 and subsequent crops of corn.'

"PRICE SUPPORT

"(2) The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

" 'SEC. 105. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1959 crop, price support, shall be made available to producers for each crop of corn at 90 per centum of the average price received, by farmers during the three calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for such crop begins, adjusted to offset the effect on such price of any abnormal quantities of low-grade corn marketed during any of such year: *Provided,* That the level of price support for any crop of corn shall not be less than 65 per centum of the parity price therefor.

" '(b) Beginning with the 1959 crop, price support shall be made available to producers for each crop of oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums at such level of the parity price therefor as the Secretary of Agriculture determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the level at which price support is made available for corn, taking into consideration the feeding value of such commodity in relation to corn, and the other factors set forth in section 401(b) hereof.'

"(3) Section 101(d)(4) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is repealed effective with the 1959 crop."

Please note that this section 104(b) stated that if a majority of corn farmers voting in a producer referendum did not favor the price program set out in subparagraphs (1) and (2) then these subparagraphs (1) and (2) would become inoperative.

In the fall of 1958 a corn referendum was conducted by the Department of Agriculture. In that referendum a majority of farmers did favor the program set out in subparagraphs (1) and (2). Therefore, these subparagraphs (1) and (2) did become operative beginning with the 1959 crop.

As you will note, subparagraph (1) contains an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 adding a new section 330 prohibiting the Secretary from establishing acreage allotments and a commercial corn-producing area for the 1959 and subsequent crops of corn. This provision is still in effect today.

As you will further note, subparagraph (2) set up a new price support formula for corn and other feed grains (related to market average). That section remained in effect for the 1959 and 1960 crops.

As further evidence of the fact that these provisions became operative in the original version of section 104, Congress on four subsequent occasions has amended section 105 of the 1949 act.

Public Law 87-5, approved March 22, 1961, established a special feed grain program for the 1961 crop. This statute added new subsections (c) (1) and (2) to section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 dealing exclusively with price supports on the 1961 crop of feed grains.

Public Law 87-128, approved August 8, 1961, added new subsections (3) and (4) to section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 dealing exclusively with price supports on the 1962 crop of feed grains.

Public Law 87-703, approved September 22, 1962, repealed section 105(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as originally enacted and established a new and permanent price support authority—at 50 to 90 percent of parity—for corn beginning with the 1964 crop and at the same time added new subsections (c) (5) and (6) to section 105 dealing exclusively with price supports on the 1963 crop of feed grains.

Public Law 88-26, approved May 20, 1963, added a proviso to section 105(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 applicable to the level of price support for feed grains if an acreage diversion program is in effect for the 1964 and 1965 crops of feed grains. This statute also added a new subsection (d) to section 105 dealing with price supports on the 1964 and 1965 crops of feed grains.

Public Law 88-26 does not contain statutory authority for the Secretary to require compliance by farmers with any acreage limitations as a condition of eligibility for price support beyond the 1965 crop. After the 1965 crop, section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which specifically prohibits acreage allotments and a commercial corn-producing area will apply.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that the "Ramseyer" in House Report No. 366 is in error because it shows a repeal of both section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Nowhere in H.R. 6196 is there any reference to section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Nowhere in this bill is there any reference to section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Nowhere in this bill is there any reference to section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1958.

The only way that the Ramseyer rule can be held to have been met is to sustain as a matter of law that the bill, H.R. 6196, repeals these two provisions which automatically became operative as the result of a farmer referendum in the fall of 1958.

To sustain the validity of the argument that section 3 of H.R. 6196 actually does repeal section 330 of the 1938 act and section 105 of the 1949 act would ignore the fact that Congress on four separate occasions since 1958 has specifically amended and changed section 105 of the 1949 act. In Public Laws 87-5, 87-128, 87-703, and 88-26.

To sustain the validity of this cotton bill report which shows the repeal of these important feed grain laws would be to also sustain as a matter of law that the repeal of an enabling statute enacting substantive law subject to a subsequent contingency which actually occurred repeals not only the enabling statute but also the substantive law which became operative as a result of that contingency. I know of no legal precedent for such a concept.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me state that I hesitate to raise a procedural point against a bill of this magnitude and importance, but I would be derelict in my duty to feed grain farmers if I do not. If it is ruled that the report is in compliance with rule XIII and H.R. 6196 actually repeals the prohibition against establishing acreage allotments on corn, feed grain farmers will be faced with these controls in 1966. If it is held that this bill also repeals section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support for the current crop of feed grains, as well as for the 1964 and 1965 crops, will be repealed.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

I want to make just one additional observation. I think the Speaker of the House and the Parliamentarian will find that all changes in existing law have been shown in our report under the Ramseyer rule. The rule does not say that you cannot have something else in the report which might be surplus and which might not be needed. But if you will look at section 104 on page 25 that is a strict compliance with the Ramseyer rule insofar as this legislation is concerned.

The reference to section 330, I think, is irrelevant and immaterial and is not even needed, perhaps, in this report. But we believe this is a meticulous compliance with the Ramseyer rule and we ask that the point of order be overruled.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has listened to the statements made by the gentleman from Iowa, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from North Carolina on a very interesting point of order and question.

During the discussion the Chair has had the opportunity to study the report of the committee as well as the bill as comprehensively as was possible for the Chair to do so in light of the fact that the Chair had no advance knowledge that the point of order was going to be raised. The Chair does not make that observation, of course, to convey any impression that the Chair should have been advised in advance.

It is the opinion of the Chair that the report of the committee complies with the Ramseyer rule, the purpose of which is to give Members information in relation to any change in existing law.

If a report includes some other references to other laws which in a sense would be surplusage or unnecessary, it is the Chair's opinion that the committee was attempting to give to the Members of the House as full information as was possible.

The Chair rules that the report does comply with the Ramseyer rule, and the point of order is overruled.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. FINDLEY. To propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am not clear about the substantive effect of the ruling of the Chair at this time. Does it mean that section 105 of the 1949 act and section 330 of the 1938 act are repealed by this bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not pass on that. The Chair simply said that they were included in the report.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. DOLE. To propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOLE. Based on the decision of the Chair, is it proper now or in order to offer amendments to section 330 and section 105?

The SPEAKER. Not at this time.

Mr. DOLE. But the amendment would be proper at the proper time?

The SPEAKER. At the proper time in the Committee of the Whole, if the gentleman desires to offer an amendment he may do so.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6196) to en-

courage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Committee on Agriculture for almost 30 years and have participated in the preparation and passage of many laws which have gone into the making of what we have considered to be a well rounded farm program.

I do not believe that at any time during the long period I have served on the committee has any bill received more consideration over a longer period of time than H.R. 6196, the cotton bill which we are now presenting for your consideration.

We actually started the work on this bill and the problems involved about 12 months ago, and this legislation has been constantly under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6196 is a bill to revitalize the American cotton textile industry. It is a bill national in its scope. It is a unique piece of farm legislation, in that perhaps no other farm bill ever considered by the Congress embraced more widely distributed benefits for American consumers, and for so many workers in factories, as well as for farmers and their families.

This bill came from our Committee on Agriculture with the support of our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy. It is recommended unreservedly by the administration of his able successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

CONSUMERS, WORKERS, FARMERS

Mr. Chairman, the greatest benefactor under this legislation will be the American consumer. Americans will enjoy lower prices for American-made cotton goods, at savings estimated at more than $500 million a year.

This bill will forestall and prevent the ruin of the cotton industry in which more than 10 million Americans are associated in the production of cotton on the farms, in ginning, marketing, transporting, milling, and in the manufacture and merchandising of cotton goods.

This legislation will protect the livelihood of the millions of people who work with cotton.

COTTON ECONOMY IN JEOPARDY

The economic structure of the American cotton industry now is in jeopardy, due to the price that American mills must pay for cotton—a price that is one-third higher than the world price for cotton. American cotton is assailed, and is losing ground, on two fronts:

First. A flood of low-priced textiles is flowing in from abroad, displacing the goods produced by our own workers and demoralizing the domestic markets for our textile industry. Foreign mills enjoy a great advantage in our markets, in that under our export subsidy program they are able to buy American cotton much cheaper than the same cotton may be obtained by domestic mills. The Tariff Commission has denied a request for relief through an import fee that would equalize the price of raw cotton in foreign and domestically produced goods.

Second. Synthetic fibers—principally rayon—make devastating inroads into markets where cotton never before has been seriously challenged. Rayon imitates cotton and, because it is much cheaper, this synthetic is mixed with cotton or substituted for cotton in goods offered to consumers.

TO END TWO-PRICE SYSTEM

H.R. 6196 will end the two-price system for cotton. It will enable domestic mills to buy American cotton at the world price of cotton. The world price now is 8½ cents per pound below the current American price support level of 32.47 cents per pound.

This will enable American mills to compete more fairly with foreign mills, in the American cotton goods markets.

This will enable cotton to compete more fairly with synthetic fibers.

This will forestall the deterioration of the farmers' markets for cotton which now threatens severe reductions in our cotton acreage. It will enable our farmers to hold on to their markets for cotton, and to expand these markets.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that some additional expenditures in the cotton program are involved here. The Department of Agriculture estimates that the 3-year program embraced in this bill will cost in 1964 around $118,200,000 more than expenditures if the present program continues, $87,900,000 more than the present program in 1965 and $44 million more than the present program in 1966.

But these are modest expenditures, indeed, when we consider that the expected savings to consumers and users of cotton goods will amount to over one-half billion dollars a year, that the livelihoods of many thousands of millworkers will be protected, and that cotton farmers may benefit from the revitalizing of their markets.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Mr. Chairman, I now will give the House a brief summary of this bill which holds so much promise for so many people:

First. Beginning with the date of enactment until July 31, 1967, the Secretary of Agriculture would be directed to make payments in kind to persons other than producers to eliminate the inequity of the cotton cost differential between domestic and foreign mills. Until August 1, 1964, payments would be at a level determined by the Secretary. From August 1, 1964, to July 31, 1967, the rate would be the amount necessary to make cotton available to domestic mills at a price not in excess of that for which it is made available for export. American mills would get American cotton at the world price for cotton.

Second. The Secretary is directed to conduct a special cotton research program to reduce production costs as soon as practicable. For this purpose, an appropriation of up to $10 million annually is authorized.

Third. The bill as reported by the committee directs the Secretary, beginning with the 1965 crop, to make such reductions in the level of price support as will reflect reductions in the cost of producing cotton. An amendment subsequently approved by the committee establishes the general level of price support for 1964 at 30 cents per pound for Middling 1-inch cotton, a reduction of about 2½ cents per pound from the 1963 level. It further provides that the general level of support for 1965 would be 29½ cents per pound, and for 1966, 29 cents.

Fourth. For the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops, the Secretary is authorized to provide price support at up to 10 percent above the basic loan level established for the remainder of the crop on not more than 15 bales of each farmer's production, but such higher level of support could not exceed 32.47 cents per pound, the same as that for the 1963 crop.

Fifth. Beginning August 1, 1964, CCC may sell upland cotton at not less than 105 percent of the basic loan rate plus reasonable carrying charges, instead of 115 percent of the loan, as presently required.

Sixth. For the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops, if the acreage allotment exceeds 17 million acres, the amount of the excess would be equally divided: One-half to be distributed among base allotments, and one-half to farmers who want to overplant their allotments by up to 20 percent. The production from the overplanted acreage must be sold at world prices.

WHY THIS BILL IS NEEDED

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6196, although it bears my name, represents the combined efforts of the administration of John F. Kennedy, the members of our Committee on Agriculture, and the cotton industry generally. I would like to review briefly why this bill is needed and something of its history.

As an aftermath of the Korean conflict, when the price of cotton rose sharply, foreign production of cotton increased. As a result, U.S. exports began falling, and by 1955–56 were down to 2.2 million bales, the lowest level since 1871 except for the period during World War II, when cotton production was disrupted throughout the world. In order to save our export markets, Congress enacted the cotton export program in 1956.

While that program has been generally successful insofar as cotton exports are concerned, it has created a downward pressure on the use of cotton in this country. Under this program, cotton has been made available to foreign mills at world market prices substantially less than those which American users are required to pay. Knowing this would be the result, the American textile industry nevertheless supported this program. But it did so with the understanding that action would be taken to offset its cotton

cost disadvantage. Unfortunately, this has not been done. Principally as a result of the cotton cost advantage enjoyed by foreign mills, imports have almost quadrupled since the export program started.

On three occasions, the industry has appealed for action through the Tariff Commission under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended. Each time, relief has been denied. An effort has been made to obtain action under the national security clause of the Trade Agreements Act without success. In short, the industry has exhausted administrative remedies available to it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I will include at this point a statement setting forth in detail the industry's efforts to meet the problem of imports.

INDUSTRY EFFORTS TO OBTAIN RESTRAINTS ON COTTON TEXTILE IMPORTS

First. In 1955, the then American Cotton Manufacturers Institute petitioned the Secretary of Agriculture for action under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to impose quotas on imports of cotton textiles at 150 percent of the 1953–54 average of such imports. The petition was turned down by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in February 1956.

Second. In 1956, an amendment, including import quotas on cotton textiles, was offered by Senator RUSSELL to the farm bill (H.R. 12), but was defeated by a vote of 33 to 57. During the same year, the Senate rejected two proposed import quota amendments to the foreign aid bill. An amendment offered by Senator YOUNG to limit imports of surplus agricultural commodities and their products not covered by a section 22 quota was beaten 43 to 45. Another amendment applicable only to cotton textiles offered by Senator JOHNSTON was turned down 36 to 52. Included in the Agricultural Act of 1956 was section 204, authorizing the President to negotiate with foreign countries to limit imports.

Third. Negotiations, aimed at limiting imports from Japan, which at that time accounted for the largest volume of cotton textile exports to the United States, began in 1956. In 1957, they culminated in a 5-year plan for voluntary control of Japanese exports of cotton textiles to the United States.

Fourth. In 1959, the industry asked the Secretary of Agriculture to seek a Tariff Commission hearing under section 22 to obtain relief from imports. The President asked that the case be limited to the effect of imports on the cotton export program. The Tariff Commission turned down the industry's request.

Fifth. In May 1961, the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, together with numerous other interested textile groups, initiated action with the Office of Emergency Planning under the national security clause of the Trade Agreements Act seeking a determination that the cotton textile industry is both essential to national defense and jeopardized by imports. Under the authority of the national security clause, the President may impose import controls to protect an industry if the above criteria are met. The record in the case was closed in October 1961. No decision has thus far been announced.

Sixth. The long- and short-term Geneva agreements were negotiated in 1961 and 1962. Enforcement of the agreements has been rendered virtually impossible because of the cotton cost advantage held by foreign mills.

Seventh. The Department of Agriculture sought Tariff Commission action to limit imports under section 22 again in November 1961. The President widened the scope of the investigation by extending it to cover the effect of imports on all U.S. cotton programs, but the Tariff Commission in September 1962, once more ruled against relief.

Eighth. Development of legislation to remove the inequity of the two-price cotton program began at President Kennedy's direction in late 1962, following the adverse decision of the Tariff Commission. The result is H.R. 6196.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY URGED ACTION

On February 16, 1961, less than a month after taking office, President Kennedy established a Cabinet Committee, headed by the Secretary of Commerce, to make a study of the problems facing the textile industry. On May 2, he announced a program of assistance to the textile industry consisting of 7 points. Point 4 is as follows:

> I have directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to U.S. mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers.

On November 13, 1961, the Secretary of Agriculture recommended that the President request the Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation of the cotton textile import situation pursuant to section 22. On November 21, 1961, the President requested the Commission to conduct such an investigation. Although the Commission completed its hearings on February 23, 1962, it was not until September 6, 1962, that its recommendation against action under section 22 was announced.

On the same day the Tariff Commission made its recommendations, President Kennedy issued a statement on cotton in which he said that a solution must be found to the two-price system, which he described as an "inequity" and a "unique burden upon the American textile industry." The President stated that:

> Early in the next session of Congress I shall recommend legislation designed to remove the inequity created by the present two-price cotton system.

In order to cope with the cotton problem, President Kennedy in his message to the Congress of January 31, 1963, stated:

> I urge that the Congress give early consideration to cotton legislation that will make this important fiber more competitive and help it recapture its markets. Ideally it should be signed into law before the end of February and made applicable to the planting of the 1963 crop.

President Kennedy recommended that the new law include payments to reduce the cost of cotton to domestic mills so as to eliminate the inequity of the present two-price system and to strengthen cotton's competitive position. In addition, he asked that authority be granted for producers to exceed their allotments with the excess to be sold at the world price. The President also recognized the importance of research to reduce the cost of producing cotton in the United States as a means of strengthening the cotton industry.

BRIEF HISTORY OF BILL

In anticipation of this message, I introduced H.R. 2000 on January 17, 1963. This bill would have completely eliminated the cotton cost difference to the American mills to better enable cotton to meet its price competition by making it available to them at the same price it is made available for export. In an effort to get legislation as early as possible, hearings began in December 1962 and were concluded the first of February 1963. At the conclusion of the hearings, it was clear that disagreement existed among certain segments of the cotton industry, and with the administration, with respect to some very important parts of the proposed cotton program.

I then brought together a small group representing cotton farmers from across the Cotton Belt in an effort to obtain agreement on a bill. After almost 4 months of negotiation, agreement was reached and I introduced H.R. 6196. That bill had the support of virtually the entire cotton industry and the administration.

Then we began a series of conferences with our friends on the other side of the aisle in an effort to obtain their support. Agreement was reached on a change in the bill which will permit many of them to support it. So today, I am pleased to tell the House that we bring to you a bill which was developed during the administration of John F. Kennedy and which has the blessing of President Johnson, and which enjoys support on both sides of the aisle of the House.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO COTTON

That we urgently need to enact H.R. 6196 at the earliest possible moment is clearly shown in the following thumbnail sketch of what has been happening to cotton.

In the 2 years ending July 31, 1963:

First. Cotton has suffered a direct competitive loss to competing fibers of about 1½ million bales.

Second. Exports have dropped from 6.6 to 3.3 million bales.

Third. Imports of cotton in the form of textiles are up from 414,000 to 645,000 bales.

Fourth. The national acreage allotment has been cut from 18.5 million to 16.2 million acres—the statutory minimum.

Fifth. Stocks of cotton on hand in the United States increased from 7.2 to 11.2 million bales—by August 1, 1964, stocks will likely be almost 13 million bales.

Sixth. CCC cotton stocks increased from 1.5 to 8.2 million bales—by August 1, 1964, CCC will likely own 10 million bales.

Seventh. Annual storage and handling charges on Government cotton have increased from about $25 million to about

$75 million—by August 1, 1964, they will be about $83 million.

Eighth. The Treasury spent about $1 billion acquiring surplus cotton—during the year ending July 31, 1964, about $1¼ billion additional will be spent by the Treasury acquiring surplus cotton.

Ninth. Government investments in cotton stocks have gone up from about $300 million to about $1¼ billion—by July 31, 1964, investment will likely be $1½ billion.

What will H.R. 6196 do to correct this situation? It will make cotton available to American mills at the same price it is made available for export to foreign mills. It is beyond me to see how any fair-minded person could possibly object to giving the same treatment to an American industry which we accord its foreign counterpart. It is absolutely impossible for an American mill to meet the competition of foreign-made goods when it is forced by its Government to pay one-third more for its raw material on top of a substantially higher wage scale and it is absolutely impossible for U.S. farmers to produce cotton at world market prices. These are the two horns of the dilemma.

Laws, which the Congress of the United States passed, have created what President Kennedy so aptly called this "unique burden." He asked for the elimination of the grossly unfair cost disadvantage which has been legislated on this American industry. H.R. 6196 would do away with the cotton cost difference between United States and foreign textile producers.

SUBSIDY TALK IS NONSENSE

I have heard this described as a subsidy to the textile industry. This is utter nonsense. Such a charge is completely irresponsible. This is a bill that, while entailing great benefits to consumers and producers of cotton, will protect the hundreds of thousands of jobs which are in the textile industry and in those businesses dependent upon the textile industry for their raw material—cotton fabrics.

After fabric is made in a textile mill, it goes through a series of processes which involve dyeing, bleaching, finishing, cutting the cloth, and making the apparel. In addition, many people are involved in the merchandising and sale of those products to the consumers. These are the jobs that are in jeopardy. These people live in highly concentrated areas of our country, where fabrics are merchandised. Misleading statements have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD purporting to show how much money some of the larger firms would receive. The term "windfall" has been used to describe the elimination of this cotton cost difference.

A PRIVATE STUDY

Mr. Chairman, a private research firm conducted a study of the relationship of the price of cotton to the price of cloth. Its findings are on pages 8, 9, and 10 of the committee report. I urge the Members of the House to read it all. Over a period of 38 years—including war and peace—depression and prosperity—cotton cloth prices have gone up and down with raw cotton prices. Let me read to you just two sentences from the report:

> As compared with almost any other industry, the intimate relationship between the price of the principal raw material and the price of the finished product in the cotton textile industry, as demonstrated by the correlation above, is most unusual and remarkable. When consideration is given to the long span covered, the varying political and economic conditions during this time period, the great and minor depressions, the two wars and the two postwar periods, this record verges upon the unbelievable.

Certainly those of us who believe in the private, competitive, free enterprise system will agree that competition among the 5,000 companies which manufacture textiles in the United States will force an immediate and comparable reduction in cotton cloth prices when the price those companies pay for cotton is reduced.

Any person who says the textile industry will be subsidized or receive a "windfall" under H.R. 6196 either does not know the facts or refuses to accept them.

COTTON MORE COMPETITIVE—AT HOME AND ABROAD

When U.S. mills are able to obtain cotton at the price at which it is sold for export to foreign competitors you will see a reversal in the continued upward trend in imports of textiles. It will come in those types of textiles where the cotton cost represents a large part of the cost of the goods.

Another important effect will be to make cotton more competitive. This will expand the consumption of cotton here at home and bring about a reduction in Government cotton stocks. CCC will no longer have to spend money acquiring surplus cotton. Unless this happens, we will be forced to reduce the present minimum cotton acreage allotment. No one wants to see this done. Mr. Chairman, to my friends in the cities, let me say that a further cut in cotton acreage will mean that farmers will not buy as many tractors and other farm machinery, nor as much gas, oil, tires, batteries, et cetera. They will not need as much chemicals for control of insects. In short, lower cotton acreage will mean fewer jobs and unemployment in the cities.

MIDWEST INTEREST

To my friends in the Midwest, let me say that you have a very direct interest in a healthy cotton economy. The acreage now devoted to cotton is much of the most highly productive land in the United States. Whereas your climate will not permit you to grow cotton, the climate in the cotton area is such that we can grow grain, soybeans, grass, and other things which you produce. If we let the cotton situation continue to deteriorate requiring a reduction in cotton acreage, certainly land taken out of cotton will go into other crops, most of which are already in surplus. I do not think I need to elaborate further on this point. But this is what will surely happen if we do not enact H.R. 6196.

RESEARCH

There is another very important provision in this bill. It directs the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing cotton at the earliest practicable date and to lower the price support on cotton as production costs are lowered. As a cotton farmer, I can tell you from personal experience that production costs can be reduced very substantially if we had the know-how. It takes a great deal more research to find the answers to the problems of losses and costs attributed to insects, diseases, and weeds to cite examples of cost-cutting possibilities.

As these costs are reduced, an accompanying reduction in price supports is mandatory. This will further reduce the Government's cost. It is highly probable that in a reasonable time, we can reduce costs to the point where the cotton program will not cost the taxpayers a dime.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, the problems have been considered for many, many months. This bill is supported by our former beloved President, by his Secretary of Agriculture, his Secretary of Commerce, his Secretary of Labor. It is supported by the National Cotton Council which is the organization of the cotton industry, consisting of cotton producers, cotton ginners, cotton warehousemen, cottonseed crushers, cotton merchants, cotton spinners. I think it is supported as it was reported by the committee by the National Grange. It is supported by the AFL-CIO Textile Workers Union of America and other major labor organizations.

The fact of the business is I do not know of any segment of the cotton industry that is opposed to this bill.

Involved in this legislation perhaps is the future welfare of the New York Cotton Exchange and the New Orleans Cotton Exchange. I am sure this bill is supported by cotton buyers, cotton merchants, and cotton exporters.

My friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] suggested a while ago that we should do it by the tariff. You know and I know that that cannot be done. This administration, the prior administration, and I suppose the next administration all have or will advocate the lowering of trade barriers and removing obstacles to international trade, instead of raising trade barriers and isolating ourselves from other areas. Particularly is that true when we contemplate the Common Market. How can we ask for fair and reasonable treatment in the Common Market countries if we here start raising tariffs? Perhaps you will say, "Why don't we do it some other way?" There is another way and that is by direct compensatory payments. I am willing to take that way out. I would prefer it. But I know that such legislation cannot be passed by this Congress.

The American cotton textile industry reaches from Boston to Houston. All over this country, from the east coast to the west coast, people are interested in cotton.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is our last chance. We either pass the bill at this session of Congress or, perhaps, we will never pass a bill and the entire cotton textile industry will be demoralized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I took with me some of the members of the House Committee on Agriculture down to the textile areas of the South. We saw the mills in operation. One of the leading textile industry men picked up a ball of yarn and he turned to us and said, "I can import this yarn from Hong Kong or Pakistan or Portugal or some other foreign country, and up to this point I can make money. I will have to fire, or I can fire, and discharge 12,000 textile workers."

I am interested in this bill not only because I am interested in the producers of cotton. In North Carolina we have more textile workers than any State in this Union, as pointed out here a moment ago by my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], who lives in one of the great textile areas of our State. In the neighborhood of 230,000 North Carolina workers are involved here in this legislation. I want to save their jobs. I want to save the cotton industry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I did not mean to be partisan in talking to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. However, the gentleman was talking about the tariff and denounced this whole program. I merely reminded the gentleman of the fact that the bill that made the two-price cotton system possible was signed by President Eisenhower. I was not trying to be partisan about it. The Tariff Commission under President Kennedy did not give us any better treatment than the Tariff Commission gave us under President Eisenhower. But the fact remains, how can you vote to continue a program—and the program will continue unless we enact legislation—that gives to foreign mills a $42.50-per-bale advantage over the domestic mills?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

A few moments ago the gentleman spoke of past administrations. Does this bill have the blessing of the present President of the United States?

Mr. COOLEY. I will say this to the gentleman: I met in the Speaker's office a short while ago and I asked that very question. I said, "Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you now, speaking for my committee, I shall not insist upon the consideration of this cotton bill until I know the views of the President."

Within 3 minutes he had the President on the telephone, discussed it with him, and told him about the meeting. We were assured that we would have his 100-percent support for this cotton bill.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am not surprised, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. What is that?

Mr. GROSS. I am not surprised, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, I am not surprised either. I think that his views are exactly right.

But, Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the members of the committee to help us remove this inequity from one of the great industries of America.

This legislation proposes to open up new avenues for American cotton, both at home and abroad. We thought that by bringing down the price that this objective would be accomplished.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] will introduce an amendment which the committee has instructed me to accept. That is the reason a moment ago I attempted to make the motion which I will make at a later time to permit the bill to be open at any place for amendment. Mr. MCINTIRE's amendment will be offered and I have every reason to believe the amendment will be adopted.

The purpose of the amendment is to make cotton more competitive with synthetics and cotton goods imported from other countries. That, it seems to me, should please some of the people who have objected to what they consider to be high price supports.

I have advocated high price supports all through the years, but only on limited production and only when the farmers would cooperate and keep the supply in line with demand. Beginning in 1933, we operated the cotton programs for 20 years on that basis, and at the end of 20 years we did not have a loss. We had not sustained the loss of a single dollar, but we had cotton program profits of $268 million in the Treasury. Now we have lost that profit, and I think the accumulated losses now amount to about $1,800 million.

How long can we continue that program?

We are told under the program embraced in H.R. 6196 there will be a saving of at least one-half billion dollars to the people of the country.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. Would the gentleman expand on that point a little bit? If I understand my good friend from North Carolina he is saying that if the price of cotton is reduced to the processor there is going to be a somewhat corresponding reduction in the price of the finished product. Do I understand him correctly?

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what I am saying.

Mr. SHORT. What reason do we have to believe this is going to follow? We have seen certainly for many years the price of wheat go up and down. It seems one of the arguments that has been offered many times is that cheap wheat does not necessarily bring about cheaper bread. Do we have any more reason to believe that the price to the consumer on cotton goods is going to go down with the price of the raw cotton?

Mr. COOLEY. I think I can answer that. I remember when I first came to Congress we had a bill to reduce the price support on cotton from 12 to 9 cents a pound. One of my very dear friends, a former Governor of our State, came to my office and told me if we adopted that bill it would bankrupt every one of his friends. I asked him, "What do you mean?" He said, "Because their inventories are building up, and they cannot compete when somebody else starts to making cotton goods on 9-cent cotton."

The same thing happens here. These inventories I referred to have been built up on 32.5-cent cotton, and as they get the lower priced cotton that the foreign mills are receiving they will have to write off losses on these inventories. We were told that the writeoff amounts to about $150 million, or something like that.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think there is clear proof in the committee report that the price of manufactured, unfinished cotton follows closely the price of raw cotton. A survey was conducted by an independent corporation here in Washington, the Survey Research Corp., of 1010 Vermont Avenue, which traced the relationship of raw cotton costs to wholesale costs of cotton cloth over a period of 37 years. That concern reported that whenever raw cotton goes up 2 cents a pound the wholesale price of cotton cloth goes up 2 cents a pound. When the price of raw cotton goes down 2 or 3 cents a pound, it is immediately followed by a similar reduction in the wholesale price of cotton cloth. Bear in mind also that 55 percent of the cost of manufactured products is represented by raw cotton. So I think the record is clear, if you accept the facts of history, that the price of manufactured cloth will follow the price of raw cotton downward.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman will yield further, is it proper to make the observation that this is just a little bit contrary to the experience that we have had in the price of finished products, particularly wheat products, with relation to following the price of the raw products?

Mr. COOLEY. I think wheat is processed so quickly into bread and other food that it would probably be disposed of before the price could be really affected, but this is a different process. The gentleman seems not to agree. But bread down my way, if it is 2 days old they sell it for the pigs, not for human beings.

Mr. SHORT. This is not the basis for the criteria of establishing the price of bread?

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, bread does not come down because wheat comes down.

Mr. SHORT. That is the point we are making.

Mr. COOLEY. Here is a chart showing the price of raw cotton and the gray goods. Every time raw cotton goes down gray goods goes down. That is over a period of 40 years, they tell me.

Mr. SHORT. I am not too familiar with cotton textiles. What do we mean when we talk about gray cloth?

Mr. COOLEY. That is the basic product of the mills, of the spinners. It goes out from there to other industries, for further processing.

Let me hurry on with this. I do not want to take up too much time. I have consumed more time than I intended to.

I am delighted to see my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], let us know how he feels about this. I know I am a good Democrat. I know he is a good Republican, if there is such a thing on earth. He is a very good Republican, and he understands cotton because he comes from up there in the textile country. He knows what this means not only to the farmers but to the workers in his district.

It is the same way with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and the same way with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] and these people who come from the textile areas. It is important to me in my district as much as it is important to all the people I represent.

I hope the bill will be enacted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am not so much interested in politics as I am in the Agriculture Committee continually coming to the House and making fish of one and fowl of the other in the business of allegedly trying to do something for the producers of agricultural raw materials in this Nation. What are you doing for the poultry producers of this country? What are you doing for the livestock producers? Both are in trouble.

Mr. COOLEY. You tell me what you want, and I will see what we can do and what can be done for you. I do not know what you want.

Mr. GROSS. I beg your pardon—you do not know what is happening to the poultry industry?

Mr. COOLEY. I know what is happening. I have one of the biggest poultry-producing counties in the whole United States in my district. Poultry is important to me and to my great State of North Carolina. But I say to you, and as I have said to the producers, they do not know what they want. I have begged them to come forward with a program.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot understand. The gentleman knows what would be beneficial for them.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know what they want and I do not know what would be beneficial.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I think this would be an appropriate time to make the point that this bill is not a product of the cotton producers of this country.

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. I can announce to this House that I represent a lot of cotton producers who are not happy with this bill at all. They would much rather receive the 32½ cents a pound in price supports than to see those supports go down to 29 cents. This bill is not the bill that is advocated by the cotton producers. I am sure I can speak authoritatively when I say that many of the producers are opposed to it. But this bill is a compromise as all legislation must be when you have a conflict of interest involved; would not the gentleman say that that is a correct statement of the situation?

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman. I am inclined to agree with him exactly. I think the farmers of the Southeast would like to have the 32½ cents a pound, but they are, I think, more or less realistic, generally speaking, and I think they would accept this bill. I have not been deluged with letters in opposition to the bill. This bill is supported by the entire industry from one end of the Nation to the other and from one ocean to the other.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman spoke a moment ago about the possibility of the reduction in consumer prices. The margin of profit for the textile mills in the United States has been very small; has it not?

Mr. COOLEY. Very, very small I understand, yes.

Mr. KYL. If that is true, we should expect those mills to take a little larger margin of profit, if an opportunity presents itself; should we not or else we would be giving them no benefit.

Mr. COOLEY. That brings up another question which is still open to controversy and that is—to whom shall the payments be made? We said they should be made to anybody else except to the producers. I want to say that the mill people before our committee said they did not want to be subsidized. The farmers said they did not want to be subsidized. In view of that controversy, we decided to let the Secretary make that decision. The payment will be made somewhere along the line, perhaps, to the cotton merchants of America and then they will pass it on. The mills will have to compete with each other and will have to compete with foreign producers unless in some way we can change this situation.

Mr. KYL. I would just like to make this observation. I know a little something about the retailing of these soft goods. I want to say that this competition between the American mills and the foreign mills is not going to be removed by this venture into which we are engaging today because the disparity of these prices are much too great to be removed by this single action. As a matter of fact, I think there is danger for our domestic mills.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of our committee to explain to me his interpretation of the payments that will be made. As I read the bill, beginning with the enactment of this section, the Secretary may make payments to such persons other than the producers which will eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users.

I think I can understand removing the inequity, and we leave the discretion in the mind of the Secretary of Agriculture. As you know, before our committee there was a lot of discussion about how much it took to remove the inequity. We see further down in the paragraph that beginning August 1, 1964, these payments will be made presumably at a different rate, because it indicates that it will be at a price not in excess of the export subsidy which we are paying.

Am I correct in assuming that the payments which would be made effective with the enactment of this legislation—and those payments would also go to the mills that had raw cotton in inventory that will be at one price—do you anticipate that that price or that payment will be different from the payment which will be made beginning August 1, 1964, when it says here that the payment shall be not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export? Those are some of the things I think which need to be clarified here to see who gets what and why.

Mr. COOLEY. I cannot tell you who will get what, because we leave it in the sound discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All right.

Mr. COOLEY. But I would prefer that some of the other speakers answer that question. I am sure that it could be cleared up for the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. May I ask the chairman this question: The chairman knows the high regard I have for him. Can I be assured that we will not cut off this 4-hour debate as long as some of us have questions we would like to ask or statements we would like to make?

Mr. COOLEY. I will make you that promise, but I do not want to make it for 435 others.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Now, in summary, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6196 contains what, in my judgment, is a sound, long-range program for cotton. It is important to the cotton textile industry, to the 542,000 cotton mill workers, to those in the towns and cities who supply the cotton industry, and who process the cloth into garments, to cotton growers, and to the Government.

I understand that several members plan to offer amendments to this bill. For the most part, the adoption of these amendments will mean defeat of the bill on final passage. This bill, like most legislation, is a compromise very carefully worked out among the various segments of the industry, Members of Congress, and the executive branch.

As I stated earlier, the committee approved an amendment after the bill was reported, which was urged by some of our friends on the minority. I refer to the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE]. The committee directed me to accept that amendment; but, as of this time, I can think of no other amendment that would not have a serious effect on this bill, if not preclude its passage.

Moreover, I emphasize to the House that this is not a bill to last forever. It is a 3-year bill. Prior to the expiration of this legislation our committee and the Congress certainly will take another look at the whole cotton situation, in the light of conditions and circumstances then existing, and in the interest of farmers,

consumers generally, and of the millions of workers directly associated with cotton.

JOHN F. KENNEDY AND LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conclude these remarks without paying tribute, on behalf of the farm families of America, to the aspirations and the works of John F. Kennedy, in behalf of these people who feed and clothe us. I cannot conclude without expressing my reverent acknowledgment and thanks that the divine goodness has given us another President who recognizes the great contribution of our farm people to the health, the strength, and the happiness of this Nation, and who is determined that these people who till our soil shall share equitably and fairly in the rewards of the American free enterprise system.

I do now conclude, Mr. Chairman, in humble and thankful awareness that these two great men have approved this bill that is now before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN].

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege as a Member from Nebraska to serve on the Cotton Subcommittee and I have great interest in it. Maybe us cornpickers will have to help the cottonpickers straighten out this situation.

Cotton hearings were held a year ago this month, on December 13 and 14, and again on January 15, 30, 31, and February 1 and 4 of this year. I attended every hearing because I wanted to learn and I wanted to be helpful to the cotton industry.

The sad situation in the cotton industry today is an ugly monument to failure—the failure of the Government to manage agricultural production and prices for the benefit of either the farmer or the public generally.

Everyone agrees that the American cotton industry is in great difficulty. The relative use of American cotton is lagging, despite the great increase in population and purchasing power. Man-made fibers are replacing cotton in the mills because of the artificially inflated cost of cotton. These artificial prices have accelerated research into other fibers. The discovery and manufacture of synthetic fiber has been a free society's way of compensating for artificial meddling in its free system.

The American cotton manufacturers can no longer compete against foreign mills because American cotton costs too much.

One of the witnesses testified as to this and that testimony is to be found on page 103 of the hearings on January 30, 1963.

The inflated price on cotton—a price which is causing hardship in both the agricultural areas and the textile areas—is not caused by the cottongrowers' inability to raise cotton cheaply and efficiently. It is not the farm operator who has driven cotton costs out of the competitive range of foreign cotton and synthetic cloth.

The culprit is a philosophy. It is a philosophy of supply management, which probably has done more to damage agriculture than all the insects and weeds that ever ravaged a field. I believe supply-management theories will ultimately cause ever further catastrophes to agricultural areas of America.

Cotton now stands as the outstanding, horrible example of what happens when manipulators try to operate farms with laws and regulations that defy natural laws of supply and demand.

Let us review briefly the developments in the American cotton industry under the New Deal program—a program which depended upon high supports and reduced acreage for success:

First. The consumption of American cotton, per capita, has increased very little since 1933. The consumption of foreign cotton and competing synthetic fibers has risen prodigiously.

Second. The program has delayed desirable shifts in cotton production. Areas which in the ordinary course of events would stop growing cotton, still are planting it. Some areas which could produce abundantly and efficiently have been held back because they had no acreage allotment. Even with high supports, the inefficient areas barely make a living out of cotton, but they stay in because of the Government support prices. On the other hand, many producers are given windfalls at the taxpayers expense.

Third. The cotton program threatens to wreck the domestic cotton industry. The high supports raise our price above the world price. In order to keep our markets abroad, a high export subsidy is paid—$42.50 a bale at present. As a consequence, foreign cotton mills can buy American cotton cheaper than our own manufacturers. This gives them a tremendous advantage in the world market as well as in the United States with their new machinery, and since their labor costs are lower than American labor costs, excluding the price of cotton.

In brief, our cotton program is a monstrosity. It is such a monstrosity that it is killing the cotton industry, whose death will have grave repercussions.

Secretary Freeman is not the author of the cotton tragedy, but his fumbling had a hand in it.

The Agricultural Act of 1958 gave the Secretary the authority to set cotton prices and cotton quotas. Clearly, the only sensible decision to aid the cotton industry was to make cotton more competitive. This actually was a life and death choice for the cotton industry. If American cotton did not become competitive, it would slowly strangle to death. But the Secretary chose to protect the vested interests that are built up by a subsidy program. Congress provided the vehicle in the 1958 act to get the cotton industry headed in the right direction. But to the horror of the astute, the Secretary took a course in the opposite direction. He increased the price and reduced the acreage.

This action was foolish and irresponsible. The higher price the Secretary placed on cotton made it possible for farmers to buy more fertilizer, and to invest more in getting the most out of the land. The farmers simply grew more cotton on the same acreage. They reacted with imagination and energy to a new set of conditions, and defeated the purpose of the supply managers. In 1962, cotton production went up 10 percent despite the lowest acreage allotments permitted by law.

For the first time in our history, growers increased the average yield above a bale per acre—to a national average of 516 pounds an acre. The previous high yield was 466 pounds per acre, established in 1958.

Just look at the statistics. The national allotment for upland cotton was 18.1 million acres in 1962. In 1963, acreage was cut to 16.3 million acres. But production increased from 14.7 million bales in 1962 to 15.2 million bales in 1963.

Back in 1953, cotton was not subject to acreage allotments. In that year, there were 24.2 million acres under harvest, and the yield was 16.3 million bales. In brief, we had approximately the same production with only two-thirds of the acreage. We have not solved a thing with the present cotton program.

The major result is greatly increased consumer prices. The price differential between foreign and American cotton is greater, and the cotton industry suffers even more because it cannot compete.

Now H.R. 6196 attempts to tack on another subsidy in order to correct the effects of two other subsidies that have not corrected anything. The Cooley bill just puts one more useless gear into the Rube Goldberg machine that is trying to manage agriculture today.

H.R. 6196 is a steep 180 degrees in the wrong direction.

The cotton industry had begun to recover under the 1958 Agriculture Act. But the unwise action by Secretary Freeman in raising support prices and cutting acreages stopped the recovery, and sent the industry into a tailspin.

The experience of higher yields from reduced acreages is not limited to cotton, of course. The same thing happened in corn. The emergency feed grains program cut corn acreage.

The farmer responded in typical American fashion. He raised production from a national average of 54.5 bushels of corn in 1960, to an average of 66.2 bushels an acre in 1963. We now have the biggest corn crop in history.

The folly of this kind of supply management has not been lost on the American farmer. The evidence seems pretty plain to me that farmers are getting just as sick of Government mismanaged farm programs, as are the city dwellers who look upon the farm program as a gigantic subsidy to their country cousins.

The wheat referendum last spring gave supply managers a tremendous shock. The very wheatgrowers who were supposed to get their pockets lined with extra money were the identical ones who voted down the wheat program. Many farmers have realized for years that Government-controlled agriculture would be detrimental to the industry, in spite of the apparent short-range increase in income through artificially increased

prices. They foresaw what has happened in the cotton industry. They predicted their inability to compete because Government management would eventually work to their disadvantage.

The significant thing about the wheat referendum is that a large block of farmers have come to this same conclusion. It is worth noting that most of the States that voted down the wheat program also raise cotton. If those farmers have judged that a managed wheat program is detrimental to their interest, then I suspect they will have a similar attitude toward supply management in cotton.

H.R. 6196 provides for an indirect subsidy that will enable manufacturers to buy American cotton for the same price that it is sold to foreign industry. Here is the ridiculous subsidy situation in a nutshell. We subsidize the cotton grower. We teach foreign operators how to grow cotton. Then we subsidize the foreign buyer so he can afford to buy American cotton. Now, we are proposing in this bill to subsidize our textile industry so it can compete with the foreign mills. At the same time, we have pushed up American tariffs in an attempt to give American industry some protection. But these duties have not been enough.

The Cooley bill simply is an attempt to correct a situation, caused by errors, with another mistake.

Some of our dilemma in the cotton fiasco has been the result of leaving this legislation to experts. Some of us have not tried to understand what is happening to the cotton industry because we have no direct interest in it. Now we find that we do have a direct interest—in fact, another $250 million on top of a present billion dollar cost to the taxpayers. We find that the textile industry, one of the largest employers of Americans, is staggering under an impossible burden.

The cotton situation is firm proof of what can happen to a product and an industry when disinterested people let the interested people make all the decisions. This is no longer a source of worry limited to cotton States. It affects all States and all our constituents. Agriculture and its related industries approach 40 percent of the American economy. The farm bloc may be growing smaller, but the effect of agriculture on the economy is very great. This is no problem to be left to the experts. If this principle of direct payment is approved very likely all crops will be brought under direct payments. This is a problem for every Member.

The Cooley bill is a sign that we have lost our perspective on the cotton problem, just as we have lost our perspective on the entire agriculture program.

I firmly believe we must phase the Federal Government out of production and marketing controls—but on a gradual basis.

We have made a gross error by increasing agriculture programs. Some of us have believed that we were bolstering a sector of our economy that is fading away. This is false. Agriculture controls are hamstringing a vital, vigorous industry that is still the backbone of America's strength. American agriculture does not need the Rube Goldberg type of assistance that is found in this cotton bill.

Rather, the Congress needs to slowly unravel the laws and regulations that prevent agriculture from functioning at its greatest strength in our free society.

You need only think of the wheat deal with Russia to pinpoint the weakness in the Communist world. Their Achilles heel is agriculture, and the Communists have been trying to supply-manage it from the beginning. Agriculture is still our strength in spite of Government mismanagement.

The great American agricultural industry can adjust to the sixties. Livestock, fruits, and vegetables have survived and prospered without libraries full of regulations and buildings full of manager-bureaucrats. The cost-price squeeze is more the product of artificial manipulation than the result of an industry's ability to meet competition.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you to turn down this further doctoring of American agriculture proposed in the Cooley cotton bill. The Government got into the production and marketing of agricultural crops in the thirties under perfectly understandable and necessary circumstances. The intention was to provide a crutch when a crutch would help.

Now, let us permit the patient to recover. He would have been healthier years ago if we would have cut down on the treatment. I do not propose to kick the crutch out from under him this afternoon. But let us not prevent his recuperation by tying another weight on the crutch.

Let us turn this bill, H.R. 6196 back to the Agricultural Committee with the understanding that it will work on a measure to gradually eliminate—not add—controls and subsidies.

I am a farmer. I have repeatedly said—both in Nebraska before I came to Washington, and after I was elected—"Get the Government out of production and marketing agriculture commodities as quickly as possible."

This bill is not the way to do it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I think it should be made crystal clear that all of the problems about which we are speaking this afternoon were created by the Government, not by the cotton textile industry either through any action that the industry might have taken or because of any inaction.

The mistakes that have been mentioned in the debate so far were made right on this floor and downtown in the executive offices. Our problem today is to try to find a way to eliminate a gross discrimination that resulted from mistakes that have been made in the past. The only possible way of eliminating that discrimination, the inequity and the unfairness, about which so much has been said today, is for the Government to take action because the cotton textile industry itself is powerless to bring about any corrective action on its own responsibility.

The importance of maintaining a healthy, efficient, and growing cotton textile industry becomes manifest when we realize that more than 10 million American citizens rely upon this industry for their livelihood in the production, ginning, processing, manufacturing, and transporting of cotton, and in the merchandising of cotton goods. That is such a substantial number of American citizens that I feel that mere numbers alone should be sufficient to enlist the careful consideration of the Members of Congress in an effort to solve a problem that threatens their very existence.

That this industry is in jeopardy and in trouble is made manifest also by just a few facts which I should like to detail for the record.

First, a quarter of a century ago cotton was the dominant factor in the domestic fiber market, but this position has gradually deteriorated over the years. To be specific, in 1938 cotton supplied 81.6 percent of the U.S. fiber market, but by 1962 this percentage had dropped to below 60 percent. Between 1960 and March of 1963, cotton suffered a competitive loss of 1,500,000 bales. For the past year, cotton's share of the fiber used in the cotton spinning mills of this country has declined every month, and allotted acreage for cotton today is at the lowest since the farm program began about 25 years ago.

Second, cotton once accounted for approximately one-third of all of our exports, manufactured as well as agricultural products combined, but today U.S. exports of cotton amount to only 20 percent of all agricultural exports, and in spite of the current heavy export subsidy of 8.5 cents per pound of $42.50 per bale for cotton, cotton exports continue to decline: In May of this year the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that only 3,059,333 bales of cotton had been registered for export under the 1962–63 program as compared with 4,350,571 bales on a comparable date a year ago, a drop of 1,291,238 bales in exports in only 1 year.

Third, because of our liberal trade policies, about which some comment has been made previously in the debate, plus the $42.50 per bale export subsidy now in effect, imports of foreign-made textile products have sharply increased in recent years. In 1962 these imports reached a record 650,000 equivalent bales of cotton, compared with only 100,000 in 1954. This sharp upward trend of textile imports has largely occurred since the advent of the two-price system for cotton, which permits foreign competitors of our cotton mills to buy home-grown cotton at $42.50 a bale less than our own manufacturers have to pay for it. Since raw cotton accounts for 55 percent of the cost of manufacturing cotton cloth, the result of these heavy textile imports is devastating to the domestic textile industry: Active cotton spindles have dropped 9 percent since the two-price cotton system has been in effect, active spindles on 100 percent cotton have fallen to an average of 88.7 percent, and 162,000 textile jobs have been lost.

Now I want to take the liberty, after having obtained the permission of the gentleman who wrote this letter, to read

into the RECORD parts of a letter written to the President of the United States last year by a textile manufacturer in my State which contains a more eloquent analysis of what is transpiring and in what danger the present situation is placing the textile industry than I can possibly do.

The letter is as follows:

We have one of the most modern textile spinning mills in the world; it was completed in early 1961. The plant employs 101 people including myself; it has all new machinery, new production methods, and strict quality control. Our manufacturing space is all refrigerated, clean, and is ideal for employee comfort and manufacturing. Our yarn quality is excellent and our customers are pleased with our quality. We all feel that we have done everything humanly possible to build an efficient plant to employ personnel who were left without work when a previous spinning mill closed down on the same location. We invite you personally or any of your representatives to tour our plant at any time.

We have been in a relatively bad market since we made our first pound of yarn. The cotton cost has risen from 32.50 to 37.33 cents per pound and the yarn prices have declined. Our product is all cotton carded knitting yarns from 14/1 to 30/1; we spin Memphis territory cotton.

Last week I was in southern Germany and Switzerland looking at the newest Swiss textile machinery and methods in production. The mills there were spinning cotton from Pakistan. The management informed me that they could buy cotton from Pakistan and other countries other than the United States for 3 cents per pound cheaper than they could buy cotton from the United States—even with our 8½ cents per pound subsidy.

When I came back last Thursday, I called on my knitting customers in New York. I could not procure any new business because they frankly showed me Portuguese yarn that they were buying for 11 cents per pound cheaper delivered than our costs.

Then the other day I saw this gentleman and was discussing with him the approaching debate on this bill, he said:

I will send you a copy of a letter I wrote to our employees when we had to go out of business because we could not compete.

What he did was to sell his plant to a well diversified integrated big textile operation that could absorb the losses of this spinning mill and make up for these losses in finished goods.

I would like to read a portion of the letter that this manufacturer addressed to his employees explaining why he had to take that action:

We invested heavily in the new plant in 1960 not only with material means, but also with planning, time, and true enough—a great deal of sweat and tears. The venture has not been the most successful, but each of you has produced far more than was expected.

Unfortunately, we started producing carded cotton yarn for the knitting industry just at the time when our Nation started importing great quantities of foreign yarn. Indeed, more yarn of this specific nature (unbleached, unprocessed cotton carded knitting yarn) has been imported in 1 month—month after month—than we can produce in an entire year. Our customers' competitors were buying this far cheaper yarn; eventually our customers had to start buying it also to remain in business.

Two years ago the basis of our Nation's cotton program was changed. This increased the cost of our raw stock as much as 5 cents per pound which represented a weekly cost increase of $5,000 to us. At the same time, our Nation was/is shipping the same cotton to foreign spinning mills for 8½ cents per pound cheaper than we can buy it ourselves. As a result of this and far lower labor costs of the same mills they are shipping great quantities of yarn into our Nation. One of our largest customers has just purchased 1 million pounds of 18/1 for 48 cents in Egypt—plus a cost of 7 cents to land it in his New England plant for a total cost of 55 cents per pound. The net result of this foreign yarn is that the average sales price of our yarn has dropped from 66 to 61 cents and in some cases to 60 cents. This is a drop of $5,000 to $6,000 per week for our product. This decrease in the market price of our product plus the increase of our cotton has made us labor under a $10,000 to $11,000 per week differential since 1960. This is a total of $500,000 to $550,000 per year.

No wonder he could not stay in business.

The result of all this is that U.S.-grown cotton is not being sold in the domestic or foreign markets but is piling up in Government-rented warehouse space around the country. The following facts make this crystal clear:

First. On August 1, 1961, the U.S. Government owned 1.5 million bales of cotton for which the U.S. taxpayers had paid $300 million.

Second. By August 1, 1963, the amount of Government-owned cotton had increased to 8.2 million bales and the cost to the taxpayers had gone to $1.3 billion.

Third. By August 1, 1964, it is estimated that Government-owned cotton will have increased to 10 million bales and the cost to the taxpayers will go up to $1.6 billion.

Fourth. Storage costs on this cotton will be $75 million in 1963 and are expected to be $83 million in 1964.

So here we have $1½ billion invested in cotton in storage. What are we going to do with it? Unfortunately, cotton is one agricultural commodity which cannot be eaten. A bale of cotton is virtually worthless unless it is processed in a cotton mill. It follows therefore that the textile industry, at home and abroad, is the only customer for this vast quantity of cotton we already own in storage and for additional cotton the Government will be forced to acquire in future years under existing law.

Reduced to its simplest terms, the bill under consideration today will enable the Government to rid itself of an unprofitable investment by unloading some of this cotton on the domestic textile industry at a price which is actually a cent or two a pound above the world price.

If this bill is not passed, the following results will occur:

First. We will sell as much of it as we can to foreign textile manufacturers who will continue to flood our markets and displace goods produced by our own textile industry, thereby throwing additional workers out of jobs and forcing the liquidation of additional textile plants. For every bale we do sell abroad, we will be subsidizing foreign competitors of our own textile industry at the rate of $42.50 a bale. Even so, the record shows that despite this heavy subsidy, our exports are in a declining trend because of increased cotton production abroad at costs even lower than our own subsidized ones. This means that it will be exceedingly difficult, if not actually impossible, to increase our cotton exports even though they enjoy a substantial subsidy. But assuming that we can sell 4 million bales abroad next year, the subsidy alone will amount to $170 million and it all goes to foreign competitors of our own textile mills.

Second. Or we can dispose of some of it abroad under Public Law 480 for unredeemable foreign currencies or give it away under the foreign aid program. For cotton so disposed, the taxpayers will take a 100 percent loss on the acquisition price of the cotton augmented by the substantial storage and carrying costs that have been added.

I submit, in fairness to the millions of American citizens who depend for a living on a healthy domestic cotton-textile industry, that if we intend to continue a policy of selling homegrown cotton to foreign competitors at prices substantially lower than our own mills have to pay, and if we intend to continue to permit this cotton to return to the United States in the form of manufactured products for sale in our own markets at prices substantially lower than domestic manufacturing costs, we ought to make our surplus cotton available to the domestic mills at the same price you make it available to their foreign competitors. To do otherwise will perpetuate a gross injustice to American textile workers and manufacturers.

Moreover, our failure to do so would constitute a disservice to American consumers of textile products. Opponents of the pending legislation argue that the bill will provide a substantial subsidy for domestic cotton mills but an official of the U.S. Department of Commerce testified to the committee that the extra costs of this program, whatever they may be, will find their way into the pockets of the American consumers in a ratio of $2 saved for $1 spent.

This opinion is supported by an independent research study made by Survey & Research Corp., of Washington, D.C. The study included a comparison between the price of raw cotton and the wholesale price of unfinished cotton cloth from August 1925 to February 1963, and from the results of this study it is established that the savings flowing to textile manufacturers from reduced raw cotton prices will be passed on to the consumers of textile products in the United States—and this means all of us. The U.S. Department of Commerce estimates these savings will approximate $500 million a year for consumers if H.R. 6196 is enacted.

Every Member of Congress can in good conscience vote for H.R. 6196 because enactment of this bill will, first, make it possible for domestic cotton mills to purchase homegrown cotton at the same price this cotton is sold to foreign mills and thereby remove an intolerable discrimination against the home folks; second, prevent the creation of new depressed areas all over the Cotton Belt and make it possible for the domestic cotton textile industry to survive the grossly unfair competition which now exists from abroad; third, create some 35,000

new jobs for cotton textile workers; and, fourth, result in an annual saving to the American consumers of cotton textile goods of more than $500 million.

I do not see how we can fail to take appropriate action to prevent the perpetuation of the gross discrimination against the domestic textile industry and the millions of American citizens who depend upon it for a living.

This bill offers your only opportunity to take such action.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina on the fine presentation he has made here today. I sympathize with him in regard to the plight of the textile industry. But are we not going about this in the wrong way? Why not do away with the unrealistic price supports on cotton production, plus the export subsidy benefit to foreign textile manufacturers? Are we not compounding a felony here today by doing this, by adding a third subsidy?

Mr. JONAS. No; if the McIntire amendment is adopted, and the chairman of the committee stated that he has authority to accept it, we will be moving in that direction. The price supports are going down over 3½ cents a pound over a period of 3 years. That might not be as far as the gentleman thinks we ought to go at one fell swoop. But that is taking a step in the very direction that the gentleman thinks we ought to go.

Mr. CONTE. Yes, it is a step in the right direction, but I do not think it is a long enough step.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure the gentleman does not want to disrupt the whole industry by taking a giant step. We can make more progress in the long run by taking a small step at a time.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not pretend to be an expert on the intricate factors involved in the cotton problem, and I am sure that a number of my able colleagues are much more knowledgeable on this subject than I am. As both a housewife and a consumer, however, I am very much interested in the statements offered today in support of this legislation and particularly the statements in justification of this bill to the effect that consumers of cotton products, if the bill is enacted, would enjoy a savings of some $500 million. Naturally, this is a most attractive promise, and I am sure that all persons who purchase finished cotton products would like to save such a substantial sum.

Mr. Chairman, I am most intrigued by this theory that a 25-percent cut in the cost of the raw product to the manufacturers, in this case cotton, will result in the accruing to the consumer of manifold benefits, but I am afraid I don't quite understand the logic that is being offered in its support. Quite frankly, a number of questions still remain unanswered and I think we are entitled to have clear-cut answers to these questions.

First. Will a 6-percent cut in the raw product cost of cotton to the mills mean a cut in the price of cotton garments? I recall that Senator ELLENDER remarked during the hearings before his committee that his $6.95 cotton shirt probably contained no more than 30 cents' worth of raw cotton, and I believe that findings of the National Cotton Council and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service support his statement. In other words, the total mill cost of the raw cotton is somewhere in the neighborhood of 5 percent of the retail price of the end product. I suppose that a saving of 25 percent in raw cotton cost potentially might shave maybe 1 percent from the retail price of the shirt, but I am sure that in most instances this saving in raw cotton cost would not be enough to lower the retail price. From every reliable cost survey I have seen, this is the inescapable conclusion. I therefore ask my colleagues whether they can logically expect that when they buy their wives a dress which costs $25 and contains about 2 pounds of cotton, they will expect that the dress will be 12 cents cheaper than it is now?

Second. I notice in the committee report that the table—which has been alluded to—deals with raw cotton prices and gray cloth. As a consumer, I know that gray cloth is not the fabric which is used extensively for such things as shirts, pajamas, bathrobes, dresses, blouses, skirts, slips, and so forth. I am wondering why the proponents of this legislation did not make use of a chart correlating the raw cotton price and the finished cotton material?

Third. Who is the consumer to be benefited by this new, and I might say very expensive, subsidy? I think it is apparent to all of us that the consumer being referred to is the very same working man and woman from whose paycheck a given percentage of income is withheld every week to pay for the costs of running the Federal Government. We know that he or she, as taxpayers, will be paying another $200 million to $250 million a year more for the cotton program. These costs are fact but I feel that the benefit our consumers are to presumably receive is at best a theoretical benefit, and tenuous at that. The money that the consumers might theoretically save is money which was taken from their own pocketbooks.

Fourth. What can we reasonably expect in the way of action on the part of the textile mills themselves if this legislation should pass? Is not the stated purpose of the bill to enable the textile industry to meet foreign competition? It seems to me that all this means is that, for one reason or another, foreign competitors are now offering American consumers cotton products cheaper than the American textile industry can offer. In other words, we can buy Japanese-made corduroy overalls for our children which cost less than corduroy overalls made in America. Presumably, under this bill we will be able to buy American-manufactured overalls at the same price. Can we therefore assume that for other than patriotic reasons the American consumer will be buying nothing but the American-made product, since the prices are just the same?

Fifth. The fifth question that I would like to raise about this theory of consumer benefit is this: If a cut in the raw product cost of cotton in the amount of $250 million, as the committee report indicates, will give consumers a $500 million benefit, why does not this theory work in the opposite way? In other words, according to this theory, an increase in the raw product cost would also substantially increase the cost to consumers. When the Secretary of Agriculture in the spring of 1961 raised the price support of cotton by 2½ cents per pound, he, according to this theory, substantially and disproportionately increased the cost of cotton goods to the consumer, did he not?

Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Agriculture for 5 years now and during that time I have often heard my distinguished colleagues, some of whom are advocating this bill today, say that the raw costs of the foreign commodity had very little to do with the cost of the finished product to consumers. A study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture covering the cost of bread from farm to retail counter is especially significant. Bread involves the manufacturing processes of milling and baking and therefore comes somewhat close to the circumstances of manufacturing and distributing cotton end products. Now I think that most of my colleagues know that wheat content cost is about 10 percent of the retail price of a 1-pound loaf of white bread. This compares with the 5-percent ratio of cotton to the retail price of shirts. Food distribution, furthermore, is probably the most highly competitive trade, even more so than apparel. Therefore, the normal expectance theoretically might be that the raw material cost trends would be reflected directly in the retail price of bread. Quite to the contrary, wheat cost has declined 11 percent from 1947 to 1949, while the retail price of bread advanced 55 percent.

I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that if the House adopts this theory today that the farmer in the future will be in much more serious trouble than he already is. How then will those of us who believe in sustaining farm income to the maximum extent possibly justify an increase in the value of the raw agricultural commodity made available to the processors? Particularly I am concerned about wheat, which under the current program is scheduled to drop in price to $1.25 a bushel in 1964. Will this mean that consumers will save millions and millions of dollars on the price of bread? I think not, but the theory of this cotton bill says it will. Conversely, will it not be exceedingly difficult next year to enact remedial wheat legislation to improve the income of the wheat farmers if the House today accepts the theory that raw products costs are a larger part of the cost to the consumer. If the theory that is being advocated today is sound, then every farm bill which comes before us in the future will be attacked on the basis that by raising the raw product cost, you are doubling the cost to consumers.

Mr. Chairman, the theory of this bill before us today reminds me of a Mutt and Jeff comic strip. Mutt asked Jeff why he was running along the street behind a streetcar. Jeff replied that he always ran home behind a streetcar and therefore was saving 25 cents a day on transportation. Mutt replied that he always ran home behind a taxicab and saved 75 cents a day.

It is an intriguing theory, but I wonder how many of us can sell it to our taxpaying consumer constituent?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for a question?

Mrs. MAY. Yes, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Does not the gentlewoman think that she is correct in this, that the price of cotton that goes into a $7 shirt is rather inconsequential?

Mrs. MAY. Yes, I do. I was going to make that point.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentlewoman will yield further, the price of cotton that goes into a cotton blanket or into a cotton sheet or into a cotton towel is a very important factor.

I think the gentlewoman would agree that there should certainly be passed on to the consumer a substantial reduction in the cost of such things as sheets and towels and pillowcases and cotton blankets as well as cotton duck and products that are largely just plain cotton textiles rather than such textiles and products that require extensive workmanship, such as a fine quality, well-tailored shirt.

Mrs. MAY. Of course, I would point out to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], that we are not making a comparison of cost here because to try and back up this claimed savings, we would have to go into every type of end product. I, as a consumer, was thinking of many other types of cotton products which carry different percentages.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I feel sure that the gentlewoman would be interested in a statement which I inserted in the RECORD, which appears on page 23011, in which I made a very serious effort in trying to determine what relationship, if any, there has been over the years between the price of the raw material, cotton, and the price of the finished cotton product which consumers buy off the shelf.

A chart was inserted in the committee report, which I am sure was placed there in order to convey the idea that retail prices automatically go up and down on the same fixed relationship with the price of raw materials. That did not seem to me to make sense. I contacted the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture, the same office from which the figures in that chart originated, and asked for any figures, if they had them, on the composite cost—retail cost—of cotton product items.

In this statement, printed in the RECORD today, there can be found a listing of the average farm value of the cotton for each of the years 1935 through this year, and also the retail cost of cotton-product items.

Then, I would also call to the attention of the gentlewoman from Washington that in that same statement I called attention to the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] who is vice chairman of the committee, wherein they comment about the relationship between raw materials and the consumer prices.

I think it is particularly notable that in a statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina back in 1958 when he was commenting on the relationship between the prices farmers get for their milk and the price consumers pay, he concluded that the millions of dollars poured into the program will be absorbed by middlemen and consumers will derive no price benefit whatsoever.

So, it is indeed a very confusing picture. My conclusion is that we cannot be sure of any definite price relationship.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman. I did see the gentleman's statement in the RECORD. It, again, verified some of the doubts that I have had with respect to the claims for consumer savings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Washington has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentlewoman has made considerable of the fact that she feels the difference between the price of raw cotton and of gray cloth is meaningless, but for 40 years there has been an almost exact relationship in that every time the price of raw cotton has gone down the price of gray goods has gone down almost exactly in the same amount.

The gentlewoman points out that she does not buy gray goods, but gray goods is what the mills produce. The mills sell gray goods. Regardless of what the consumer buys, that is the product the mills sell.

The gentleman from Illinois used another set of figures for the last 30 years for what he calls the cost or retail prices, which must be simply a compilation of certain products because it does not include all cotton products. But even this follows exactly the same curve. When the price of raw cotton went up, gray goods went up and the retail price went up. When the price of raw cotton went down, the price of gray goods went down and the retail price of cotton goods went down.

During World War II the margin between retail prices and gray goods approximately doubled and has remained at approximately that relationship. That does not mean the margin between the price of raw cotton and what the mills sell, because that has remained almost static.

Look at the chart. The gentlewoman has referred to a tabulation the gentleman from Illinois put into the RECORD on page 23012. Does this gentlewoman remember what year the price of cotton was highest?

Mrs. MAY. No, I do not.

Mr. POAGE. I thought probably the gentlewoman would. Actually, it was 1951; 1951 is the same year that the retail cost to which the gentleman from Illinois referred was the highest. The gentleman's charts on this page to which he referred and to which the gentlewoman referred show that the price of raw cotton rose steadily from 1935 to 1951, and that the retail price of cotton goods rose steadily during the same period. Since 1951 the price of raw cotton has declined and the retail price has declined at almost the same rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Washington has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I will try to make this very brief.

May I say to the gentleman, I believe he misspoke himself as to what I said originally, saying that I did not purchase gray cloth or that I did not see any connection. I believe, if the gentleman had been listening to my speech, I said it was very difficult for us who are not familiar with all the intricacies of this cotton legislation to answer these questions and I asked that the members of your committee give us a more clear-cut answer. I still say some of the misunderstanding comes about because the charts you use have correlated gray cloth and do not give what I would call a more clear-cut picture to the housewife and consumer of the cost of the finished products and how it reflects in the many finished products that we do purchase.

I thank the gentleman for trying to clarify the situation. I think it is very necessary for all of us.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the cotton industry is languishing gradually but surely and if not revitalized its future is most uncertain. It is the purpose of the Cooley bill to eliminate the two-price system for cotton and permit the American mills to buy cotton at the same price foreign mills are privileged to buy the same cotton. At least 10 million people earn their livelihood in the production, ginning, transportation, marketing, milling, manufacturing, and merchandising of cotton and cotton goods. Quite a large number of additional people are employed by supplying the materials used by the cotton farmer and the various other segments of the industry. Cotton accounts for about 20 percent of our entire agricultural exports. Seven hundred million dollars annually is added to our gold supplies as a result of cash sales for our cotton in world markets. This $700 million helps to maintain our Nation's balance of payments.

The people who produce cotton receive a gross income from that crop of about

$2.5 billion each year. This money turns over about six times, as it flows into the pockets of suppliers and various service industries and all those who are responsible for processing and distributing cotton to the ultimate consumer.

In 1962 the imports of cotton textiles had reached a total of 650,000 bales equivalent, as compared with the year 1954 when the Nation imported cotton textiles with an equivalent of 100,000 bales. These mounting imports of textiles are hurting the farmer, the manufacturer, and more important, the textile workers. Foreign mills enjoy a great advantage over our own mills in that they can buy American raw cotton at 8½ cents per pound less than our mills have to pay for it. With the cheap labor rate paid in many of the importing nations, the finished product can be shipped into this country at a much lesser figure than the American-made product.

The cotton farmer is expected to produce in 1963 15.3 million bales of cotton on 14.3 million harvested acres. The estimated yield of raw cotton per acre is a record 516 pounds. This mammoth crop was produced on 8 percent less acreage than was harvested in 1962. The domestic consumption and exports for the current year are expected to reach 13.8 million bales. The disappearance is larger than a year ago, although a million and a half more bales were produced and consumed. One of the principal problems affecting the cotton industry is finding markets for cotton and cotton goods.

Under the Cooley bill cotton will compete fairly with synthetic fibers. It will greatly improve the position of our domestic mills in regaining markets here at home for various types of cotton textiles. The American consumer will be in a position after about 2 years from the passage of the Cooley bill to buy cotton goods at a much lower price. The savings will amount to about $500 million a year. These savings would be the result as the manufacturer would be able to buy cotton at the world price, which would amount to 8½ cents per pound less than is now being paid by him. The fiber, in this instance raw cotton, makes up about 55 percent of the total manufacturing cost of cotton cloth. The testimony before the Agriculture Committee was that it would reach an even higher figure.

The legislation will save jobs for many millions of our citizens by eliminating the causes for the disruption and deterioration of king cotton.

The Subcommittee on Cotton of the House Committee on Agriculture commended hearings in December 1962. Two days in December were consumed. The second series of hearings were held in the months of January and February. Considerable work on the part of interested individuals and groups has been required in the moving of the Cooley bill to the floor of the House. It is believed that by the reduction in the price to the domestic mills, as anticipated by this legislation, a gradual increased consumption of the fiber would be the result. The United States will enjoy a fair share of the world cotton market, should this bill be enacted into law. It would aid the farmer, as he can then remain in the business of growing cotton. It will make a healthy cotton trade and merchandising system, and it will promote a thriving and growing cotton textile industry and employ great numbers of Americans in useful occupations.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I know there is not a man or woman in this Congress who is not aware of the economic situation of his own district. I, for one, have a small compact district of about 11 square miles comprising a lower, middle, and upper-middle economic group. The majority of these people work for a living, as you can tell by the economic group they are in.

I represent about 450,000 people, but a unique district in view of the fact that more people come into my district to earn their livelihood each day than the number of people who actually live in the district itself. I know, for example, there are 30,000 people employed in the field of education.

There are 30,000 people who work for the Federal Government, 10,000 of them working for the naval shipyard.

I know that about 25,000 people are employed in the electronics industry.

I know there are 150,000 white-collar workers.

I know there are 20,000 people employed in the field of candy and confectionery.

I know there are about 30,000 people who earn their livelihood in what we call the apparel section of the city of Boston.

So, consequently, this bill means considerable to me coming from the northeast section of this country representing a district which comprises two-thirds of the city of Boston.

It means a tremendous amount to the economy of my area. It means a tremendous amount to the economy of all the Members from the Northeast who come from metropolitan areas.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we wipe out the present differential on cotton under which domestic mills have to pay 30 percent more for American cotton than the foreign mills have to pay.

Since the initiation of the two-price cotton system, New England cotton textile and allied employment has declined from 89,000 workers to 47,000 workers, a drop of 47 percent. Over 50 cotton textile mills have been liquidated during this period.

In Massachusetts, the decline in cotton textile employment has been from 40,000 to 22,000 workers during this period. Twenty-eight mills have been liquidated.

Cotton spindles in place in New England have declined from 2,680,000 to 1,041,000 currently, a decline of 61 percent. In Massachusetts, the drop has been from 1,342,000 to 421,000 a drop of 69 percent.

Despite this liquidation, the cotton segment of the Massachusetts textile industry contributes significantly to the whole textile, apparel, and textile machinery complex in this State, which, in turn, is essential for the economic health and welfare of the State.

In Massachusetts, there are over 100,000 textile and apparel workers employed in 1,700 plants in 146 cities and towns, with an annual payroll of $300 million. In addition, there are 16,900 employees engaged in making textile machinery and supplies in over 100 plants.

This great manufacturing complex stretches across the length and breadth of Massachusetts, from Boston to the terminus of the Mohawk Trail; from New Bedford to Amesbury; from Great Barrington to Plymouth. It is also characterized by concentration in several areas. For example, textiles account for 79 percent of manufacturing jobs in Fall River, 46 percent in New Bedford, and 30 percent in Lowell. In the city of Boston itself, 25 percent of the manufacturing jobs are in over 600 textile apparel plants. This is the particular area which I represent.

For these reasons, I support the Cooley bill and the amendment I understand will be offered by my colleague from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

The bill will eliminate the inequitable and unfair situation wherein our domestic cotton textile industry has had to pay 25 or 30 percent more for cotton than those foreign mills which turn the cotton into textiles and apparel and ship them back into this country.

Imports have steadily risen since 1956 and, currently, exceed 1 billion—I repeat, 1 billion square yards annually. In terms of cotton content, imports have tripled to 310 million pounds.

Cotton's share of the U.S. market for textile fibers will continue to drop as it has over recent years unless this unfair burden affecting the cotton growing textile and apparel industry in this country is eliminated by this bill.

This bill protects the small grower while permitting a modest reduction in the support price of cotton, and provides for research to reduce the cost of producing cotton in the future.

This is no windfall to our mills or textile workers. Lower cotton prices mean lower fabric prices to the consumer in this highly competitive industry.

The thousands of textile mills throughout the country, of which Massachusetts and New England have a modest share, are the principal customers of American cotton. Without them, the raw cotton industry, as we know it in this country, cannot grow and prosper.

It is essential, therefore, that after 7 years of delay, we now face up to this situation and vote for this bill with Mr. McINTIRE's amendment.

As I understand it, all of labor and all of management in our area support it, and I cannot for the life of me conceive how any Member from New England, regardless of what city or where he comes from, could vote against legislation of this type. I hope the bill is passed.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 215]

Ashbrook	Gibbons	Morse
Ashley	Gill	Moss
Auchincloss	Glenn	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett	Gurney	Olson, Minn.
Battin	Hall	Passman
Becker	Harsha	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Hawkins	Pepper
Bolling	Hébert	Powell
Brooks	Holifield	Rivers, Alaska
Byrnes, Wis.	Jennings	Robison
Carey	Johansen	Roosevelt
Celler	Kelly	Roush
Chelf	Keogh	St Germain
Colmer	Kilburn	St. Onge
Curtis	Kirwan	Shelley
Dawson	Lankford	Sheppard
Diggs	Lindsay	Smith, Va.
Dowdy	Long, La.	Steed
Dulski	McLoskey	Thompson, Tex.
Edmondson	Mailliard	Trimble
Ellsworth	Matsunaga	Van Pelt
Fallon	Milliken	Widnall
Fogarty	Monagan	
Fuqua	Morrison	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 6196, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 362 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 6196, has been designed as an aid to the cotton industry for, as everybody is fully aware, the cotton industry is in grave trouble.

Evidence that the cotton industry is hard pressed is reflected in the fact that during the 5-year period between 1958 and 1963 some 45 cotton mills have been liquidated in the United States, with approximately 30,000 jobs having been wiped out in the process. In this same period, employment in broadwoven fabric mills declined from 246,800 to 216,700 production workers.

There are, of course, many conditions that have contributed to the troubles and problems of the cotton industry. In the case of the textile manufacturer, for instance, there is the complaint that the two-price system on cotton requires the domestic manufacturer to pay 8½ cents more per pound of cotton than does his foreign competitor for the same cotton.

H.R. 6196 would move forward to correct this inequity. It would do this by providing payments-in-kind in order to make American cotton available to domestic mills at world cotton prices. This would eliminate a grossly unfair cost disadvantage under which our American mills have for long labored, and it would enable the American textile manufacturer to meet his foreign counterpart on an improved competitive basis.

It is to be recognized, too, that our national policies in two areas have also contributed substantially to the crisis in which the U.S. cotton industry today finds itself.

In the price-support area, for instance, the support levels on agricultural cotton in 1961 were lifted from 30 to 32.47 cents per pound. Through this unwarranted upward adjustment in the support level of agricultural cotton, the two-price policy was transformed from a program which the domestic industry could barely tolerate into one that was unbearable.

The introduction of this cost disadvantage to our domestic mills was largely responsible for a competitive loss of some 1,700,000 bales of cotton during the last 3 years, a loss which—if something is not done to correct the situation—might very well continue into the future.

The area of trade policy has also failed to offer any protection against the textile imports that have been flooding into our domestic markets.

It is true, of course, that the United States has entered into voluntary trade agreements with other countries toward the end of controlling the volume of cotton textile products coming into America; however, notwithstanding such trade agreements, these imports have reached new and record highs.

For instance, since 1946 cotton textile imports have increased at an average annual rate of 22 percent. For calendar 1962 imports have been up 23 percent, and for the first 8 months of 1963 cotton textile imports are higher than they were for the same period last year.

In absolute terms, cotton goods imports were, in 1955, running just about 300 million yards, in 1960 approximately 1 billion yards, and in 1963 it is estimated that the imports will be just about 1,200 billion yards.

It must be recognized, too, that the price-support program for cotton has boosted the price level for cotton above what it would be under natural conditions in the marketplace. This has had the effect of creating a gap between cotton prices and those of other natural fabrics and synthetics. This gap has been broadening, and as the price of cotton continues to go up, the demand for cotton over and above the other fabrics goes down.

It is quite clear that some administrative action—particularly with regard to trade policies—can be taken to improve the position of our cotton industry. This action would involve restricting cotton textile imports that are sweeping into this country.

Over and above this, however, it is quite obvious that legislation action will have to be taken, too. And H.R. 6196 provides a base of assistance for the severely stricken cotton industry.

In brief, this legislation would help the cotton industry by correcting the severe price disadvantage under which our domestic textile mills today labor.

The legislation also would make cotton more competitive with other natural and synthetic fibers.

I do not, of course, wish to represent this legislation as being, in itself, a cure-all for the many ills that have crowded in upon the domestic cotton textile industry. It does, however, contain the seeds for progress toward a solution.

The program will not be without its costs, but it is interesting to note that as cotton would come out of Government storage under this program, there would be an appreciative saving on storage costs for this commodity.

And toward the end of further reducing the costs of the operation of this program, I will—at the proper time—offer an amendment to H.R. 6196. My amendment would establish a statutory ceiling on the level of price supports on cotton for the production in excess of 15 bales on upland cotton for the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops.

In short, my amendment would permanently repeal the Secretary of Agriculture's present discretionary authority to set upland cotton price supports from 65 to 90 percent of parity permanently.

The cottongrower will not enthusiastically embrace this proposition, for it would have the effect of adjusting his income a little downward. By the same token, however, it must be recognized that presently the price support level on this cotton is 32.47 cents per pound, an unrealistic figure in consideration of the fact that just about two-thirds of the cotton in this country is produced at cost levels well below this figure.

H.R. 6196 does not, as it is now written, change the Secretary of Agriculture's discretionary authority to set upland cotton price supports from 65 to 90 percent of parity. Under the present parity price, this means that the support price for 1964 could be set anywhere from about 27 to 37 cents per pound. Either of these levels would prompt undesirable results.

Under the present costs of producing cotton, most cotton farmers could not continue to produce cotton if the price were immediately dropped to 27 cents. On the other hand, if the level were set as high as 37 cents, cotton would be priced out of most markets as a textile fiber. Furthermore, it was not possible to estimate the costs of this bill unless a price support level could be definitely nailed down. I, therefore, considered it desirable to include in this legislation a provision specifying precisely what the level of price support should be.

I want to remind my colleagues that at the time the committee reported this bill, it had not been possible to get an agreement on this matter of price support levels. There were some who felt that a proposal offered by the Department of Agriculture was too low, while others thought it was too high. In any event, agreement finally was reached, and the House Committee on Agriculture met and approved the amendment that I will offer.

My amendment provides that the level of support for 1964 shall be such as to reflect a loan of 30 cents per pound for Middling inch, as the basic price support. H.R. 6196, as originally introduced, provided that in 1965 and thereafter, the level of support would be that for the previous year adjusted downward to reflect any reductions in the cost of producing cotton.

In addition, the bill directed the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a special research program aimed at reducing the cost of producing cotton, authorizing an appropriation of $10 million annually for this purpose. It seemed reasonable, then, to establish a maximum of 29½ cents per pound, which my amendment

does, for 1965, and for 1966, and thereafter the maximum level would be 29 cents per pound.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I shall be very happy to yield to my chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not that the amendment which was considered by the committee after the bill had been reported and the committee instructed me, as chairman of the committee, to accept the amendment when it was presented on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. McINTIRE. This will be the amendment which I shall offer at the appropriate time.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask one other thing? I am sure my friend will agree that this bill is a 3-year bill, and that before that 3 years expires, it will be the duty of the Congress and the committee to review the situation as it then exists with reference to the prices?

Mr. McINTIRE. This would certainly by my understanding. As I have mentioned, the history of cotton legislation would be that probably within those 3 years other cotton legislation would be proposed in order to follow up with the developments within the cotton industry.

As the cost of producing cotton is reduced, the price support level would be reduced below 29 cents per pound. In each of these instances, the amount applies to Middling inch cotton.

With the cotton industry facing the continuing loss of markets to synthetic fibers, and with increasing imports and reductions in acreage, it was obvious that the price of cotton to U.S. mills must be reduced to world levels.

The present difference in the domestic price and the world price is, of course, 8½ cents per pound. Under H.R. 6196, the price to domestic mills would be reduced by 8½ cents in order to eliminate the obvious inequity. My amendment specifies that farmers would absorb 2½ cents of this reduction the first year. By 1966, the farmers' contribution to the reduction in price to the world level would be 3½ cents per pound or 41 percent. The Government's share would be 5 cents per pound, or 59 percent of the reduction. In addition to a reduction in the potential cost of eliminating the inequity, this would reduce the cost of the present export subsidy by 59 percent or over $85 million.

I sincerely hope that with an expanded research program, it will be possible for costs to be reduced to the extent that the price support level will be below 29 cents by 1966 and continue on down to the world level in a reasonable time.

It is interesting to note that evidence presented to the committee pointed out that there were five areas in which production costs on cotton could be reduced substantially, by as much as 11 cents per pound or about one-third of the current price support level. This presentation was made by representatives of the cotton industry and was concurred in by the top research officials of the Department of Agriculture and many of the State experiment stations in the Cotton Belt.

I firmly feel that the amendment which I will offer is sound, fair, and workable.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House is aware of the fact that the economic stability of the Nation as a whole is threatened as a result of the continual loss of our cotton markets.

Cotton has historically been the largest item in the balancing of our foreign trade accounts. Cotton has historically employed a very large number of our citizens, not only in production but even more in processing and distribution. People far removed from the cotton fields of the South, from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oreg., have and do depend upon cotton for their livelihood. Cotton is presently in trouble, not from the standpoint of production—producers have learned how to contently increase yields—but in the markets. Our price support structure has placed American produced cotton textiles at a very decided disadvantage as compared either with imported cotton textiles or with domestically produced synthetics.

The Cooley cotton bill is not a sectional measure. It is one of national importance. It is one which deserves the same consideration from New England and the Midwest which it deserves from the Delta and from California. Were this bill fully understood I have no doubt it would receive this widespread support, not because it is a perfect bill—it is not. Very little legislation which comes before this Congress ever reaches or even approaches perfection. The Cooley bill is a bundle of compromises, and each compromise is dependent upon some other compromise. I doubt very much that this bill can survive the breakdown of any of these compromises.

Of course, I must point out in addition to the committee amendments which are printed as a part of the bill, that the so-called McIntire amendment has been approved by the Agriculture Committee and must be considered as an integral part of the bill just as the other committee amendments are. It is one of the compromises. I did not and do not like to support the McIntire amendment because it means that certain cotton producers will, at the end of a 3-year period, be receiving a support of only 29 cents per pound. I had hoped it would not be necessary to drop this support price below 30 cents, but I recognized in the committee, and I recognize now, that there are a great many other Members who believe the support should be brought much lower. This is indeed a compromise. I stand by this compromise and support it just as I expect my colleagues to stand by the other compromises which constitute the bill. Standing together and accepting the compromises heretofore worked out, we can and will pass an effective and workable measure, but to the extent that any of us seek, at this late hour, to write our own personal preferences into this bill, we jeopardize the relief which we know is essential to the maintenance of a great national industry. I am, therefore, voting for this bill for the committee amendments and for the McIntire amendment, and against all other amendments.

Now how does this bill propose to restore the health of the cotton industry? It proposes to do it by making payments in kind, that is, by using some of the 11 million bales surplus we now have to make cotton more competitive when used by our American mills. Years ago the Congress timidly approached the problem of bringing the supply of farm products in balance with the demand therefor. We never have actually done the job. We have used acreage controls in our effort to narrow the gap but our scientific and technical advance has been so rapid we have achieved little real production control, but since the Cooley bill does not deal with crop control in any manner, I will not dwell on this.

We have further implemented our efforts to maintain the price by providing a program of nonrecourse loans for producers who have held their plantings down to their allotted acres. At the present time the loan on cotton is 32.47 cents per pound. This is approximately 8½ cents more than the world market. We have sold cotton on the world market by giving a subsidy "in kind" to exporters. When an American exporter sold cotton on the world market and produced the evidence that he had actually shipped the cotton to a foreign destination, he has been given, from Commodity Credit stocks, additional cotton of the market value of approximately 8½ cents for each pound of his exports.

This has been known as an export subsidy. It has not involved any cash but, of course, it does involve the use of a valuable commodity. The exporter has not been able to retain this 8½-cent value for himself. On the contrary, he has been forced to sell his cotton at world price. The payment "in kind" has enabled him to recoup his losses, that is, the difference between the American price and the world price, but it has left the foreign mill with a decided advantage over American mills insofar as selling on the American market is concerned.

What the Cooley bill does is to apply exactly the same principle and use of the same machinery for the equilization of the price of cotton used by American mills. It gives the same type of subsidy, that is, a payment "in kind" out of Commodity Credit stocks, and in the same amount to the cotton merchant who delivers cotton to an American mill as the law already gives to the merchant who delivers to a foreign mill. To me, this is simple justice.

Many of the critics have contended that we should pay something less than the complete difference of 8½ cents. They base this, first, on the argument that cotton will cost the American mills less because of transportation. I do not believe this argument will stand analysis. Of course, if we assume the use of the so-called conference rates for ocean shipping, the American mills would get their cotton for less than foreign mills would but no foreign mill ever ships cotton and pays the conference rates—they

ship by tramp steamer, and as best I can ascertain, it is oftentimes cheaper to ship cotton from Lubbock, Tex., to Osaka, Japan, than it is to ship it from Lubbock to Charlotte, N.C. Freight rates are, at best, a complicated and difficult matter of determination, but I think it is clear that there is very little if any difference between the cost of delivering cotton to American mills and delivering it to foreign mills.

In the second place, those who oppose this measure say we do not actually need to equalize the cost; that if we would give the mills a subsidy of something like half the difference between the domestic and the world prices, this would be very helpful and would be "reasonable." I do not so understand the situation. We know rayon is available to our domestic mills at between 24 and 25 cents. So long as the mills can get rayon for less than the price they would have to pay for comparable cotton fiber it seems to me that the inducement to use it will remain. As I see it, there is a "critical point" just as there is in many chemical processes. For instance, if one wants to make ice he can reduce the temperature of water from 90° to 35° but he would still produce no ice. However, if he will reduce the temperature of the water another 3° he will produce ice. Thus, the money spent on reducing the temperature the first 55° is totally wasted unless we go on for the next 3°. I believe we are faced with a rather similar situation in connection with the use of cotton.

Possibly a more vital and more fundamental question is that raised by those who contend that this bill is a "mill subsidy." This deserves serious consideration. The charge is that if the Government makes it possible for the mills to get cotton at 8½ cents less than they are now getting it, they will simply pocket this 8½ cents as added profits and there would be no saving to the consumer. Of course this conclusion is based on the assumption that all cotton mills in America are parties to some kind of gigantic, mysterious conspiracy in violation of our antitrust laws, because it is clear that no such monopoly exists, for if one mill cut the price the others would have to.

To me, the experience of the last 40 years clearly precludes the possibility of such a conspiracy. I cite you the very figures which have been selected by the opponents of this bill. You have seen the graph on page 23012 of the RECORD for December 2, 1963, showing the fluctuations of the price of raw cotton and of gray cloth, the basic product of our cotton mills. You have seen that for 40 years there has been a direct relationship. Not one time in those 40 years did the price of cotton go down without a corresponding decline in the price of gray cloth. To me this graph is absolutely conclusive. The mills can only maintain a rather basic margin to pay their costs and profits.

True, in one of the letters you received from the opponents this morning, there has been superimposed on this graph another, showing the "retail price of cotton products" for the last 30 years. This second graph shows a wide margin between the price of gray cloth and the retail price of cotton products but it, too, shows that the retail price of cotton products went up every time the price of raw cotton and gray cloth went up, and that this retail price dropped every time the price of raw cotton dropped. I suggest that my colleagues familiarize themselves with this graph and with the tables which the opposition has inserted in yesterday's RECORD.

I sincerely invite your serious study of these tables because I believe they prove better than anything any of us could say that there is indeed a direct relationship between the price of raw cotton and the retail price of cotton products. The only other point which these graphs and tables make is that during the war years and just following the war through 1947, the spread or margin between the price of gray cloth and the retail price of cotton products jumped from something like 60 cents per pound to approximately double that amount. Clearly those who handle cotton goods after they leave the mill have, for the past 15 years, enjoyed a much larger margin of profit than any enjoyed prior to that time. But the important point is the relationship between the price of raw cotton and the price of the retail products fluctuates up and down just as it always has.

Now, based upon this relationship, the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther Hodges, who has himself long had a successful career as a cotton mill operator, told our committee that in his opinion for every dollar's worth of surplus cotton we put into this program, the consumer would save at least $2 on the cost of his retail purchases. Other knowledgeable operators have told me this is a very conservative estimate; in their opinion the saving to consumers would be much greater.

You will understand, of course, that this saving to consumers becomes larger than the actual amount of the reduction in cotton prices because each time the cotton product is sold and passes through additional hands it carries a margin of profit based upon the entire accumulated cost. Thus, if we start with a product which costs the mills 32½ cents we are going to find that the accumulation of profits is substantially greater than if we start with a product costing 24 cents. There is nothing strange or mysterious about these cotton margins of the price of cotton goods.

This bill simply provides an effective way of enabling the mills to get more cotton for their money, therefore enabling them to sell gray goods for less. This keeps the mills using cotton rather than synthetics, and it keeps our stores selling American-produced fabrics rather than foreign fabrics. This means a wider market for American cotton. It means our farmers will be able to grow and sell more cotton. It means that our retail stores will be able to stock more American-made textiles and sell them. It means that American workers will find jobs in American mills, and that in the long run American consumers will get more cotton products for the money they spend, and that more money will be spent at home rather than sent abroad.

I think these are all sound objectives, and that they are all national, not regional, objectives. I would, therefore, Mr. Chairman, urge that my colleagues give serious consideration to the basic implications of this legislation, and that they not be led astray by those who would like to impose upon it their special views or ideas no matter how meritorious any one particular change might be. You simply cannot make changes and retain the structure of the bill. I repeat, this bill in its present form is a series of compromises. This bill does not "solve" the cotton problem but it greatly ameliorates it. We have a chance today to get a part of something, a part of something which is desperately needed. If we defeat this bill, or kill it by amendments, we will then have secured absolutely all of nothing. I am in favor of taking the part of something.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have given a great deal of thought and study to this proposed legislation, and I have come to the conclusion, in view of the situation which seems to be recognized by everyone, that approval of this bill would be in the best interest of our country.

I represent a rural district. We have heard a great deal about the cotton industry, primarily the textile side of the cotton industry, and I must confess I am not too familiar with the problems of the textile industry because I have not had an opportunity and thus the experience of talking to people and observing the technicalities and all of the operations of that industry, not any more so than our dear, beloved friends and colleagues who come from the cities and who are just as interested in this problem, and appropriately so, as we are in my district. But I am familiar with the cotton producing side of this question.

My State is a substantial cotton producing State. My district produces substantial cotton, both in the delta area and in the uplands. So I do know something about their problems. I do know something about their concern. They are not the kind of people who want to impose upon the textile industry and the consumers of this great country of ours. They are the kind of people who want to continue to be a part of the economy of this country. They want to be in position to produce cotton and get a price for it that will permit them to get along and have equal opportunity in the economic relationships that we enjoy. That is all we want. We should not ask for more, and I do not think we are entitled to any less.

It is admitted apparently by everyone that something needs to be done. I have always had the feeling, Mr. Chairman, that we have had the know-how and the ingenuity and if given an opportunity will resolve any problems regardless of how difficult they may be.

It is our responsibility to try to give them that opportunity with this problem.

There may be other ways that might be more desirable than proposed by this bill. I suppose it is possible that there

could be devised some scheme that would be more desirable from the viewpoint of many people. I imagine if I were given the authority or had the responsibility to sit down and try to work something out in my own mind I probably could satisfy myself a little more. But that is not the way to get things done in the Congress. That is not the way we can give that opportunity, as I see it.

So the committee has come up with a plan, and this is the only practical plan, as I see it, with any reasonable opportunity of realizing anything that will alleviate the present situation. Therefore I am supporting this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to encourage increased consumption of cotton. No one can object to that. To maintain the income of cotton producers, and to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production. That is precisely what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] talked about earlier. That is precisely what the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] talked about. That is precisely what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the committee, who has labored so hard under such difficult conditions to try to come up with some plan that we in this House could support, has talked about.

I think the great Committee on Agriculture under the present situation, recognizing on both sides of the aisle that something should be done, is entitled to our support. I ask my colleagues to join me in giving it this support.

Yes, we are interested in our district in Arkansas, but if we are willing to give a little, why can we not come to a reasonable conclusion here? Let us work it out.

The committee has accepted the McIntire amendment. The committee, you have heard, has accepted other amendments in order to try to strengthen it and accomplish the purposes of the bill.

This payment in kind we are talking about as proposed in the bill, I wish there were sufficient time to talk about it a little bit more, but there are two questions you might ask. First, could we not achieve the same goal by reducing the price support to the point where cotton could be sold on the market at a price competitive with the foreign mills? When we build up the farm economy over the years with cotton at a certain level, to immediately chop it off or drastically reduce it to an unreasonably low price could not do anything except bankrupt the industry and have an adverse result on the consumers of America. So it would not be a proper thing to do, in my judgment. But it is proposed to do something about it in a gradual way.

The next question is, you may ask, Why not eliminate the cotton export subsidy completely? How are we going to do that without getting all the other things involved in our economy and the markets, both domestic and foreign, involved in it? How are you going to do it from a realistic, practical standpoint? You cannot do it without disrupting the whole economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of this bill. I think it is entitled to our support.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, of all the bills we have reported out of our Committee on Agriculture, I believe this is the worst. Usually, we consider a bill ought to hold down Government expenditures and maintain the farmers' income. In this bill we do neither. This is an increase in Federal expenditures and a decrease in farmers' income. Now I think the farmers might be willing to accept a slight reduction in income in order to correct a very difficult situation which the cotton industry is in. However, I do not think there is any reason why we ought to increase expenditures in the cotton program which is already costing us too much. We have heard so often that the cotton program is one of those successful programs working so well with high supports and mandatory controls. Well, the cotton industry is in trouble and the present program has caused them to be in trouble. But already there is a substantial expenditure of funds. When we add up the cost of this program for 3 years to the present cost of the cotton program, the cost to the taxpayers in 3 years will be exactly the value of the cotton crop for 1 year or about $2,338 million.

I noticed when the chairman talked about the cost of the cotton program he used some smaller figure. As I look at the Department of Agriculture's indications here, I see they give no value whatsoever to 950,000 bales of cotton. Well, that cotton at least could be sold on the foreign market for 24 cents a pound so we ought to give it at least that value and this would make the cotton program cost another $114 million a year. So even with the McIntire amendment, here is a tremendously expensive program.

Now shall we spend that amount of money on cotton? Well, if we did this for every other commodity, mind you, the value of the marketing from all commodities is $35.7 billion a year, that means our Federal program for agriculture, if we gave the same treatment to every commodity would run $35.7 billion in 3 years, if this same deal was given to everybody. Now, I would be willing to spend money for a good program, if it solves something. But I do not believe this bill will solve anything. I do not think the cotton industry will be any better off in 3 years from now than they are right now because there is no insurance that at the termination of this program we would then go to a lower price to prevent a two-price system for cotton. Without the McIntire amendment the prices would go back to any level that the Secretary would want to set as he is doing now. With the McIntire amendment, I understand it would still be kept at 29 cents a pound which is still higher than the world price. Without any more insurance of a better program at the end of 3 years, I could imagine that the mills could use this money to help them to switch over to the synthetics at a more rapid rate than they are able to do right now. They could take this two-hundred-and-some-million dollars a year, according to our figures, we see here it averages $212 million additional each year—they could take that money and use it to switch over to synthetics. We have got to give them a hope that at the end of 3 years something is going to be different for them, that the two-price cotton system would be over with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. How does the gentleman figure that the mills will receive this money, unless the mills actually use up the cotton because the subsidy that you are talking about is being paid on a per pound basis.

Mr. QUIE. The cotton mills can do anything they want with that cotton. At the world price, it is true, they receive a subsidy in the form of cotton and then they also receive a subsidy in the form of cotton in order to get their subsidy of cotton down to the world price. This would go over and over again until it worked out.

Mr. COOLEY. You mentioned the cost involved. Do you have any idea what the dairy program, in which the gentleman is very vitally interested, has cost the taxpayers of this Nation?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I recall that the Secretary of Agriculture said we have to get the cost of the dairy program down to $300 million a year—anything above that is unreasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. The value of the dairy production each year is twice that of cotton. It is twice that. Dairy production value is $4.8 billion while cotton is marketed at a value of $2.4 billion. So if the Secretary of Agriculture says we must keep the dairy program down below $300 million, why should we have an increase in the cotton program when the crop is worth half as much as dairy products and already taxpayers are paying more for the cotton program than they are for dairy?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not interested in the statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture, but what did this dairy program cost the taxpayers of America?

Mr. QUIE. I could not tell you that for the last 20 years, but it runs $400 million a year presently on a $4 billion crop instead of $750 million a year on a $2 billion crop as this bill proposes.

Mr. COOLEY. Figures I have before me indicate that the Commodity Credit Corporation has lost $3,151 million in dairy price support operations. You seem to quote the Secretary of Agriculture. Are you aware of his calculations on the pending bill that this will result in consumer savings of about $500 million a year?

Mr. QUIE. We have never seen this proven in the life of agriculture. We have seen prices go down. We have seen beef prices go down. But did the consumer receive that kind of reduction in the price of meat? No, we have not seen it happen. Milk prices go down to the farmer. Does the price to the consumer go down? When the price of the raw

material, cotton, goes down to the mill, does the consumer receive these savings? We have no assurance of that.

Mr. COOLEY. Do you disagree with the textile manufacturers, the industry statement to the effect that they will have to write off their inventories to the extent of about $150 million, all of which will accrue to the benefit of the consumers?

Mr. QUIE. We have no assurance of that, because like any other industry which utilizes the raw material from the farms, there is no assurance whatsoever that they will cut the prices on their products.

Mr. BELCHER. The chairman asked the gentleman from Minnesota what the dairy program was costing. Could the gentleman tell me what the dairy program would cost if we adopt the same type of program for dairy products that we are going to adopt now for cotton?

Mr. QUIE. If we would do the same thing for dairy products, by making a 15-cent direct payment for butter, and not bring it down to the world market level but just have a 15-cent cut in price, this would cost the taxpayer $360 million just for butter—not for cheese or dry skim milk but just for butter. How would this House react if we came before you and asked for $360 million additional for butter to give them exactly the same kind of program as you are proposing for cotton? They are in the same difficulty as cotton.

Mr. BELCHER. The same argument would prevail on this two-price system for butter that would prevail on the two-price system for cotton, would it not?

Mr. QUIE. That is right. We send dairy products overseas for less than Americans must pay for it. They have an export subsidy, like cotton, and butter is endangered by substitutes, just like cotton.

Mr. BELCHER. Would not the dairy people have the same argument in favor of this type of program that the cotton people have?

Mr. QUIE. That is right. And there is no reason why, if we can adopt this program, we should not go ahead and adopt the same kind of program for every other commodity in the same difficulty, and there are others.

Mr. BELCHER. I suppose the gentleman knows that there are dairy bills which are prepared to be introduced to do that very thing in case this bill passes the House. Do you not?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. The National Milk Producers Federation last year passed a resolution supporting a dairy program similar to this.

Mr. BELCHER. Is that not going to put us all in kind of a spot, because every Member of this House, unless he represents an entire city district, has at least some farmers that have milk cows. Is that not correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is right. For instance, we also have difficulty with imports of beef now. If we are handing this money out to the cotton farmers and the cotton industry we would want to do the same thing for beef.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Chair's ruling against the point of order concerning the committee report raises some very troubling questions about this legislation. To help clarify them I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], to pages 25 and 26 of the committee report. I call attention to the language on those pages in black brackets. Is it true that the language so bracketed is repealed by this bill? Will the gentleman from North Carolina indicate whether or not the language which is bracketed in black on pages 25 and 26 of the committee report is repealed by this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not care to argue the point of order which has already been overruled. I do not think it is proper for the gentleman to interrogate me about a ruling of the Chair. The point of order was overruled and that stands as it is at the moment.

Mr. FINDLEY. Will not the gentleman agree that the Members of this body are entitled to know the effect of this bill upon existing law?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is explaining to the Members of the House the effect of it. This is in substantial compliance with the Ramseyer rule, and the Chair so ruled. Why does the gentleman take the time to discuss it any further?

Mr. FINDLEY. Precisely because there is doubt as to what language in existing law is stricken by this bill. I think the Members of this body are entitled to know, and I invite anyone on the committee or others in this body who can answer to tell me if the bracketed language on pages 25 and 26 of the committee report are stricken by this bill. And if we cannot get that answer, why should we proceed with the consideration of this bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. This is not a question of discussing the decision of the Speaker on the Ramseyer rule. This is a question of knowing what is in the law today; what you have done with respect to the existing law.

Mr. COOLEY. You have the law in front of you, I am sure, because you examined the law before you made your point of order. You made your point of order and it was overruled.

Mr. GROSS. This is not a question of debating the point of order. The question is this: Are the feed grain and acreage allotment provisions of the law repealed by this bill, H.R. 6196?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman is in doubt of it, he can offer a clarifying amendment when we get to the amendment stage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Let the record show that the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, refuses to respond to the question as to whether these provisions of law have been repealed, according to the report accompanying this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly the gentleman is not serious in saying, "Let the RECORD show." This RECORD is not going to belie my statements. I made my statement and it stands and it has been sustained by the Parliamentarian and by the Speaker.

Mr. FINDLEY. The only point we are trying to clear up is what is actually the effect of this bill; whether or not language now in the law comes out. It is vitally important, especially to anyone who represents a feed grains area, because it is quite clear that the effect of this bill is to strike out the language in brackets on pages 25 and 26. That being the case it is also clear that section 105 of the Agriculture Act of 1949 is stricken out. Therefore, the subsequent amendments to section 105 of the Agriculture Act of 1949 have nothing to hang to, amendments on which authority for the current feed grains program is derived. The striking of section 105 and subsequent amendments thereto reinstates, in my judgment, the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to invoke mandatory acreage controls in the feed grains area. So, it is of vital concern to find out just what this bill actually does to substantive law today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will my friend from Illinois yield again?

Mr. FINDLEY. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask someone on the Committee on Agriculture the meaning of the language which appears on page 2 of the bill, section (3), which reads as follows:

Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

I shall not take the time of the committee to read all of the section, but thereafter follows the new language concerning upland cotton.

Now, what does this do? I seek to ascertain from some member of the committee what this does with respect to sections 330 and 105 of the existing law.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, it repeals section 104.

Mr. GROSS. In section 104 are contained sections 330 and 105, would the gentleman agree?

Mr. COOLEY. They are referred to; that is true.

Mr. GROSS. So that it repeals the feed grain and acreage allotment provisions?

Mr. COOLEY. Section 104 of the act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing upland cotton in the United States at the earliest practicable date. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $10 million annually, as may be necessary for the Secretary to carry out this special research program. The Secretary shall report an-

nually to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate with respect to the results of such research.

What is it you want to know?

Mr. GROSS. Section 3, reads as follows, the introducing language:

Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

Mr. COOLEY. All right.

Mr. GROSS. If it is amended to read as follows——

Mr. COOLEY. Anything inconsistent with this rewrite would certainly be repealed, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. All right, then it is all inconsistent, beginning with section 104, all of the feed grain and crop acreage provisions are inconsistent and therefore repealed?

Mr. COOLEY. No, it does not mention either section by name or number.

Mr. GROSS. It does mention it by number.

Mr. COOLEY. What section?

Mr. GROSS. It does mention that section 104 is amended to read as follows.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, directly, the 104 section is mentioned. You are complaining that part of section 104 is apparently repealed by the rewriting of the section?

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from North Carolina I am not complaining about anything. I am merely trying to find out what is repealed, if anything, of the feed grains and acreage allotment provisions now in existing law. I am convinced you have repealed those provisions by the language which appears on lines 22 and 23 at page 2 of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. All right. If we have done that it certainly can be corrected when we start to read the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Why should I correct it? I did not change the law.

Mr. COOLEY. If this bill changes it, you can correct it.

Mr. GROSS. You can do all the correcting you care to. I will say to the gentleman that what I am going to do is vote against the bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is clear from this colloquy that there is a considerable amount of doubt as to the actual effect of this bill. It would be very hazardous for us to consider the bill and to act on it until these points are clarified. I certainly hope that the chairman of the committee and the staff of the committee will give consideration to amendments which will clarify these points.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Texas, to the chart which was printed on page 23012 of the RECORD to which the gentleman referred earlier. The gentleman indicated that the price of cotton products always goes up and down with the price of raw cotton. The gentleman mentioned that earlier in the colloquy with the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY]. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that 11 times in the brief span of years on the chart the two price lines did not move together. They either moved in opposite directions or one stayed the same and the other moved in one or the other direction.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. In the first place, the gentleman's chart does not refer to the price of raw cotton as compared with the price of the gray goods at the mill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ten Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. POAGE. In the first place, the gentleman's table does not relate to the difference between the price of raw cotton and the mill price of gray goods, but to the difference between the average farm value of cotton and the retail cost of goods.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is exactly what I intended.

Mr. POAGE. I understood the gentleman to suggest that it was a comparison between the price of raw cotton and the mill price. This is not the mill price, this is the retail price to which the gentleman referred. The gentleman says there are certain minor variations, and I recognize that is true. You do not find every time there is 1 cent movement that the very next year you will find it reflected because always in a yearly movement you do get times of the year when you do not find exactly the coordination; but the gentleman will agree, I am sure, that at the very beginning of his chart, which is 1935, there is a retail cost price of 91 cents as against a price of cotton of 12 cents.

Mr. FINDLEY. I will say it is true that the price lines have followed a general direction.

Mr. POAGE. A general direction, yes.

Mr. FINDLEY. But there has not been a strict relationship between the two.

Mr. POAGE. It shows both went up at approximately the same percentage until 1951. The gentleman's chart shows, and I think you will agree, a general movement upward from 1935 to 1951 of both the price of raw cotton and the retail price of cotton products.

Mr. FINDLEY. We are adopting a theory, then, that the retail price always goes up or down with the cost of the materials?

Mr. POAGE. The rest of my sentence was to be that the chart he has submitted further shows that beginning in 1951 down to the present time there has been a gradual decline both in the price of raw cotton and in the price of the finished product. That is exactly what I said, and I repeat it.

This very chart the gentleman submits shows a direct relationship between the two sets of prices.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that what really confuses me is a speech which was reprinted in part on the same page of the RECORD today in which the gentleman from Texas was quoted as saying:

The record shows rather clearly that the tremendous loss which farmers have sustained in the way of low prices for their products in recent years has not been passed on to the consumers—and if low farm prices don't help consumers, why should Government try to lower them?

Why should we pass this bill to lower the price of raw cotton if it is not going to help the consumers?

Mr. POAGE. We should not pass it if it is not going to help the consumers. The gentleman from Texas was speaking about farm prices in general, of which the gentleman from Illinois is well aware, and that is exactly how farm prices in general have reacted. But the gentleman's own figures show that this is not applicable to the price of cotton products.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is the gentleman excluding cotton from this general picture?

Mr. POAGE. I am pointing out that there is a very special relationship between the price of raw cotton and the products thereof, and that relationship developed as the result of the competitive situation which exists in the cotton market that does not exist in a great many other commodities. There is a great deal more flexibility in the use of cotton products than there is in the use of meat or potatoes or bread. I am not quarreling with the gentleman's figures. I am just asking him to accept the implications which necessarily flow from them.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, on November 8 I made a statement in the RECORD concerning H.R. 6169, the Cooley cotton bill. I was pleased to see a response in the RECORD on November 13 by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. The gentleman is author of the bill and chairman of the Committee on Agriculture which considered and reported the bill.

He therefore speaks with authority for those supporting this legislation. The arguments he advanced may reasonably be assumed to be the best that can be said for it. If so, the bill deserves a quick demise.

Most—if not all—farm legislation is a conspiracy against public understanding. Its true character is concealed in verbal underbrush so thick that only a few persevering bushwhackers ever fully understand it.

And for very good reason: if the general public ever found out what was actually proposed the taxpayers' wrath would stop the legislation but quick.

The Cooley bill and the gentleman's defense of it constitute a prize example of this conspiracy with public understanding.

First. The gentleman claims this is not really a mill subsidy. The payment is called a trade incentive. Does not the word "incentive" imply a consideration, something of value? Of course, it does, and the consideration is a million dollars worth of cotton—a consideration just like money in the bank to textile mills. Who gets the consideration—the payment in kind—the trade incentive? Is it the producer? No, this is disallowed in the very language of the bill. Is it

the first or second handler? No, the Committee on Agriculture specifically rejected an amendment to provide the payment to the first or second handler.

The payment, of course, is to the mill. It is the only practical place for it to go. Not actually a mill payment? How about the mills who buy directly from cotton farmers? In that case, who would get the payment? The producer is disqualified by the language of the bill, so it could go no place other than to the mill—clearly a mill payment.

This bill authorizes a mill subsidy pure and simple. Arguments to the contrary add nothing but confusion.

Not a mill subsidy? Who would get the 8½-cent-a-pound payment authorized for private holders of raw cotton? This payment in total could amount to over $43 million. If the mill holds the raw cotton, would the payment not go to the mill and thus properly be considered as a mill subsidy? Of course it would. It is estimated there are 1,023,000 bales of raw cotton in private hands. At $42.50 a bale, computed at 8½ cents a pound, the direct payment could total $43,477,500.

Another example of subterfuge, and conspiracy with public understanding, is the manner in which cost figures have been presented.

I have in my hand a chart dated October 14, 1963, carrying the reference: ASCS:PPA. It is headed:

Cotton: Comparison of major items of estimated expenditures under current legislation and H.R. 6196 based on assumptions listed below.

One might assume this would present a fair and clear picture of the cost of this bill. The final dollar figures, showing "net additional expenditures added by H.R. 6196, as amended," are $118.2 million for the first year, $87.9 million for the second, and $44.3 million for the third.

Then a final, innocent line, which may salve the conscience of those who prepared the chart, but hardly completes a fair cost presentation. This line read "Reduction in CCC stocks in addition to cash expenditures," followed by the phrase "950,000 bales" under the column for each of the 3 years.

Completely concealed is the fact that these 950,000 bales enter into the cost of the bill.

These bales are used for payment in kind. They are to be given to the mills. The taxpayers have invested about $162.50 in each of these bales. Nine hundred and fifty thousand bales represent an annual taxpayers' cost of $154,375,000.

Why was this not shown as a part of the program's cost, instead of being skillfully slipped in without a dollar sign, indeed with a subtle phrasing that made it seem like a gain—rather than a loss—for taxpayers?

Another example of conspiracy with public understanding is the claim that this bill is actually a $500 million-plus gain for the American consumer. This is an insult to the intelligence of this body.

Spend an extra $250 million in taxes for a direct subsidy program like this, and the taxpayers get back not just the $250 million—but an extra $500 million as well.

This argument is based on the erroneous theory that consumer prices automatically reflect raw material prices. I refer you, Mr. Chairman, to a statement I placed in the RECORD, page 23012. It carries a tabulation which shows that cotton product prices at retail do not automatically jump up and down in fixed relationship to raw cotton prices. Indeed, sometimes the price lines go in opposite direction.

In that same statement, I quoted from earlier statements by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] citing figures to show that consumers do not get the benefit of lower prices for farm commodities. I hope the Members will take the time to read these statements. They effectively destroy the argument that consumers will get a big windfall out of this bill.

If we accept the theory that consumer prices always reflect changes in farm commodity prices, we must remember an economic law works both ways. If this bill will benefit consumers, then Secretary Freeman actually punished consumers to the tune of some $90 million in 1961 when he jacked up price supports on cotton.

Are we now to accept this theory?

Where does all of this lead?

How about the fast-growing synthetics industry in this country? How about the people employed in the manufacture of manmade fibers? If we are going to spend $700 million a year, or so, to subsidize the price of cotton—how can we deny a similar claim from manmade fiber manufacturers? Are they not American citizens too, and entitled to fair and equal treatment?

If this bill passes, the manufacturers of manmade fibers will be forced to help finance this cotton industry subsidy—a subsidy which discriminates unfairly against their own businesses.

Then, how about other commodities, other industries. This bill would establish a dangerous precedent—a new-type subsidy—a big enough gate for any industry to reach through for tax dollars if it gets into trouble.

In our concern for consumers, for cotton textile workers, for cotton farmers, we should remember that these people are also taxpayers.

Cotton is in trouble, literally on the ropes. The blame properly belongs at the door of the Federal Government. The responsibility for providing a remedy belongs at the door of the Federal Government.

But a legislative remedy is not needed. We do not need a new law. Secretary Freeman has the authority—and a legislative mandate—to remedy the cotton problem.

All he has to do is sign his name, and thus order a gradual reduction in his price. He has this authority—and this mandate—under the Agricultural Act of 1958.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK].

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to add my voice in favor of the passage of H.R. 6196, because an important segment of our American business community is fighting to survive. I refer to the cotton industry, now facing a situation that is closing mills and eliminating jobs all the way from the silent, boll-studded cotton row to the busy, efficient loom.

The immediate and only answer at hand is the Cooley cotton bill. I urge its prompt passage by both Houses of Congress, thus eliminating an injustice that is rapidly growing into a nationwide social mephitis and a political hystrix.

I wonder how many of our colleagues, not to mention the citizens at large, realize what has been happening to the American cotton farmer and industrialist in the last 8 to 10 years. One phase of our foreign aid program has been the encouragement of greater production abroad. We did this by supplying machinery, financial assistance, and technical knowledge. And then, for the foreign cotton manufacturer, we lowered our export cotton prices so that our American cotton was available to him at 8½ cents per pound less than it is to the manufacturer here at home.

As the years have passed since we started this program, our desire to help our friends overseas has lashed back at us in the nature of the bite at the hand that feeds. The foreign manufacturer can buy our cotton, produce his end product with low-paid labor, and send it back over here to us at a much lower price than we can produce it ourselves.

The cotton interests are bearing the burden. And they do so at a time when they are battling a threat from another quarter. Synthetics are seriously competing with textiles and are demanding a larger and larger share of the market.

In the face of this dilemma which has come upon the cotton industry, I hope we can take immediate action before we lose an element of our business life that has contributed a major part toward America's greatness. The South, during its uphill battle in the regrettable war of the 1860's, learned only too well and too late the importance of cotton.

We should act now to keep the cotton farmer at his plow and the millworker at his loom. The need for such action has been seen for years, both at the executive level and elsewhere. There have been recommendations, but they have gone for naught.

Passage of H.R. 6196 would provide the needed relief. The main thing it does is to make cotton available to our American mills at the same price it is sold to the foreign competitor.

Our mills have been the buyers of more than 70 percent of our domestic cotton. When they are forced to close and the cotton farmer has no buyer for his crop, he must go into some other field of agriculture, thus placing a burden on other

branches of our economy. To illustrate the seriousness, I merely cite that cotton has suffered a competitive loss in its domestic markets of 1.7 million bales a year for the last 3 years. More than 3 million persons live on farms growing cotton. Millions of others in allied fields depend upon the raw cotton industry for their livelihood.

The district I have the honor to represent in Congress is largely agricultural, but it also has some important cotton mills. One of these is the Dan River Mills at Danville, Va., the largest in the world confined to a single community. It was formed in the 1880's, coming along at a time when the South was trying to rebuild following the period of reconstruction, and it was a great aid to the people and the economy of the area at that time. It still is an important source of income to working men and women, employing at Danville alone more than 11,000 persons. Its manufacturing establishments are found in three of the Southern States, and its sales agencies are located strategically throughout the United States, while its operations enhance and contribute toward the economy of the entire Nation.

I have always been opposed to subsidies, but I do not look upon the provisions of H.R. 6196 as a subsidy. I realize this bill may not be desirable in all respects and may in some ways be violative of what some of us consider sound legislative and governmental policies; nevertheless, it is the best and only means now available to correct the grave injustice that now exists by reason of these price differentials in favor of foreign manufacturers.

It is a simple principle of law that where there is a wrong there is a remedy, and surely there must be some remedy which will work to the benefit of the cotton industry. I believe this bill, H.R. 6196, has that remedy. If this is not the correct remedy, we can change it later.

In conclusion, in my opinion, a vote against this bill is a vote to give to foreign manufacturers cotton at a price of 8½ cents a pound less than we sell it to our domestic manufacturers who are employing our own people and who are making other significant contributions to our economy. I cannot in good conscience cast a vote that will give a differential in favor of foreign manufacturers against American manufacturers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is a rapidly changing world and we have to change policies and procedures in keeping with the nature of the world in which we live. That applies to agricultural programs and policies.

Much of the discussion today has related to the serious situation confronting the cotton industry. We are confronted with a serious problem. But, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] pointed out, this is not the first time we have been confronted with serious problems in agriculture. When we are confronted with these problems, we have always found ways to deal with them.

We should not berate ourselves as Members of the Congress, on the Republican and Democratic sides of the aisle, in regard to what has been done in the past for agriculture. It is true that no perfect answers have been found; some programs have failed, and there have been expenditures which could not always be defended. But the Congress, and I speak of the Democrats and the Republicans, has during the past 30 years done a good job in enabling the farmer to grow and to prosper. The Congress has provided an atmosphere of stability which has enabled the farmer to plant and to produce and to harvest his crops with some assurances. Fortified with these assurances the farmer has done an unbelievably good job. He has achieved the most efficient agriculture in the history of the world. For this neither the farmer nor the Congress need apologize.

I do not personally wish to disassociate myself from a great majority of the farm programs of the past because I believe they have brought this country a long way. I remember as a boy on the farm how the farmer was regarded by many as just an old hayseed, a man who was not capable of doing something more profitable.

Too often the farmer was considered by townspeople a few decades ago as a second-class citizen. You know that—many of you know that. But as a result of farm programs made available by the Government to the farmer, the farmer has for many years been able to achieve a higher status. In the eyes of the townspeople he has become a first-class citizen. We want to continue to cooperate with the farmer in programs designed to enable him to occupy his proper place in the economic life of this Nation.

Yes, we are confronted here with a serious problem in cotton. We can meet this situation. I might add that it is going to take some time and it is going to cost some money, but a healthy agriculture in the future will contribute tremendously to the welfare of labor and industry in the cities. It has contributed in a big way to the welfare of labor and industry in the cities in the past. In the interest of the general welfare, we cannot afford to let this great cotton industry, including all facets, such as production, processing, and manufacture, suffer collapse.

I hope that in the legislative process in the House and Senate a reasonably adequate answer can be found and I shall work with others toward that end.

We have got to find a way to make cotton more competitive. We want an expanding industry, not a declining industry. Our objective is increased consumption of cotton by our mills and additional cotton acreage allotments for farmers.

I hope to have an opportunity tomorrow to speak more specifically as to the statistics on cotton and the pros and cons of the pending bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN], such time as he may desire.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, and my other colleagues. I support H.R. 6196 because it has the almost unanimous support of the cottongrowers of California and those elements of the cotton business which process and merchandise their product. It is also supported by those persons who supply cottongrowers with goods, services, and labor. I am also advised that it has the unanimous support of those sections of organized labor which represent millworkers and those which represent labor engaged in converting cotton into garments and other consumer items. I also support it because I think it is good legislation.

There is one item of stipulated agreement between those persons who favor H.R. 6196 and those persons who oppose it, including the Republican members of the House Agriculture Committee who submitted a minority report on it. It is unanimously agreed that the present cotton program is not working and that something must be done to save the production of a major farm commodity which has an annual value of about $2.4 billion and which earns at least $750 million annually from sales abroad for dollars and which could earn more to assist in the solution of our balance-of-payments problem. In addition the processing, manufacture, and sale of this fiber by U.S. corporations and individuals adds further billions of dollars to the income of both capital and labor.

There is no quarrel then over the fact that a major U.S. industry, which benefits both capital and labor, has a problem which demands a solution. The only dispute is over the means of solving it. I submit that H.R. 6196 is the only solution available to us which will give immediate answers to an immediate problem which, to be sure, will require a different permanent long-range solution.

Let us examine the bill and its background to support this conclusion.

BACKGROUND FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS

First. Only a handful of U.S. cottongrowers—operating under ideal soil and climate conditions and with massive financial investment—can profitably grow cotton at a world market price ranging between 23 and 25 cents a pound, which is established by lower foreign labor and other production costs. Thus if we are not to lose the bulk of our cotton production and irreparably damage a major sector of our farm economy with a probable shift of resources into other crops which are in surplus condition, we must have a fair and reasonable cotton price support program with the protection of the domestic market derived from existing quotas on imports of raw cotton.

Second. These necessities have heretofore worked to the disadvantage of U.S. cotton mills and cotton fiber end users in the United States because they have been paying more for raw fiber and primary cloth than their foreign competitors. The current disadvantage is at least 8½ cents a pound to the mills and a greater amount to cloth users. Do not be fooled by the argument that this disadvantage is insubstantial. Industry figures, verified by Government agencies, reflect that the cost of raw cotton is 55 percent of the manufacturing cost of primary cotton cloth, commonly known as gray goods. This disadvantage

combined with higher labor costs at all stages of use after the fiber reaches the mills has resulted in the loss of practically all the U.S. foreign market for finished goods and a rapidly increasing incursion of foreign made finished cotton goods and yarn into the U.S. market. A collateral and equally serious result has been the acceleration of the substitution of cheaper synthetic fibers for cotton by U.S. manufacturers whenever possible to the detriment of both the cotton grower and the consumer. Such substitution also means increased mill-worker unemployment because a whole section of a cotton mill can be eliminated by such substitution.

How does H.R. 6196 reach these elements of the cotton problems?

First. Through a payment device, using cotton stocks already in Government hands, it assures U.S. mills the right to buy U.S. cotton at the same price that it is sold to their competitors abroad. This reduction of costs to the mills will reach the consumer in the form of lower finished product cost. Consumer savings will be even greater than mill savings because the handlers and finishers, manufacturers and marketers, who operate between the mills and the ultimate consumer buyer, each add percentages on the cost of gray goods material as it goes through them with an estimated minimum 100-percent markup between the mill and the ultimate buyer according to Department of Commerce estimates. For example, if we assume a 30-cent-per-yard gray goods price compared with a 38½-cent price if we fail to pass this legislation, the saving to the mill would be 8½ cents per pound; the saving to the final consumer perhaps 17 cents per equivalent pound of material depending on its finished form. Hickman Price, then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, testified before our committee that this pyramiding of savings between the mill and the housewife meant at least $100 million of saving of cost to the housewife for each penny of reduction of cost of raw cotton to the mill.

There are those who argue that the mill saving would not be passed on. The facts contradict this statement. U.S. Department of Agriculture figures covering a period of from 1925 through part of 1963 demonstrate that a movement up or down in the price of raw cotton is almost identically matched by a movement up or down in the mill price of primary cotton cloth.

Second. It establishes a pattern of price support—with the McIntire amendment which I support—which will result in a reduction of that support on two-thirds of the crop by 3.47 cents a pound. An exception to this reduction is made for the case of the so-called small farmer who produces 15 bales or less but the farmers of this size are rapidly and wisely getting out of the cotton business, and I am satisfied that this bill will result in a permanent reduction of cotton price supports across the board after the 3-year program of the bill terminates. Such permanent reduction of support levels should save at least $243 million annually in the cost of a cotton program.

The opponents of this bill maintain that this new program will cost $221,600,000 more than the present program. They are incorrect. Because of savings as aforementioned from lower support levels and other factors, the Department of Agriculture estimates that the program will only cost an additional $118 million the first year, $87 million the second year, and $44 million the third year of its 3-year lifetime. These costs will be more than matched by consumer savings and the revitalization of a great industry.

Third. It establishes a vehicle for adding to the acreage of those cotton producers who are most efficient and the most damaged by the inadequacies of the present program. Such addition will occur only in the event it will not add to cotton surpluses.

Fourth. It provides for paying the so-called mill payments through delivery of cotton out of surplus Government stocks with the result of reducing a huge Government investment which has already been paid for and which adds costs of storage and other costs daily and which, if not otherwise disposed of through the increased cotton consumption which this bill provides for, are frequently given away abroad at a total loss to the taxpayer.

Fifth. It provides for accelerated research to reduce the costs of cotton growing to the end that price supports and Government costs can be further lowered.

I hope that I have demonstrated that this proposed legislation hits at the major elements of the cotton problem immediately and in a massive, effective way.

The only alternative the opponents of it have offered is a request of the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce cotton price supports across the board. The advice and request overlooks the fact that the present statute does not permit his making a reduction as large as that provided for by this bill for two-thirds of the cotton. The advice overlooks the fact that such action, within the limits permitted by statute to the Secretary, would not solve the mill problem. If the Secretary made the maximum discretionary reduction our domestic mills would still be forced to pay a price for raw cotton substantially higher than that paid by their foreign competitors.

Finally I wish to emphasize that the so-called mill payment is not a payment for the benefit of the mills and under the Cooley bill need not be paid to them. It is merely a method of giving the mills price equity with foreign mills. It is the only method that has even been suggested for achieving that result without requiring such a drastic reduction in the farm price of cotton that 99 percent of our cotton farmers would cease to farm cotton. The payment is designed to benefit farmers.

The Cooley bill was developed after extensive hearings which began in December of 1962. It was reported by our committee in June and given a rule shortly thereafter. Every detail of it was discussed with President Kennedy and President Johnson and it has received the approval of both of these distinguished men. It merits your approval.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] 5 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 216]

Ashbrook	Gibbons	Morrison
Ashley	Gill	Morse
Auchincloss	Glenn	Moss
Baker	Gurney	O'Brien, Ill
Baring	Hall	O'Hara, Mich.
Barrett	Hansen	Passman
Bates	Harsha	Pepper
Becker	Hébert	Powell
Bennett, Mich.	Herlong	Rivers, Alaska
Blatnik	Jennings	Robison
Bolling	Johansen	Roosevelt
Brooks	Kee	Roush
Byrnes, Wis.	Kelly	St Germain
Celler	Keogh	St. Onge
Chelf	Kilburn	Shelley
Colmer	Kirwan	Sheppard
Curtis	Kluczynski	Siler
Davis, Tenn.	Latta	Slack
Dawson	Long, La.	Smith, Va.
Diggs	McLoskey	Steed
Dowdy	Madden	Thompson, La.
Dulski	Mailliard	Thompson, Tex.
Ellsworth	Matsunaga	Trimble
Evins	May	Van Pelt
Fallon	Miller, Calif.	Vinson
Fogarty	Miller, N.Y.	Wharton
Fuqua	Milliken	Widnall
Garmatz	Minshall	Williams
Gary	Monagan	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 6196, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 343 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I hope that anything I say here will not further confuse you on this bill. I think it is a difficult bill for the average person, particularly those people who do not come from a cotton area or who do not come from a mill area, to understand.

As I stated yesterday, the only reason that I voted to permit this bill to come out of committee and to come onto the floor of the House was to give an opportunity or to provide a vehicle for making some changes that would improve this bill. It can be improved. It can be made acceptable, I think, to a majority of the people on both sides of the aisle. I regret, of course, that there has apparently been some politics thrown into this fight. I would remind you, however, that this bill has had a rule since July 30. During the months of August, September, October, and the greater part of November it could have been brought to this floor had there been any great effort on the part of the administration or desire to want to pass this bill. The title of the bill as it is

written does not indicate what is in the bill. To start with, it says that this bill is "to increase consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes." I take it that the phrase "for other purposes" is the thing that is to cover those parts of the purposes of the bill that are not definitely set out.

The first thing I asked the distinguished chairman of our committee today was to give me an explanation of the differences in section 348 and going over to page 2 of the bill where it says that the Secretary may determine the amount of payments which "will eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users." Then it also says:

Including such payments as may be necessary to make raw cotton in inventory on the date of enactment of this section available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of this section.

I think that most of us realize that this bill originated at the request of our late President to try to eliminate the inequities that existed between the domestic mills and the foreign mills. For several years now we have been paying an export subsidy of 8.5 cents a pound to the foreign mills. In other words, on that cotton that they could buy at a reduction of 8.5 cents a pound.

The domestic mills felt they were being discriminated against and they asked that this inequity be removed. I want to go on record here and now—and I think I represent the views of most of the people in this House—that we do appreciate the fact when an inequity exists that we would like to eliminate it. But I do not want to go beyond eliminating that inequity.

In the hearings before our committee the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Murphy, was present and made several statements about the views of the Department, as to what was necessary to eliminate the inequity. He did not at any time agree that it required 8½ cents a pound to the domestic mills to eliminate that inequity.

What I am trying to point out here is I am in favor of the Secretary of Agriculture having the authority, with the staff that he has at hand, to determine what this inequity is and to pay that. I have no objection to that at all. But as we go down in the bill, beginning with line 12 on page 2, we find a proviso which says:

Provided, That beginning August 1, 1964, such payments shall be made to persons other than producers in an amount as will make upland cotton produced in the United State available for domestic use at a price which is not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export.

I think it was clear in the committee when that provision was put in there, that the first payment to eliminate the inequity might be 5 cents, it might be 5½ cents, it might be 6 cents, or it might be 4½ cents, but sufficient to eliminate the inequity. After that time this proviso would set up a greater subsidy, and in my opinion would provide a windfall to the mills.

I think it might be appropriate at this time to mention to this body, because I find that many individual Members, when I mentioned this to them during this week, were unaware of the fact that the domestic mills at the present time do receive a subsidy on all of the processed cotton that they export. Last year it amounted to about $17 million, and the year before that about $18 million. They do get that subsidy to allow them to compete in foreign markets already. So I was surprised to learn that many members of our committee, some of them from areas where these mills operate, did not know that that existed. That would be one of the amendments I would propose to offer tomorrow, to provide that we would eliminate the inequity, but not go any further than that.

The next thing I would propose to do to bring this bill into line is to bring the production in line with the demand that we have for cotton. We have gotten into trouble in the cotton industry because we have encouraged overproduction through high supports and through other operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] 2 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It is going to be difficult. I will have to hurry here in an effort to try to explain these amendments that I will offer tomorrow. I do hope that when we get into the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule we will have an opportunity to explain these amendments more thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, under the present provisions of law, the Secretary cannot allot more than 16 million acres of cotton. Last year there was a reduction in cotton allotments of 11 percent. But with that 11-percent reduction, due to a gimmick in the law, all of the States, with the exception of four, produced more cotton than they did the year before. In some of the counties the individual growers, instead of taking an 11-percent reduction in acres, actually received a 40-percent increase in acres, and much of this increase was in high-production areas. Actually, in 1963, with an 11-percent reduction in acres, total production will be up about one-half million bales over 1962.

Mr. Chairman, we have all heard about release and reapportionment of cotton acres which adds to the production. The worst thing about that law is the fact that the people who release their cotton acreage are located in the areas where they have the lowest yield and where it is not profitable to grow cotton. For instance, in one State 32 percent of all the cotton allotments are released from people who have low yield. When the released acres are not requested in that county, that goes into a State pool and is reallocated in areas where they produce two bales, three bales, and in some cases as high as four bales this last year.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to read through all of these States, but in one State 22 percent of its allotted acreage represented released acreage, 27 percent in another State, 14 percent in another State, 26 percent in one, 32 percent in another and 20 percent in yet another. This release and reapportionment has gotten entirely out of hand, yet in this very bill we encourage an increased continuation of this practice.

Mr. Chairman, when the bill (H.R. 6196) is read under the 5-minute rule tomorrow, it is my intention to offer an amendment, which would have the effect of limiting the subsidy, through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates, to an amount which will be sufficient to eliminate the inequities due to differences in cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users of such cotton. This amendment will read:

On page 2, line 12, substitute a period for the colon and add closing quotation marks; then strike the remainder of line 12 and all of lines 13 through 17.

Mr. Chairman, I have prepared other amendments which I am considering offering, although it is not likely that all of them will be offered; in fact if one or more would be adopted it would be inadvisable to offer the others. However, for the purpose of presenting the various considerations that I have been giving to this bill, I am including herewith a statement of the purposes of each amendment, as well as the wording of the various amendments, numbered from 2 through 5.

Amendment 2 is intended to provide that when the national acreage allotment exceeds 16 million acres, the acreage in excess of 16 million acres shall be allocated so that the first 500,000 acres of such excess shall be "export market acreage" and the balance of such excess shall be allocated one-half as export market acreage and one-half as normal allotment pursuant to section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Amendment 2: Amend section 349 in subsection (1) of section 6 of the bill to read as follows:

"SEC. 349. If the national acreage allotment established under section 344(a) of the Act for the years 1964, 1965, or 1966 exceeds sixteen million acres (exclusive of the national acreage reserve established under section 344(b) of the Act), the amount of such acreage allotment in excess of sixteen million acres shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this part, be allotted as follows: The first five hundred thousand acres of such excess shall, subject to the provisions of this section and section 350 of the Act, be allotted by the Secretary as export market acreage directly to farms eligible to receive allotments under the provisions of section 344 of the Act; any remaining acreage in excess of sixteen million, five hundred thousand acres of the national acreage allotment shall be allotted one-half pursuant to the provisions of section 344 of the Act and one-half shall be allotted as export market acreage in the same manner as the first five hundred thousand acres of export market acreage: *Provided*, That no farm may receive an allotment of export market acreage in excess of the per centum prescribed by the Secretary for the crop year of the acreage allotment for the farm established under the provisions of section 344 of the Act. In allocating export market acreage, the Secretary shall estimate the amount which would be planted on farms and establish a percentage, hereinafter referred to as

the maximum export market acreage (not exceeding the per centum prescribed by the Secretary under the proviso in the preceding sentence), of the farm acreage allotment established under section 344 of the Act reasonably expected to result in planting of an acreage equal to the export market acreage available for the crop year. Any acreage allotted to a farm as export market acreage and planted to cotton shall be in addition to the county and State acreage allotments and shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. Notice of the maximum export acreage for each farm shall be included in the notices of farm acreage allotments and marketing quotas issued pursuant to section 362 of the Act. The provisions of this section shall not apply to extra long staple cotton."

Amendment 3 is intended to eliminate the 15-bale provision for a premium price.

Amendment 3: Amend the bill by deleting section 5 thereof and renumbering subsequent sections of the bill accordingly.

Amendment 4 is intended to provide that not more than one-half of the released acreage in each county may be reapportioned to other farms in the same county, or transferred to the State committee for reapportionment to farms in other counties in the State.

Amendment 4: Add a new section 7 to the bill as follows:

"SEC. 7. Section 344(m) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by addition of the following new paragraph:

"'(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection (m), for the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops of cotton the county committee shall not reapportion or surrender to the State committee an acreage in excess of one-half of the acreage released under paragraph (2) of this subsection (m). This paragraph shall not apply to extra long staple cotton.'"

Amendment 5 is intended to authorize the Secretary to purchase and retire the allotment and related State, county and farm acreage history from the owner of any farm having an acreage allotment of 15 acres or less. The price for such purchase could not exceed the smaller of 20 cents per pound of cotton production per acre calculated on the basis of a 3-year average yield or $100 per acre.

Amendment 5: Add a new section 8 to the bill as follows:

"SEC. 8. Add a new subsection (o) at the end of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended as follows:

"'(o) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is hereby authorized to purchase all of any farm acreage allotment for upland cotton for the 1964, 1965, or 1966 crops established under this section excluding any allotment reapportioned to the farm pursuant to section 344(m)(2) of the Act which may be offered for sale to the Secretary in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary from a farm having an acreage allotment of 15 acres or less established under this section. Any such purchase shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by regulations of the Secretary: *Provided*, That the maximum payment per acre of allotment shall not exceed the smaller of 20 cents per pound of cotton production per acre based on the farm average yield for the three years preceding the crop year as determined by the Secretary or $100 per acre. Allotments for other farms and State and county reserves shall not be revised for the year for which the purchase is made. The related State, county and farm acreage history shall be retired permanently and the allotment and related history so purchased shall not be used in establishing future State, county and farm allotments. The farm shall not be eligible for a new farm allotment for the next succeeding two crops of cotton.'"

There are numerous ways in which the practices which have contributed to the unwarranted and unwanted increase in production, could be handled by amendments to this bill, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps the most simple way would be to add a proviso to this bill stating that as long as the cotton carryover remains in excess of 10 million bales in any marketing year, there will be no reallocation of released acres, thereby requiring that all cotton would be produced on the acres receiving the original allotment.

Another suggestion, and one for which there is a similar precedent in the release and reallocation of tobacco acres, where the release and reallocation is accomplished between two individual growers, and the reallocation is restricted by the production on the farm releasing the acres. Following is an amendment which would carry out, in effect, though not to the exact degree, the release and reallocation within a county; and then from a specific county to the State pool. This sounds complicated, but I have been assured by the Department of Agriculture, that such a procedure would not be difficult to administer.

PROPOSED NEW SECTION 7 TO H.R. 6196

SEC. 7. Paragraph (2) of subsection (m) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended (1) by changing the period at the end of the first sentence to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided*, That beginning with the 1964 crop, the acreage so surrendered shall be reduced by the percentage by which the normal yield for the farm surrendering such acreage is below the normal yield for the county for the preceding year, and the total amount of acreage so reapportioned by the county committee or surrendered to the State committee shall not exceed the sum of the surrendered acreage so adjusted and the surrendered acreage not required to be so adjusted."; and (2) by changing the period at the end of the second sentence to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided*, That beginning with the 1964 crop, the acreage so surrendered shall be reduced by the percentage by which the normal yield for the preceding year for the county surrendering the acreage is below the normal yield for the State, computed on the same basis as to years and conditions as the county normal yield for the preceding year, and the total acreage reapportioned by the State committee shall not exceed the sum of the surrendered acreage so adjusted and the surrendered acreage not required to be so adjusted."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 6196 because it contains a means of correcting a situation involving the price of raw cotton which has needed correction for many years.

Notwithstanding my wholehearted support of H.R. 6196, at the appropriate time when the bill is read for amendment, I shall seek recognition for the purpose of offering an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The substitute which I propose to offer is not a surprise to the Committee, because it has been discussed among Members of Congress, especially among members of the respective Committees on Agriculture in both the House and the Senate, among every segment of the cotton trade. It is generally referred to as the Talmadge cotton bill, and has been designated as S. 1190.

Today I have introduced an identical bill in the House of Representatives which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The objectives of each bill are identical. In my opinion the beneficial effect of each bill would be similar, although I naturally feel that the benetfis to be derived from the amendment which I shall offer are superior to the benefits to be derived from H.R. 6196.

Let me make it eminently clear that I am in wholehearted support of the principles of either bill. If my amendment is adopted, I shall, of course, support the bill on final passage. If my amendment should be rejected, I shall still support the bill on final passage.

The objectives of the bill are the same and include the maintenance of income of cotton producers, the protection of the welfare of consumers and those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, and the elimination of the two-price cotton system.

The principal advantage which I believe is inherent in my amendment is that it would provide a permanent solution to the inequities of the present two-price cotton system, would save approximately $100 million per year, and would provide increased employment in the textile industry and undoubtedly would permit substantial wage increases to textile employees.

The provisions contained in this amendment could provide the means by which the United States can recapture a portion of the world textile market which has been lost because of the vicious two-price cotton system.

One major difference between my amendment and H.R. 6196 is that my amendment would provide for production controls based upon units of production rather than the archaic, outmoded, and unrealistic system of production controls based upon acreage.

During the past 8 months, I have discussed this legislation with hundreds of people, including scores of my colleagues. Almost without exception every person with whom I have discussed this legislation believes that the language contained in the amendment which I shall offer will more nearly solve the problems which exist than would the language of any other legislation yet presented. Almost without exception, each prefers the language which is contained in my amendment.

In the time allowed to me, it will be my purpose to explain the provisions of this proposed amendment.

The text of the amendment which I expect to offer is to strike out all after

the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Cotton Domestic Allotment Act".

SEC. 2. This Act shall be applicable to upland cotton beginning with the 1964 crop and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except sections 301(a), 373, 375, and the provisions of subtitle F of title III thereof, shall not be applicable to upland cotton beginning with the 1964 crop.

DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall proclaim, not later than December 15 of each calendar year, a national domestic allotment for the crop of cotton to be produced in the next calendar year of a number of bales of cotton which is estimated to result in the production of cotton within such allotment equal to the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year.

(b)(1) For the 1964 and 1965 crops of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States for which a 1963 State acreage allotment was established under section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, on the basis of the number of bales of cotton determined for each State by converting such 1963 State acreage allotment (including the State's share of the national reserve) to a number of bales based on the average yield per acre of cotton for the State.

(2) For the 1966 crop of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average number of bales obtained by dividing the sum of the following by three: (i) the number of bales used as the base for apportioning the 1964 national domestic allotment, adjusted for the State average yield, mutiplied by two, and (ii) the State production base for the 1964 crop of cotton. For purposes of this section, the "State production base" shall be the smaller of the State domestic allotment for the crop or the production within such State domestic allotment, adjusted for abnormal conditions adversely affecting plantings and yields of cotton and adjusted for farms regarded as having produced cotton. For purposes of this section, "farms regarded as having produced cotton" shall be farms deemed to have cotton planted or produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (f) of this section, and farms on which 75 per centum or more of the farm allotment was produced or regarded as having been produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (d)(3) and subsection (f) of this section, shall be deemed to have produced the entire farm allotment, and farms on which less than 75 per centum of the farm allotment was produced or regarded as having been produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (f) of this section, shall be deemed to have produced the average of the farm allotment and the production (actual and regarded as produced) on the farm.

(3) For the 1967 crop of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average number of bales obtained by dividing the sum of the following by three: (i) the number of bales used as the base for apportioning the 1964 national domestic allotment, adjusted for the State average yield, and (ii) the sum of the 1964 and 1965 State production bases.

(4) For the 1968 and subsequent crops of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average of the State production bases for the three years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national domestic allotment is proclaimed.

(c) The State domestic allotment, less any State reserve, shall be apportioned to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions as is applicable to the State under subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That the State committee may reserve not to exceed 10 per centum of the State allotment which shall be used to make adjustments in county domestic allotments for trends in cotton production, for new farms, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

(d)(1) For the 1964 crop of cotton, the county domestic allotment less any county reserve shall be apportioned to old cotton farms on the basis of the 1963 farm acreage allotment converted into production of cotton by multiplying such acreage allotment by the farm average yield: *Provided*, That if less than 75 per centum of such acreage allotment was actually planted (or regarded as planted under the Soil Bank Act, the Great Plains program, and the release and reapportionment provisions of subsection (m)(2) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) the farm production base for 1963 shall be the production based on the average of the 1963 farm allotment and the acreage so planted or regarded as planted.

(2) For the 1965 and subsequent crops of cotton, the county domestic allotment less any county reserve shall be apportioned to old cotton farms on the basis of the farm domestic allotment established for the preceding crop of cotton: *Provided*, That if less than 75 per centum of such farm domestic allotment was produced or regarded as produced, the farm production base shall be the production based on the average of such farm domestic allotment and the production (including any production regarded as produced) of cotton on the farm.

(3) The farm production base shall not be adjusted under this subsection if the Secretary determines that failure to plant or produce, as the case may be, at least 75 per centum of the farm domestic allotment, or the farm acreage allotment for 1963, was due to conditions beyond the control of producers on the farm. Old cotton farm means a farm on which cotton has been produced (or regarded as planted to cotton) or produced under any other provision of law except subsection (f) of this section and the provisions of subsection (m)(2) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, pursuant to a farm allotment in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which a farm allotment is established.

(e) The county committee may reserve not to exceed 15 per centum of the county domestic allotment which shall be used to make adjustments for new farms, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

(f) The farm operator with the concurrence of the farmowner who is also a producer of cotton may release any part of the farm domestic allotment to the county committee for use in increasing farm allotments on other farms in the county. The county committee shall reapportion any such released allotment in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. If released allotment is not reapportioned in the county, the county committee shall transfer such allotment to the State committee for further transfer to other counties in the State. Any allotment released from a farm shall be regarded for purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm allotments as having been produced on the farm and in the county where the release was made except that this shall not operate to make the farm from which the allotment was released considered as having cotton production during the three-year period for eligibility as an old cotton farm.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of this Act, the following terms are defined as follows:

(1) "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

(2) "State" includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

(3) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) "Person" means an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or any agency of a State.

(5) "Bale of cotton" means a standard bale of five hundred pounds gross weight.

(6) "Marketing year" means the period beginning August 1 and ending July 31.

(7) "State average yield", "county average yield", and "farm average yield" shall be the average yield per acre of cotton for the State, county, or farm, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and changes in farming practices, during the three calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such yield is determined.

(8) "Farm" means such land as the Secretary prescribes by regulation to be constituted as a farm.

PRICE SUPPORT

SEC. 5. Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended effective with the 1964 crop of upland cotton to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act:

"(a) Price support for each crop of upland cotton shall be made available to producers through loans, purchases, or other operations at such level not less than 50 per centum or more than 60 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act and the price of cotton in world markets.

"(b) Price support in addition to that provided in subsection (a) of this section shall be made available to producers of each crop of upland cotton through loans, purchases, or other operations, including payments in cash or in kind, on a quantity of cotton of such crop produced on each farm equal to the farm's domestic allotment for such crop established under the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act. The levels of price support on such cotton shall be determined by the Secretary within the ranges prescribed in the schedule below after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act.

"Production intervals in terms of bales (standard bales of 500 pounds gross weight)	*Level of support*
"15 bales and less	Not less than 80 or more than 90 per centum of the parity price.
16 to 30 bales, inclusive	Not less than 75 or more than 85 per centum of the parity price.
More than 30 bales	Not less than 70 per centum or more than 80 per centum of the parity price.

"If a portion of the price support for any upland cotton is made available through payments to producers, the rate of payment shall be in an amount per pound of cotton which, when added to the average spot market price of middling one-inch cotton for the calendar week preceding the date of the marketing of the cotton with respect to which payment is made, as determined by the Secretary, or the level of support (converted to a middling one-inch basis) for such crop under subsection (a), whichever is higher, will provide a return to the producer equal

to the applicable level of support (converted to a middling one-inch basis) under the schedule set out above. The Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in payments under this section."

SEC. 6. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first proviso in the third sentence thereof the following proviso: *"Provided further,* That beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 per centum of the current support price established under section 103(a) of this Act for upland cotton plus reasonable carrying charges".

SEC. 7. In order to maintain and expand domestic consumption of upland cotton produced in the United States and to prevent discrimination against the domestic users of such cotton, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, is authorized and directed for the period beginning with the date of enactment of this section and ending July 31, 1964, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than the producers of such cotton, in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users of such cotton, including such payments as may be necessary to make raw cotton in inventory available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of this section.

And to amend the title so as to read: "A bill to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textile, to encourage the exportation of cotton, and for other purposes."

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitancy that I arise to raise some objection to the bill now before us; namely, H.R. 6196, a bill to revitalize the American cotton industry. My reluctance is generated by the fact that, while I do not have any cotton produced anywhere near my district, I still have a most sincere interest in the welfare of the cotton producers, much the same as I have for all of the many good farm folks throughout the Nation.

Of recent date, and on several occasions, I have found it necessary to call to the attention of the Congress and the public the fact there has been a rather consistent decline in agricultural income with the future predictions indicating that even further reductions are forthcoming in the most immediate future. This is properly the concern of Congress, because in most instances it has been brought about by previous actions or failure to act relative to the many complexities and problems that presently confront American agriculture.

Those of us who live in wheat and feed grain areas are surely very keenly aware of the extent to which net income to farm families has failed to hold its own with the rest of the national economy, and so has created individual hardships as well as a very noticeable effect on the entire contribution of agriculture to our national well-being. It is my most sincere desire that whatever actions may be taken by this Congress may serve the best interests and provide economic stability for the many people throughout the Nation who are engaged in the very vital occupation of producing food and fiber. Their service to the Nation over the years has been such that they are truly worthy of every consideration that might be directed to their problem.

There have been discussed in this debate most of the pros and cons as they pertain to the bill before us. Consequently, I shall confine my remarks to two specific areas.

First, it seems that this bill establishes a new precedent of providing direct subsidies to industry in an attempt to correct a problem that has been created by a questionable program in the first instance.

Having very carefully read the committee report, it is clearly indicative that the problem that this bill proposes to solve is one of reestablishing the American cotton market which has in recent years been substantially curtailed and limited by virtue of imports of cotton textile products, together with the development of competitive synthetic fibers. In this connection, of particular interest on page 5 of the committee report, I note that in 1962 imports of cotton textiles have grown to the extent of 650,000 equivalent bales of cotton, by virtue of average annual increases of about 100,000 bales each of the last 4 years. It is disturbing to note further in the report that this situation has been greatly aggravated by our own program of selling cotton to foreign textile manufacturers at a price that is about two-thirds of the price that the same cotton is available to our own textile manufacturers. We now propose to correct this inequity by making cotton available to our textile industry at the same price that we have for the past several years made it available to foreign competitors. To do so, in my judgment, can but establish three very undesirable complications that will all adversely affect our national economy, and more particularly, American agriculture.

First, it will substantially increase Government expenditures estimated by some to be more than $600 million for the next 3-year period, further aggravating the already huge budget deficits and national debt.

Secondly, and probably even more important, it establishes a precedent of providing subsidies to the processors of agricultural products. Once this practice has been established, it is difficult for me to even vision where it will stop. For, if we can pay this kind of subsidy to this sector of industry, then it naturally follows that there is equal justification for doing so to creameries, cheese factories, slaughterhouses, feed stations, millers, and almost every existing industry that is in the business of processing agricultural products for domestic and foreign markets.

Right at the present time, the dairy and beef, as well as many other processors, have the very same identical problem, in that they find themselves competing with imports from foreign countries for our own national domestic market—all accomplished with additional expense to the American taxpayer as well as consumer.

Finally, it seems to be of gross inequity to me that we at this point should direct our attention to this one segment of the agricultural problem while there is prevalent just as pronounced need in any number of other areas. There has been a need, and a demand raised to this Congress, that something be done in the area of wheat legislation for the past several months, which has been completely ignored. Many of us have introduced bills, presented statements, as well as urged both the respective committees of the Congress and the Department of Agriculture to take some action in this field. To date, these efforts have been completely nonproductive.

May I reiterate at this point a statement that I made to the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, Friday, July 26 of this year:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ODIN LANGEN, OF MINNESOTA, TO THE WHEAT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, FRIDAY, JULY 26, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, permit me to express my personal gratitude to the committee for affording me the opportunity to register these few observations in behalf of the wheatgrowers in my district as well as throughout the entire Nation. I should surely compliment the committee on their appropriate recognition of the need that presently exists for consideration of the situation confronting particularly the wheatgrowers who are dependent upon producing wheat for their major cash income.

A great deal of controversy has been generated relative to the wheat production and surplus problems since the recent wheat referendum. As one who has lived in and represents one of the major wheat-producing areas, quite obviously it is of prime concern to me, as well as the major portion of my constituency, whether they are farmers or local merchants. I have noted many recent statements referred to in the various media of the press which would indicate that wheat farmers had a choice in the referendum, and by virtue of their decision should not now be given any further consideration. This, in my judgment, is a substantial miscalculation and improper interpretation of the opinion that was registered by wheat farmers in the referendum.

In order that we might better understand the attitude and thinking of wheat farmers throughout the Nation, I think it is imperative that we look back very briefly to the experience of wheat referendums during all of the time that they have been in existence. Most significant is the fact that farmers have previously been called upon at least 10 times to register their choice as to whether or not they wanted wheat marketing quotas as compared to an allotment acreage program without quotas, much the same as was literally approved by turning down the certificate plan.

The results of this experience, in which they consistently voted to accept marketing quotas, can only emphasize that farmers have actually turned down the program that is now slated to exist in 1964 every time

previous to this year's referendum. At the same time they have approved programs similar to the one that is in existence for 1963.

Their reasons for voting as they did this year, I am sure, are well rounded, in that first, they have registered their objection to a further reduction in income, both gross and net, when compared to the programs in existence this year, and for the past several years. Secondly, they have registered their disapproval of a program which offered additional complexities in application to individual farms, as well as the added compliance and participation restrictions. The substitution of the wheat certificate plan for the marketing quota plan left for the wheat farmer a most unfortunate choice, in that he was forced to make a selection between a program he previously has turned down on so many occasions, and a new program which, in his judgment, did not even offer comparable compliance or income possibilities with the program now in existence. It would be well to note that many of them had felt for quite some time that this existing program was inadequate.

Surely, this has left the Congress with the full responsibility of further considering this very unique as well as distressing position in which the farmer now finds himself. For it was by action of the Congress, with the full knowledge that the program that now will be applicable in 1964 had been turned down in each of the previous referendums, that the farmer was provided only with the selection of a program that was less lucrative to him, whether considered on the basis of income or farm operation potential.

In view of the further knowledge that the present agricultural parity income is at the lowest level since 1939, it is no surprise to anyone that the farmer may have rebelled at an even further reduction in his income, with added Government restrictions. These concerns have been conveyed to my office by a great number of farmers and businessmen.

It is further discouraging to the farmer to note that the Department of Agriculture is now using every means at its disposal in attempting to secure compliance with the allotment program for 1964. Recent announcements from the Department indicate that the individual farmer will suffer reduction in his history credit if he overplants his allotment for 1964. All of these have the tendency to place the wheat farmer in much the same position he was in when marketing quotas were in effect, in that his allotment will be reduced by 10 percent, the only exception being that he does not have the price protection that was offered under marketing quotas. This is surely a very gross injustice and a very serious income threat, and carries much of the same dictatorial tactics that were so in evidence during the recent wheat referendum. This and other suggested actions amount to literally forcing compliance with a program that is supposed to be voluntary.

It is for these reasons that many of us have suggested legislation that we feel is worthy of every consideration by the committee during this year's session, in order that it might be made applicable to the 1964 crop year. The provisions of my bill, H.R. 6558, have already been well outlined to the committee by my colleagues and members of the committee who have authored similar legislation. In general, it provides for improved income possibilities on a voluntary basis, somewhat similar to and in conjunction with the voluntary feed grains program that has found both respect and acceptance throughout agricultural circles. The experience with the voluntary program in the feed grains area has been praised by many farm people as well as the Department of Agriculture. The incorporation of wheat into this program offers possibilities that I have long advocated, for I am sure it would serve to simplify compliance and offer a more acceptable production reduction program. Such action obviously is necessary, when we look at the large volume of surpluses and the amount of Government expenditures required to service and administer all of the various aspects of these programs designed to improve the agricultural economy.

The bill provides for the very minimum of income potential, and the committee would do well to give consideration to amendments that would provide even further income security, in view of the continuing rise of operating expenses that confronts every farm operation, regardless of its nature.

There is one section of my bill which I would like to call to the particular attention of the committee. It is section 207, which amends section 22(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 as reenacted by the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and merely provides that the President shall cause an investigation to be made by the Tariff Commission in order to determine the extent to which imports may be significant to the price and the market of any agricultural commodity that has been determined to be in surplus by the Secretary. Much has been said, and many statistics have been compiled relative to the extent to which our surpluses have been aggravated and prices and Government restrictions adverse to farmers have been experienced. In many instances, these circumstances came about through no fault of the American farmer, but rather because of increased imports.

These statistics have been set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on many occasions. May I refer the committee to a statement I made on February 27 of this year, to be found on page 3080 of the RECORD, as well as the statement by Mr. BERRY of South Dakota, found on page 7130 of the RECORD for April 26, and a statement by Senator CARLSON, found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 2, this year, on page 7599.

We have particularly noted the significance of imports in oats, rye, barley, beef, lamb, dairy products and others over the past several years. Of more recent date, imports of cream have very seriously affected the entire dairy products market. In all of these instances, not only have farm prices been depressed, but the expense of Government programs has grown to tremendous proportions, and unfortunately the farmer has been unjustly blamed for the resulting problems.

In order that any type of agricultural control program might be effective, whereby we attempt to control either production or the price, it seems essential to me that we must then also give due consideration to the effect that such a program might have in encouraging or promoting imports and thereby losing markets already available to farm producers.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Act, I am sure, was designed to deal directly with this problem. It is my opinion that it has not been used to the extent that it should have been, nor has it been made applicable to all areas of surplus commodities. I hope the committee may give both due and favorable consideration to this particular section.

This statement would be far too extensive and long if I were to attempt to bring to the committee the many different facets that relate to the legislation now being considered. I know, however, that members of the subcommittee, by virtue of the many hours that they have spent in study and deliberation on the problem, are well aware of the complexities and significance of providing adequate income and production opportunities to wheat farmers. In view of these many known facts, to which I have referred only briefly, it is my hope that the committee may see fit to recommend favorable consideration for the voluntary feed grain and wheat program outlined in the many similar bills that have been introduced on the subject. To do so would not only fulfill the responsibility of Congress, but, I am sure, would also find approval among farm, business, and Government circles throughout the entire Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the existing wheat situation to which I have just referred, with additional problems in the dairy, beef, chicken, turkey, and other agricultural areas that have comparable problems and contribute even more to the present decline in agricultural income, it seems that little benefit can result from the enactment of this legislation at this point. It occurs to me that this bill would not contribute anything to the facts that farm income is now at its lowest parity level since 1939, farm mortgages are constantly rising—$2½ billion in less than 3 years—and net income is below that of 1960. This bill will not improve any one of those very alarming facts. It will only add to Government expenditures.

About the only good thing that can be said for this legislation is that it does point out the extent to which American agriculture in general has been seriously hurt by improper import-export policies. I had the occasion and found it necessary to point this out to the U.S. Tariff Commission just yesterday, suggesting that it is time that we began registering the same concern for American agriculture that is being provided for foreign agriculture throughout the world. We have demanded that our producers reduce their production, subject themselves to restrictions and be confined to reduced incomes long enough, in order that we might be able to accommodate the imports of competitive products.

For these reasons, and many more previously brought out in debate and in the committee report, this House would do well to turn down this legislation today, thereby providing the opportunity of directing our attention to the need for action by the Congress on the overall farm income and surplus situation. Farm families throughout the Nation, I am sure, would herald such action.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6196 with the McIntire amendment which has been accepted by the Committee on Agriculture. I also want to congratulate the committee, its chairman, and all of its members for the long and patient work they have done in developing this bill. All year, a reasonable solution to the problem of two-price cotton has been sought. There have been many roadblocks. For the most part, they have been overcome. Certainly, the legislation is not a perfect solution, yet if we balance all the factors, it is a sincere attempt to meet the problem. The passage of this bill is urgently required if we are to restore some semblance of fair economic opportunity in the cotton industry.

But we are making a serious mistake if we assume that this legislation is for the sole benefit of the cotton textile industry or that its benefits are restricted to only one or two regions of the country. This is not true. We are blinding ourselves to the important national consequences.

The textile industry, the textile worker, the cotton farmer are all being damaged

by the present problem. All told, this represents a major multibillion-dollar economic complex that contributes importantly to the Nation's productivity. It is in serious trouble and if it continues, the shock waves will be felt in many ways from one end of the country to the other.

The problem is very simple. Conflicting Federal policies are pulling the noose tighter and tighter. Cotton price supports are eliminating American cotton from the world market. Development of foreign cotton acreage is encouraged as our cotton prices itself out of the market. To hold on to at least some of our markets, we have permitted foreign textile manufacturers to buy cotton here at the world price. The results are obvious enough. Cotton can be bought here at the world price, shipped to textile plants abroad and manufactured into cloth at a great price advantage. Textiles can then be returned to the United States to undersell the products of our own textile plants. In other words, American firms must pay one-third more for the same American cotton.

We are familiar with import competition. It has damaged many industries. But never before has it been encouraged and financed by the U.S. Government. That is what makes this problem unique. The inequities have been manufactured in Washington.

During the last 2 years, cotton exports have dropped from 6.6 million bales to 3.3 million bales. However, imports of cotton in the form of textiles are up from 414,000 bales to 645,000 bales and for the first 7 months of 1963, imports are running at an annual rate of 693,000.

Since the 1930's, the U.S. Government has maintained rigid import quotes on raw cotton which prevents American textile manufacturers from buying cotton produced abroad. As a result, American mills must pay the supported price level.

The vast growth of imports has seriously increased unemployment problems. The textile workers union reports that in the last 5 years, 45 U.S. cotton mills have closed their doors and 30,000 jobs have been liquidated. More jobs, perhaps many thousands of them, depend upon what we do here today.

We are faced with a grossly unfair situation where Government policies are making a calculated sacrifice of the cotton textile industry. This is being done ostensibly to assist the American cotton farmers, but it is self-defeating.

There is a remarkably high and positive correlation between the price of raw cotton and the wholesale price of unfinished cotton cloth. This relationship can be demonstrated historically through varying economic conditions, the two wars, and the two postwar periods. It is just as true today that the price of cotton is directly related to the price of processed cotton cloth.

Raw cotton has little or no value until it is spun into yarn and woven into salable commodities. If cotton prices itself out of the market, no farmer can be blind to the consequences. Neither can the Federal Government be blind to the vast economic troubles it is bringing upon itself. That is the reason this legislation is before us today.

This bill with the pending McIntire amendment offers the prospect of a solution to the two-piece cotton problem. For months, alternatives have been studied. The competing interests of all groups, including those of the American consumer, have been explored. Certainly, I agree that this bill represents the most reasoned and well-balanced approach. It seeks to restore the element of competition that is essential in the entire cotton industry if its problems are to be solved. And, frankly, it represents the first clear and definite effort to untangle some of the smothering Government controls that now beset this industry and the agriculture economy which supplies its raw materials. It is a temporary program of 3 years' duration that begins to phase out the costly and contradictory situation that exists today.

Broadly, the legislation would accomplish three purposes. First, it would permit domestic textile producers to buy raw cotton at the same price it is sold to foreign competitors. Secondly, it would establish a research program to develop means for reducing the cost of cotton production. Thirdly, when the amendment is accepted, it would assure the orderly reduction of price support payments over 3 years to assure a stronger competitive position for American cotton in the world. The bill also provides that as production costs are lowered, price supports will drop.

Actually, this bill is certainly not the windfall to cotton mills that those opposed to it have alleged. It is rather a comprehensive effort to remove the fantastically costly and confusing hand of government from the cotton market. This web has taken 30 years to spin. We must clear it away carefully if we wish to avoid economic chaos.

If we do nothing—if we leave things as they are today, the consequences will be far greater than the additional costs of this bill. We will assure that the cotton textile industry in this country remains stranded in an impossible competitive situation imposed by the Federal Government. The dislocation that will result—the cost of unemployment, bankruptcies, and chaos in the marketplace—is impossible to calculate. The textile industry in this country will turn to synthetic fibers. Those mills which can obtain synthetics and which have the capital to convert will survive. The others will die. It is as simple as that.

The cotton farmer will find himself with a crop that is increasingly hard to sell and Government warehouses will bulge with the costly surpluses. Two years ago cotton stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation stood at 1.5 million bales. As of August 1, 1963, the Department of Agriculture's cotton holdings soared to 8.2 million bales. By August 1964, the figure will reach 10 million bales. The Government investment of $1.3 billion will grow to $1.6 billion with $75 million each year for carrying charges alone. The trend is ominous and shocking.

Export subsidies will continue and so will the increasing import competition.

To do nothing—to allow this problem to fester—is dangerous and, I believe, for any reasonable Member of this House, unacceptable. There are those here who seem to believe that because cotton is not grown or spun in their area, this bill is of little importance. But let me say this: the land in the Cotton Belt contains some of the Nation's most productive soil. It can produce grains in abundance to support large-scale meat-and-dairy production. This phase of American agriculture has its troubles, too. If the cotton farmer turns from his traditional crop to other pursuits, we will find ourselves locked in another dilemma which can be, at least in part, traced directly to the shortsightedness of inaction on the two-price cotton problem.

If this bill is passed with the McIntire amendment, I believe we will be turning down a new and promising road to save a major American industry from Government-sponsored destruction. Its purposes are to assure markets at home and abroad for American cotton as we restore its ability to compete not only with foreign-produced cotton but with new synthetic fibers as well.

I urge the passage of this legislation as a reasonable alternative to the present Federal program.

However well meaning the opposition to this bill has been, no one can question the seriousness of the problem. Let us recognize that the Government has created these problems and that regardless of individual differences in the details of the legislation, we must move positively to correct the situation. I strongly urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE SPIRIT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S INSPIRING ADDRESS TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of President Johnson's inspiring address to the Congress last week can be seen in the following editorial of November 29 of the St. Louis Post Dispatch. A call for national unity and a pledge to action were the keynotes of this moving speech which eloquently expressed the feelings of the American people over the tragic death of John F. Kennedy.

It is a fitting tribute to have a leader such as Lyndon Baines Johnson ready to accept the challenges of the times with a full realization of the aspirations of President Kennedy. However, President Johnson cannot do it alone. He needs the help of the Congress which must be willing to accept his call for action.

A NEW PRESIDENT'S STRONG HAND

In a week of deeply moving events, the new President's address to Congress was an inspiring and strikingly impressive occasion.

Lyndon Baines Johnson stood before the Nation as a man of strong character, warm humility, and high professional competence. In less than half an hour he won the confidence of Congress and of the country. His eloquent words, and the profound sincerity that illumined them, made one feel, with a rush of gratitude, that once again the United States had emerged from crisis with a leadership worthy of its tradition.

Not only the President's appeal for unity and dedication, but the congressional response, gave cause for hope that legislative and executive arms alike will indeed reflect the national resolution to erect a memorial to John F. Kennedy in the form of a cleansed national spirit.

There was no mistaking the meaning of the ovation that greeted the President's call for "an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence." Even more remarkable was the prolonged applause that followed his appeal for prompt passage of the civil rights bill.

Nobody can rightly expect, or wish, that President Johnson should make his administration a pale copy of his predecessor's. He must stamp his own character upon the course of policy, draw upon his own sources of judgment and counsel, decide for himself what order of priorities and emphasis to put upon the several goals he chooses for his administration. When he promised continuity with the Kennedy administration, he was not promising identity.

But it was heartening that the broad principles for which he asked continuity included every essential aspiration of President Kennedy. Action on civil rights, action on tax reduction, the exploration of space, the fundamental strengthening of our educational system, an economy of full employment, the fight against poverty abroad as well as at home, powerful leadership of the free world, an unflagging search for peace—these are the goals that deserve continuity, because they are the urgent tasks of a forward-moving society. President Johnson pledged himself to them, and no one could doubt that he meant it.

He also meant it, we are sure, when he emphasized the obligation to match national strength with national restraint. The extraordinary gathering of foreign heads of state and political leaders at President Kennedy's funeral has just given us a sobering reminder of the enormous power this Nation wields in the world. Mr. Johnson gives evidence of grasping the fact that our power is not so much a cause for shallow elation as for the most solemn determination to use it with wisdom and justice. It is gratifying that one of his first acts was to send messages to Premier Khrushchev offering honorable friendship and continued negotiation to reduce tensions; and he reinforced that position in his address to Congress.

Nothing in his address, however, surpassed in impressiveness his appeal for congressional action on the civil rights bill, the tax bill, the education bills, foreign aid, and the long postponed appropriation measures. Until he spoke, the idea had been gaining ground that Congress might well go home now, leaving its work unfinished, under the guise of helping President Johnson settle into the organization of his administration. The President wants help, true enough, but he wants it in the form of legislation, not abdication.

The shock and the strain of the past week might well have justified the President in postponing the start of his struggle for a few weeks, and so it is heartening that he chose instead to fling his full and very considerable talents at once into the battle which Mr. Kennedy was waging when he fell.

Now the Nation's attention falls on Congress. How will Congress respond, when the tears and emotions of recent days are past, when the impact of tragedy has been dulled, when workaday habits supplant the elevation of spirit? Will it go back to business as usual—the business of obstruction, filibuster and delay? Or will Senate and House together rise to the challenge which President Johnson posed, and which we are confident the Nation endorses?

THE ACQUISITION OF LETHAL WEAPONS

Mr. KARSTEN. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, the assassin's bullet that struck down our beloved President and seriously wounded Governor Connally has at long last made our people aware of how easy it is for a fanatic, a psychopath or an anarchist to obtain a lethal weapon. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee and long interested in law enforcement I have been concerned about the failure of the Federal Government to uphold the hands of our States and localities in their efforts to deal with the indiscriminate sale and distribution of firearms. Even worse our unwillingness to act has almost completely thwarted and frustrated local law and ordinances designed to identify and reassure those responsible citizens who of right are entitled to possess a gun.

We have been slow to come to grips with the existing laxity in the Federal statutes, not because Congress is unconcerned over the growing number of bank robberies, murders, suicides and accidental killings that are due to the easy way a gun can be obtained or because the vast majority of the public are not in favor of some measure of control over firearms but rather, I think, because we have not had an effective, soundly conceived and carefully drafted proposal to consider.

To remedy this situation I am introducing today an amendment to the Federal Firearms Act which I request be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and scheduled for hearings before we adjourn.

My bill has the following important provisions:

First. It would prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of revolvers, rifles, and certain other lethal weapons except to responsible dealers licensed by the Federal Government and complying with State and local laws with respect to such sales.

Second. It would make illegal the sale by mail order of such rifles as was used to assassinate President Kennedy.

Third. It would strengthen the Federal Firearms Act by driving out of business the fly-by-night dealer who takes out a Federal license only to lend a measure of legitimacy to his guilty dealings with persons who should not be trusted with firearms. At present virtually any person can obtain a Federal license to transport and receive firearms as a dealer, and it will cost him only $1. The Treasury Department issues a dealer's license to almost anyone who applies, and although the Treasury is not authorized to issue such licenses to ex-convicts or fugitives from justice, there are so many applicants that it is not practicable to check up on the truthfulness of statements made in most applications for licenses.

Fourth. It would enable the States to deal more effectively with the problem of regulating the sale of firearms. As it is, State laws are frustrated by the failure of the Federal Government to control interstate shipments or sale of firearms.

In the United States some 21 States require a license to sell guns at retail and a number of States including Missouri require a purchaser to obtain a permit to purchase firearms. But these laws are all but meaningless so far as protecting the public from the purchaser and the dealer who wish to evade local laws by mail-order shipments.

The bill's method of backing up State laws is similar to the Federal controls over the sale of alcoholic beverages, certain dangerous drugs or adulterated foods or types of goods that may be manufactured, sold, or labeled contrary to State laws. A resident of Missouri cannot buy alcoholic beverages outside the State and have them shipped in without complying with State laws and paying State taxes. Why should handguns and other types of firearms, potentially the most dangerous of all manufactured products, be able to cross State lines with what now amounts to absolute immunity?

Fifth. It would require dealers in firearms to keep accurate records of firearms sales and make it possible for State and local law enforcement agencies to obtain such information without difficulty.

My bill, on the other hand, does not contain any provisions that any law-abiding citizen would consider onerous:

First. A citizen could still purchase a firearm or carry one provided he complies with State and local regualtions.

Second. It would be unnecessary to register a firearm unless such registration is required by State or local law.

Third. It would not handicap in any way the legitimate collector of antique guns and curios.

Fourth. It does not attempt to circumscribe the constitutional provision granting the right to keep or bear arms.

The memory of our beloved and martyred President should spur us into taking these belated and halting steps to stop the indiscriminate sale of lethal weapons to fanatics, subversives, and the demented. The dimensions of the problem can be seen in the widespread firearms advertising in comic books, gun magazines, and mail-order houses of all types.

As others have frequently pointed out the unrestricted circulation of firearms that presently prevails in this country is a threat and a growing threat to the safety of every citizen, business, and public official. America is the only civilized country in the world that still permits the unrestricted and unsupervised sale of firearms.

This measure contains proposals that the overwhelming majority of police chiefs and law enforcement officials have long advocated. It is a step that must be taken to put our house in order. Until the Congress acts, the States and local communities who feel the need to control firearms are helpless in controlling the influx of weapons from other States or even from other countries. At bottom the reason no action has been taken on the national level to stay the assassin's bullet is because of the unreasoning and uninformed fears that a basic right to protect oneself, engage in sports or prepare for military service would be infringed. These illusions and prejudices will lose their appeal if my bill is carefully studied and given objective consideration. I urge that the Congress take prompt and effective action.

CONGRESSIONAL SALARY INCREASES

Mr. UDALL. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, an article by one of our colleagues appearing in last Sunday's New York Times magazine is as fine a statement as I have seen on the need for congressional salary increases, and I want to call it to the attention of all Members.

Author of the article is the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable CLARENCE D. LONG, who happens to be serving his first term in this body. It may be of interest to the Members to know that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] preceded his congressional service with 25 years of teaching. Most recently he was a professor of economics at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is widely known that college professors are not in the highest income brackets afforded by our economy. No one is suggesting these days that college professors are living off the fat of the land. And yet the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] in this article observes that he is less well off on his congressional salary than he was on the salary of a college professor.

The congressional salary problem is only one of the matters dealt with in this excellent article, and I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues.

OBSERVATIONS OF A FRESHMAN IN CONGRESS

(By CLARENCE D. LONG)

(A first-termer finds that the scene looks better from the top of Capitol Hill than from below: despite handicaps, his colleagues do their jobs pretty well.)

WASHINGTON.

A letter from PRAY (Paul Revere Association, Yeomen, Inc.) predicts that the nuclear test ban will end up with "the Russians and Zionists ruling the world, all Christianity wiped out, and all wives, mothers, and daughters in the brothels of Asia, China, and India." George W. ("Wake Up Humanity") Adams demands that I "banish organized religion damned quick lest organized religion banish the world a hell of a lot quicker." A neighbor wants to know, "What are you clowns doing in Washington?" A 13-year-old boy asks me if I have ever taken a bribe. A tired-looking woman timidly seeks help in getting veteran's benefits, since she just learned that her husband, who years ago abandoned her with 10 children, had recently died after living with another woman in Brazil.

This is a tiny sample of the requests, problems, and comments that have come to me since January when, after a quarter of a century as a professor, I found myself a freshman again, in the U.S. Congress.

I was no stranger to Washington. The center of my Maryland seat—Baltimore, Carroll, and Harford Counties—is only 1 hour from the Capital City. While professor of economics at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, I had served in advisory capacities in the administrations of three Presidents and testified before numerous congressional committees. I had read and written books on the operation of government.

Now, taking inventory, I am impressed at how much I had to learn and what a gap in attitude and experience separates the Hill from the rest of Washington. Nowhere is this gap greater than between the attitudes I once had, and now have, concerning the effectiveness of Congress.

Is Congress doing its job? What is its job? How are we to judge its performance? These questions are especially pertinent as a new administration takes over.

Surely the job of Congress is not just to pass a lot of laws. Many acts suppressing freedom of speech and religion, or giving fat pensions to all over 55, would not entitle Congress to praise for accomplishing a lot. Nor would a law limiting civilian control of the military, passed without hearing or debate, entitle it to credit for getting things done quickly.

Whether Congress is effective depends really on how well it does its job—how many witnesses it hears, how carefully it questions them and listens to them, how responsibly it debates the issues and how wisely it makes up its mind and votes. On this question of quality there will necessarily be many verdicts. The fact is, there is plenty of everything in the record: brashness, ponderous emptiness, cheapness, stale humor, twisted logic.

But you can also find the classical oratory of GEORGE MAHON, the calm judgment of WILBUR MILLS, the verbal time bombs of WAYNE HAYS, and the good-humored sagacity of the gently powerful CARL VINSON, chairman of my Armed Services Committee. In the late afternoon, when the quorum calls have brought the Members together, and when minds are alerted by parliamentary maneuvering and the approaching vote, the House of Representatives is at its most impressive. Its occasional flashes of wit, of homely erudition, of adroitness, of eloquence to penetrate the mind and move the heart, I have seldom heard surpassed.

But the Congress should be judged neither by its best nor by its worst; it would be a poor service to the truth to maintain that it is as effective as it could be. Few observers, including Members, would dispute that Congress could be doing a better job. Why doesn't it?

Many explanations are offered. Criticism has been directed at the seniority and staffing systems of the committees, at the parliamentary rules and procedures on the floor, at the appropriations process, at conflicts of interest, nepotism, and junketing, at disproportionate representation, campaign financing, and the poll tax. My own feeling now is that procedures are secondary. If Americans value good Congressmen they can get them under any election procedures. If Congressmen are competent and well intentioned, they can be effective with any set of rules.

My short stay in Congress has impressed me with three closely related factors that may hamper Congressmen from doing a better job:

The 2-year term of House Members, which forces them to campaign continually for reelection;

The vast amount of time Congressmen and their staffs must spend on service for their districts;

The modest net salary of Congressmen, which forces many of them to practice law or run businesses on the side, in order to support dual residences and educate their children.

The 2-year term of Representatives is one of the briefest in American politics. The Constitutional Convention made it brief deliberately to keep it responsive to the people, and it has certainly had that effect. But has it not overshot its mark?

It was instituted at a time when the average Congressman represented only a few thousand, instead of hundreds of thousands of constituents; when Congress met a month or two instead of nearly all year; and when the Federal Government confined its activities to national defense, the excise tax, and a few internal improvements, instead of pervading every aspect of personal and business life and spending a quarter to a third of all the income of the economy.

Considering and voting on laws was in those early days a very part-time job. It is now a very full-time job—actually too big for the most brilliant and well-informed legislator—even if he had full time to devote to it. Yet the 2-year term requires that most Congressmen campaign, not just every other year, but literally all the time. The essence of campaigning is personal contact in the home district.

My "rubber-chicken" calendar for a not untypical week included the following: Addressed students of three high schools visiting the House floor, veterans groups in two counties, officers club in Army chemical center, and civil-defense officials of seven States; attended meeting of 13th District Community Council, and various meetings on urban renewal, alcoholism, and relocation of a post office; attended a bar mitzvah, two bull roasts, and dedication of a school; went to a Democratic club dinner, a political cocktail party, and dinner for a visiting Indian industrialist.

This routine—on top of legislative and administrative work—goes on 7 days and 5 nights a week, except in July and August. Holidays are busiest. On July 4, I marched in 4 parades, smiled at 200,000 people, spoke to 5,000 more in the evening, attended a party, drove 100 miles.

I have discovered—or think I have—that a Congressman is judged by the overwhelming mass of his constituents on the personal service he gives the home folks and the contracts he brings to his area.

Four times a young constituent tried to enlist in the Army and had been turned down for high blood pressure; yet the selective service board would not reclassify him, and no employer would hire him while he was subject to draft. I arranged for one more physical exam—by this time his blood pressure was really high—and got his classification changed. He just wrote to tell me that he is employed and happy.

A naval officer fell in love with a girl in South Africa and, having been informed he

could bring his fiancée to the United States, paid her way to Niagara Falls, Canada. There she was given the sad news that it was all a mistake, no admittance. At my request, the State Department cut the red-tape and let her in. Shortly afterward I received their wedding announcement.

An elderly woman, ill and living on $25 a week, was pressed for $1,000 arrears in income taxes. I convinced the Internal Revenue Service that squeezing blood out of a turnip was a cinch compared to getting $1,000 from a sick old lady existing on a pittance. Now she can live, if not in luxury, at least in peace.

Not all cases are desperate. A constituent complains that post office trucks wake the neighborhood at 4:30 every morning. A lady begs me to investigate why her young son in Vietnam could get "plenty of whisky but no soap." And not long ago a 7-year-old girl asked for some dirt from the White House lawn. I sent an assistant across town, instructing him not to knock on the front door—the President was busy with Alabama—but to reach through the back fence and dig some dirt into an envelope.

Many requests are important to more than one person, for most Congressmen run for office on an implied pledge to get business and jobs. Although my counties are in sound health, certain key firms in space, electronics, and shipbuilding have lost employment. Small firms there, as everywhere, complain of increasing difficulties.

During recent months I have toured plants and offices and talked extensively with management, workers, and union leaders. I visited the Government procurement agencies, including Defense, General Services, Space, and Small Business. These explorations led me in June to set up a business desk, to serve as a center of information on defense business and how to obtain it and to put firms and individuals in touch with Government agencies. Major accomplishments have included getting a contract for radiosondes against the opposition of the entire Pennsylvania delegation and successfully upholding the low bidder on a contract for paper butter dishes.

This service has brought an enthusiastic response from firms, as well as from workers who benefit from the fuller employment. But this service—and time spent listening to pleas for personal help—is what takes up half of my own energies and two-thirds of those of my excellent staff.

The salary of a Congressman is $22,500 a year. This will seem ample to many readers; yet I am less well off than I was as a professor.

To begin with, my election left me with bills I had not even known about. (An Alabama Congressman told me his entire first year's salary went to debts from his campaign.) In addition, my salary, before being available to pay those bills, feed my family, and keep two children in college, must first cover myriad expenses, partly political and partly congressional.

There is a durable myth that a Congressman is reimbursed for trips from Washington to home. In actual fact, he is paid for one round trip a year, at 20 cents a mile, and under a law just passed, two additional round trips, at actual expense, up to 12 cents a mile.

In my case, the total reimbursement amounts to $53 for the year. Since I commute daily my annual expense for car, trains and taxis is a very considerable item. Even Congressmen from distant States commute weekly by train or plane to their districts. A Congressman from Michigan confided that he spent $3,000 for trips last year. Within my district, I drive 3,000 miles a month at my own expense.

A Congressman is allowed $2,400 a year for stationery and supplies. For 2 offices and 10 persons, this covers writing paper, desk supplies, radio tapes, flags donated to schools and patriotic organizations, the telephone in the Congressman's district office, and, most expensive, his newsletter. This year is not over, yet I have spent my entire year's allowance and am in debt to the stationers by $800. As I expand my newsletter circulation—one of the best ways to keep in touch with my large constituency—I shall have to dip further into my own pocket.

Most Congressmen maintain residences in Washington, as well as at home. For this, they get no allowance—only an income tax deduction on what they spend up to $3,000.

A Congressman is under daily pressure to spend on miscellaneous items: luncheons for visitors; chances on baskets of cheer, space in program books of clubs and churches, tickets to dances, dinners and barbecues.

Balanced against all these expenses are a few fringe benefits: haircuts at $1 including tip, free parking, and a free footlocker valued officially at $21.57, but worth perhaps $12 in downtown Washington stores. Total value, under $200.

As a result of this financial strain, most Congressmen—used to a far higher living standard than I, a former professor—keep a hand in their law practices and businesses. The time and energy they spend on these activities can only be at the expense of what they should be spending on the complicated issues that face them in committee or on the floor. These other commitments account for the substantial membership in the Tuesday-Thursday Club—Congressmen who get to Washington on Tuesday morning and leave Thursday night.

Higher salaries would possibly attract better men to Congress—although I know of nobody who has resigned because of salary. They would certainly reduce moonlighting and give the voter a higher degree of full-time representation. They would also enable us more effectively to eliminate conflict of interest.

If these are some of the rules of practical politics which keep legislators too busy to legislate, what are the prospects of changing them?

So far as the 2-year term is concerned, the main obstacle may not be the public—which seems startlingly sympathetic to a longer term—but Congress itself. Between 1789 and 1960 about 120 resolutions introduced in Congress proposed a term longer than 2 years. Only two of these were reported out of committee; only one was debated on the floor of the House where it was defeated during the 59th Congress—over half a century ago. And if the longer term ever survived the House, it would probably lose in the Senate for the very practical reason that Senators would prefer to retain the present system under which a House Member can never run for the Senate without losing his job.

As for cutting down on the service function of Congressmen, a far-reaching proposal to delegate service chores has been made by the alert and fertile-minded Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, who believes Congress should adapt the Scandinavian institution of the Ombudsman. This special administrator is appointed by the legislature to handle constituent complaints concerning the executive branch. Germany took up the idea in 1957 as a channel for complaints by members of the armed forces, and Great Britain has considered its establishment.

Would this system work in the United States? I somehow doubt it.

First, Congressmen would scarcely abandon the one function which has been demonstrated to be the most effective means of getting reelected.

Second, the main reason a Congressman can get things done is that he has a vote. The Defense Department will listen to me when I ask for justice for an enlisted man or an access road for Aberdeen Proving Ground, because my vote may someday be critical on a $2-billion military construction bill or a $1-billion pay raise. I can't picture an appointed bureaucrat getting that kind of attention.

Third, what might work for a small, closely knit nation will scarcely fit the needs of a continent of 200 million, composed of widely diverse economic, geographic, and ethnic interests. People write their Congressmen because they want special attention to their peculiar needs—help which a huge complex, indifferent bureaucracy never seems to give. A Congressman can do a lot for the ordinary fellow because he is a Congressman. Separate the service from the office and I suspect it won't get done.

What are the prospects for raising salaries high enough to sustain full-time legislating? Congress can set its pay scales at anything it likes, subject to Presidential veto. Yet, currently, the President, the American Bar Association, and many others are urging Congress to raise its pay by at least $10,000 to $32,500; a bill to accomplish this is in the hands of the House Rules Committee, but still Congress drags its feet.

Every Congressman I have talked to wants the raise—some desperately. But many will hesitate to vote for it, and some are committed to vote against it. As one Congressman told the President when the subject came up: "My lips say 'No, No,' but my heart says 'Yes, Yes.' "

Most such Congressmen have rural constituencies, unacquainted with the dis-economies of large-city living in general and of Washington in particular. And every Congressman hears from letterwriters who hold firmly to the philosophy that the only good Congressman is a broke one.

Given congressional reluctance to vote pay raises for itself—it has raised the pay of other Government employees several times since it last raised its own in 1955—it seems safe to predict that any increase it votes will give only temporary relief from the pressures to moonlight. Even $32,500 would be little better in real terms—after income tax and price increase—than the $10,000 pay of 1939—yet Congress in the pre-World War II days was in session less than half as long as it has been in recent years, and the average constituency to be served was one-third smaller.

This Congressman, it is plain, sees no real prospect of lasting mitigation of the working conditions that may reduce the effectiveness of Congress.

But do they really have such a deleterious effect?

The answer to this depends on your views as to what is the function of a Congressman. On this there are two extreme views. One view—mine in my days of innocence—is that it is to pass good laws. The other view—held by the old-line politician—is that it is to survive, by representing constituents, giving them what they want, and staying out of trouble.

Both views are unsound. The first is naive, the second cynical. Neither would require very special skill. If our problem were to pass a logically consistent legislative program without reference to popular consent, it would be easy to assemble half a thousand experts many times as learned as any Congress ever elected. But this would be the Platonian rule of "philosopher-kings," not a democracy which rules with public consent. In an oligarchy of experts, wisdom is ultimately corrupted by power. On the other hand, in a crude democracy, power is dispersed to the endless frustration of the expert.

Here seems to be the ideal role of the Congressman: To represent his constituency, by knowing its needs and aspirations—at the same time inspiring it to something better.

Both functions—to represent and to lead—are indispensable if a democracy of ordinary humans is to survive scientific revolutions every decade. The one requires the Congressman to keep close to his constituency. The other requires him to know what goes on, in economics, in science, and in law. No Congressman is capable of all this, but a surprising number attempt it and a few come amazingly close.

This small band could be enlarged if the public would support better working conditions for Congressmen. Since it is not likely to do this very soon or very materially, Congress will continue to be less than fully effective as a purely legislative body. In adding up the score, however, let us put some of the blame on the public which makes the rules of practical politics, not entirely on the Congressman who has to live with them. And why shouldn't the critics of Congress-as-an-institution add the vital service function of Congress to its legislative one in deciding whether it gets a passing mark?

NEW TARIFF PERILS

Mr. BERRY. 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 South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, rising imports of live cattle, beef and veal, have been pressing hard against the domestic cattle growers. These imports have been surmounting our reduced tariff without the least trouble. It is fast becoming a question whether we wish to maintain a cattle industry in this country, or let it go the way of some of our other industries that have been sacrificed to a free trade policy. The United States, for example, now stands No. 5 among the fishing countries of the world; fourth as a textile manufacturing country and we have fallen in point of steel production from over 45 percent of the total world output to less than 25 percent since 1950. Our merchant marine now carries less than 10 percent of our foreign trade.

The cattle industry will suffer the same fate if the present exposure to imports is not corrected soon. I have introduced H.R. 4014, designed to hold our imports of live cattle, beef and veal, to the average level of the 5-year period from 1957–62.

The situation is a menacing one as it is; but under the GAAT negotiations scheduled to begin next year the existing tariff could be cut another 50 percent. This would be disastrous and the cattle industry can only hope that no such folly will be perpetrated.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy held a meeting in this city and I had the pleasure of speaking on the occasion. Representatives of some of the leading industries of the country were represented. Great concern was expressed over the forthcoming GATT tariff-cutting Conference. Strong exceptions were taken against the ground rules under which the negotiations will be conducted. These are of such a stringent nature that the hearings to be held before the Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee beginning December 2, will be of very little value.

The hope of moderating the tariff-cutting lust of the State Department will be very slim.

The reasons for this slight hope are set forth in the resolutions adopted by the nationwide committee. I think that the statement of its chairman, Mr. O. R. Strackbein, and the resolutions adopted merit the most serious attention. Under leave to extend my remarks the material referred to is inserted at this point in the RECORD:

THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE ON IMPORT–EXPORT POLICY

(By O. R. Strackbein, chairman)

THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962—ITS FAILURES AND PERILS

It becomes daily more clear that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 should not have been passed.

An excessive grant of power to the President combined with a destructive surgery on the escape clause remedy, has left American industry, agriculture, and labor defenseless against the market ravages of rampant import competition.

To propose a 50-percent tariff reduction in a 5-year period, after the American tariff has already been slashed to the quick over a period of years, was an appalling act. To accompany this rash exposure of our industries to the sapping competitive forces from abroad, by a withdrawal of the remedy that was long heralded as the very cornerstone of the trade program, represents a betrayal of the good faith of its fathers and all the firm assurances issued over the years, by every President and Secretary of State from 1934 to 1961.

Under the new program of the Trade Expansion Act, despite all the vote-fetching promises, not 1 of the 11 cases that have been brought before the Tariff Commission has resulted in a remedy, either in the form of a tariff increase or adjustment assistance. The tight language of the statute, fathered by the State Department, has strangled all hopes of a remedy. So dark is the present outlook for a successful outcome that the Tariff Commission has not a single new case currently on its escape clause docket.

Even industries that previously were supported with a remedy and enjoying a degree of protection, are now in a status of continuous uncertainty. They may lose their margin of safety at any time.

Beyond the dim horizon lowered on the domestic front by the legislation, the ground rules accepted by Mr. Herter to guide negotiations under the forthcoming GATT negotiations, guarantee a first-class shellacking of the American negotiators.

Oh, there will be preparatory hearings; but the additional items placed on the reserve list as a result of the public hearings scheduled to begin on December 2 will be subject, under the ground rules agreed to by Mr. Herter, to a "mutual confrontation and justification" procedure in the negotiation under GATT; i.e., any items placed on our reserve list after the Tariff Commission hearings would be subject to review by GATT.

This point of the Herter agreement throws a revealing light on the vacuous value of our publicized hearings that are to run some 4 or 5 months and cover some 6,000 items. It simply means that the U.S. reserve list may be pruned by GATT after negotiations open.

Secondly, our State Department, which calls the shots for Mr. Herter, now insists on the broad-category approach to tariff cuts, the faster to run through the 6,000 items. This approach marks a further abandonment of the long-honored assurances of the trade program's originators and their successors. The support of the Congress and the public was repeatedly wooed and won with these assurances. Tariff rates were to be reduced carefully, item by item.

Now this system is to give way to the broad strokes of the wreckers. The tariff on broad groupings of items are to be sliced in half or severed at the one-third, one-quarter mark. Heads will roll with shoulders on or even with thorax attached. Individual differences in competitive standing will be ignored.

Either this wholesale march of American industry and labor to the new guillotine represents a premeditated assault on the health of the American economy, or it is the product of a high-rise philosophy without a basement or a footing in reality.

In all good sense American industry cannot stand the competitive exposure being readied for it. To suggest that it can is to fly against the force of the clear facts verified by industry after industry, including loss of private commercial export markets, a fast-rising tide of imports and an outflow of investments that in a more hospitable domestic climate would flow into new production here and generate the jobs that we so badly need.

Under the title "The Kennedy Round," the Common Market Review of May 1963 says, page 93:

"The Americans have set their sights high this time. They hope that the outcome of the next round will completely eclipse the results of all previous tariff-cutting exercises."

This represents a dedication to economic foolhardiness.

As matters stand, we are indeed on the threshold of an enormous, perilous and uncalled-for act of economic self-mutilation.

RESOLUTION 1: NEED FOR AN EFFECTIVE ESCAPE CLAUSE

1. Whereas the escape clause remedy of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, including the adjustment assistance provision, has been a complete failure as demonstrated by the zero record of accomplishment reflected by the unanimous rejection of all 11 cases processed by the Tariff Commission to date;

2. Whereas the remedy provided for serious injury from import competition is so tightly trussed by the statutory language in that act that no industry, company, or labor group has been able to meet the onerous requirements exacted;

3. Whereas domestic producers, manufacturers, and workers are entitled to an offset, in the form of import regulation, against the combination of lower wage rates and fast-rising productivity prevailing abroad, as a means of competing with imports in the home market and maintaining and expanding employment; and

4. Whereas competitive pressures from low-cost imports foster automation and labor-displacing installations and therefore a shrinkage in employment rather than plant expansion and the hiring of more workers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the nationwide committee exert its utmost efforts to achieve a remedy at law that will assure fairness of import competition and preservation of the domestic market in a state of expansibility, thus promoting domestic employment, freed from disruption by rampant import competition.

RESOLUTION 2: TRADING INDUSTRY OUT FOR FARM EXPORTS

Public statements and pronouncements have established the intent of the U.S. negotiators of the forthcoming GATT tariff reductions to trade off sharp reductions in American duties on industrial products to assure maintenance of the present level of farm product exports to the Common Market countries.

This approach would further expose many of our industries to yet harsher import competition and put a damper on domestic market expansion. More workers are employed in industry, elaborating, processing, and fabricating raw material, than in agriculture. Therefore in terms of employment it is false economics to sacrifice the domestic market for industrial products to the end of disposing of price-supported agricultural surplus products.

We therefore condemn the policy of sacrificing domestic industry and employment to dubious efforts to hold existing export markets for surplus agricultural products, the greater volume of which flows out under the inducement of existing export subsidies.

RESOLUTION 3: F.O.B. VERSUS C.I.F. IMPORT VALUATION

The leading trading nations of the world with the exception of the United States levy import duties and tabulate the value of imports on a cost, insurance, and freight basis, meaning cost, marine insurance, and freight.

The United States levies its ad valorem duties on the f.o.b. basis which excludes ocean freight, marine insurance, etc.

As a result of these differences in practices the United States collects less duty on identical ad valorem rates than most foreign countries. As a result our import statistics show a lower total value of imports than are shown by other countries that import the same physical volume.

While no firm calculation of these differences has been made, one of which makes our tariff look higher than the foreign in terms of duty collected, and the other of which shrinks the comparative value of our imports in relation to that of other countries, it has been estimated that the discrepancy reaches an average magnitude of at least 10 percent. The effect varies, depending on distance of shipment and insurance rates.

In view of the importance of this distortion in statistics that are constantly compared internationally as if they rested on an equal base, we strongly urge that immediate corrective steps be taken by the Federal agencies responsible for the gathering and issuance of trade statistics. These agencies should undertake calculations to determine the magnitude of the discrepancy and thereafter to note an appropriate caution in official publications of trade statistics, calling attention to the discrepancy.

RESOLUTION 4: GATT GROUND RULES

The rules under which the GATT negotiations are to be conducted will rob American industry that is concerned over additional or excessive tariff reductions of virtually any foothold for effective protest.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 itself permits the grouping of products into broad categories. The adoption of this approach greatly narrows the effectiveness of representations made in support of individual rates that are above the average of the category into which the items are merged.

The ground rules agreed to by Mr. Herter, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, tighten the already rigid confines into which interested parties have thus been wedged. This is the result of two conditions laid down by the EEC representatives and subscribed to by Mr. Herter.

One is that the items that may be placed on the reserve list after hearings, over and above those reserved by statute, will be subject to "confrontation and justification" once negotiations actually begin. GATT, in other words, may insist on removal of some of these items, if any, from the reserve list. Mr. Herter may be expected to accede, judging from his record of prior compromise vis a vis the EEC countries.

The other lies in acceptance of the automatic application of rules yet to be adopted with respect to the disparities that the EEC countries attribute to our tariff rates. These refer to those of our tariffs that rise above, say, 30 percent, and are called "skyscrapers." The Europeans insist that these be reduced more sharply than they themselves should be required to cut their more moderate rates.

While the formula for determining how far we should cut our individual rates that stick out above the landscape was not agreed to, it was agreed that it shall become a matter of automatic application when it is adopted.

Once more, American industry that is vulnerable to import competition has been placed in a box.

The nationwide committee wishes to record its dismay over the ground rules and to express its clear sentiment that the Special Representative of Trade Negotiations should adopt a firmer stance henceforward lest irreparable damage be inflicted on American economic interests.

DR. GODDARD MEMORIAL

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning our great Committee on Science and Astronautics ordered reported to the House legislation providing for the erection of a memorial statue honoring the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of modern rocketry, who came from my district.

I desire again to express my warm appreciation to the gentleman from California, Chairman GEORGE P. MILLER, and the distinguished members of his committee for this latest recognition of the achievements and contributions of Dr. Goddard, whose pioneer accomplishments in rockets and missiles have brought us to the threshold of the stars. I urge that early action be taken by the House on this worthy legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement to the committee in support of this bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The material follows:

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, it is a great privilege and pleasure for me to urge today your approval of House Joint Resolution 787, providing for the erection of a memorial statue in honor of the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard in the central Massachusetts area where he conducted his pioneer research in rocketry.

At the outset, let me commend and warmly thank my good friend, our distinguished former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., for his splendid efforts and outstanding work in sponsoring and advancing this worthy proposal with his House Joint Resolution 787. In addition, Chairman MILLER with his House Joint Resolution 798 and Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND with his House Joint Resolution 799 have evidenced their continuing efforts to bring new honors upon this famed pioneer of missiles and space research, who came originally from my district.

For sometime past, I have sought to obtain well merited recognition of the memory and achievements of the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard. Not long ago, I sponsored a special resolution providing for the issuance of a commemorative gold medal in honor of Dr. Goddard and with the effective help of such good friends as Chairman MILLER and other members of this great committee, and our colleagues on the House Committee on Banking and Currency, this measure became law.

I believe that Professor Goddard is to modern rockets what Edison was to the electric light and Marconi was to electronic communication and I am happy indeed to endorse House Joint Resolution 787, which seeks to perpetuate his life's work and achievements.

Contemporaries have seldom been kind to great creative minds and Dr. Goddard was no exception. He was reviled, derided, and insulted, but his persistence and pioneering work laid the basis for Pienemunde, the German rocket center, the V-series rockets, and ultimately the great advances and achievements now being recorded in the space age.

I think that it is most appropriate for the Federal Government to arrange for the erection of suitable memorials, markers, and plaques where Professor Goddard conducted his great experiments and it is particularly fitting that a memorial statue be erected in the area where Professor Goddard launched his first rockets in central Massachusetts, as is contemplated by this bill.

The Nation and the world will surely applaud the favorable action of this great committee on this resolution and I urge that you approve it for the early consideration of the House. We have come to realize at long last the greatness and significance of the contributions of Dr. Goddard, the father of modern rocketry, and in recent years, he has been honored in many ways.

The Congress of the United States has struck off a gold medal in high tribute to Dr. Goddard. Our great space center in nearby Maryland, so meaningful to us in terms of the national security, space exploration, and the advancement of science, bears his name. Many memorials to honor him have been established in this country and throughout the world to bring enduring luster to his achievements.

It would be in our best tradition to erect a memorial statue near the site of his first experiments where, years ago, this great, dedicated man performed his pioneer experiments.

No one could possibly describe, let alone evaluate, the reach, the depth, and the everlasting vital importance of Dr. Goddard's work. Born in struggle and sacrifice, conceived in genius, carried out with a courage and a determination that would not be denied, his contributions now rank by common concensus with the most epochal ever achieved by man.

In this House, no one is more familiar with or more cognizant of Dr. Goddard's great contributions than the distinguished members of this outstanding committee. You are aware of his struggles, setbacks, and the ridicule he suffered while he was alive. I know that you will give most sympathetic consideration to House Joint Resolution 787 because it is most fitting for contemporary history to record, and for the country to know, just how great and epochal a contribution Professor Goddard made. The memorial authorized by this bill will help recall that the ideas he generated and developed have already carried us to the reaches of space. Tomorrow, they will take us to the stars.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ANTI-CATHOLIC ACTIVITIES OF COMMUNIST REGIME IN POLAND

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, enough emphasis has been placed by propagandists for coexistence with communism that the picture portrayed to the public of liberalizing developments behind the Iron Curtain deserves to be discussed.

Contrary to the long-range goals of our State Department, the public at large recognizes the incompatibility of the American way of life and that of Communist ideology.

I ask leave to insert into the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks an article which appeared in the November 16 Polish-American Journal of Scranton, Pa., reporting on anti-Catholic activities of the Warsaw Communist regime.

FORBID SALE OF FOOD, FUEL TO RELIGIOUS IN POLAND

WARSAW.—The guerrilla warfare conducted by the Communist authorities against the church in Poland recently produced the following unusual incidents:

In Nowe Miasto the food stores and bakeries were forbidden to sell bread and other food to religious.

In many localities the fuel offices have been forbidden to allocate coal to monasteries and churches.

WAYSIDE SHRINES

In various localities the peasants received orders to remove the wayside shrines and crosses, although they stand on private lands and there is no law that would require their removal.

A resident of the village of Czernikow, province of Lodz, was fined 1,500 zlotys because he refused to remove a cross from his field. A cross had been there for centuries, was destroyed by the Nazis, and was restored after the war.

A resident of the village of Kurowice Rzadowe, province of Lodz, was fined 1,500 zlotys because he refused to tear down a wayside shrine standing on the land belonging to his wife.

HOSPITAL CHAPLAINS

Officially, according to instruction of the Health Ministry, hospitals in Poland may have regular chaplains and priests are allowed to visit the sick.

However, in many hospitals the calling of priests to the sick has been forbidden, the hospital chaplains were dismissed and chapels closed.

SEIZE BUILDINGS

According to Cardinal Wyszynski, the novitiate and preparatory school of the Capuchins in Nowe Miasto "were liquidated in a most barbaric manner, which reminds one of the most painful methods used so long ago by our enemies."

In Krakow the Felician Sisters were ordered to vacate some 25 rooms, the Seraphic Sisters were forced to vacate their entire convent, and the Daughters of Divine Love were ordered to vacate the building that was used as a hospital and rest home for sick and aged nuns.

ILLEGAL ASSEMBLIES

The Communist authorities often impose fines on priests for holding illegal public assemblies.

Here are a few examples of what the Communist rulers consider illegal assemblies:

Rev. M. Namyslowski of Szubin was fined 1,500 zlotys because he organized conferences for young people about marriage problems.

Many priests were fined for holding talks to children in preparation for first holy communion.

An assistant pastor in Lipno was fined because he invited a group of high school graduates to his home for tea after holy communion.

All such abuses are protested to the attorney general but the protests remain unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, evidence such as this continually trickles through the Iron Curtain, dramatizing to us the basic viciousness of Communist rule. The answer to the cold war remains a victory of freedom over communism not acceptance of its control over enslaved peoples and polite embrace of its economic theories.

NATIONAL SECURITY—THE POLITICAL, MILITARY, AND ECONOMIC STRATEGIES IN THE DECADE AHEAD

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Center for Strategic Studies which was founded a little over a year ago at Georgetown University has produced a monumental work on national defense entitled "National Security—The Political, Military, and Economic Strategies in the Decade Ahead." The book was edited by David M. Abshire and Richard V. Allen, with an introduction by Adm. Arleigh Burke. Despite the length of the book, it is easy for selective reading, and I wanted to commend it to my colleagues in the House who are in any way involved in international affairs and national security policy.

I also think that this is a most appropriate textbook in international relations and national security courses, and I understand that it has been adopted in at least two colleges.

A review of this book by Joseph P. Bianco, Jr., appeared in the Georgetown University Alumni magazine for November 1963.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the review and the table of contents of the book.

The Center for Strategic Studies was established at Georgetown University in 1962 to study and coordinate research on strategic problems confronting free societies. The first major effort in this continuing study was a conference held at Georgetown University January 23–25, 1963, under the sponsorship of the center.

The January 1963 conference brought to the conference table well-known specialists in international politics, economics, and science. As a result, the debate covered ground beyond the limits of strategy and economics as ordinarily conceived. This book is the direct result of that conference since it includes both the individual study papers prepared by each participant for the conference and the lively discussion which evolved during the progress of the conference.

The book is unique in that it covers many of the major strategic considerations facing the United States today and these strategies are analyzed in depth by a panel of distinguished authorities with a variety of viewpoints.

The organization of this volume deserves special commendation because of its clarity and its range of topics which are arranged with study papers and discussions listed clearly under each heading. In addition each paper has a short summary at the beginning of it which will enable the researcher or the layman to get a capsule view of the author's position before reading further.

Every thoughtful American will find this volume of significant interest because it is designed for the first time to present a thoroughly comprehensive analysis of the political, military, and economic strategies for the United States in a manner which realistically relates one area of strategy to the others and shows clearly how they are inevitably intertwined.

As Admiral Burke so well states in his introduction, "The United States is the most powerful nation on earth. Strategy involves the use of that power in its full array—economic, military, political, cultural, social, moral, spiritual, and psychological—to accomplish national objectives in the world. A strategy that neglects any element of national power or declines to consider any reasonable opinion concerning it is no strategy at all."

This reviewer concurs with the thought of Admiral Burke and it is obvious that this book is a major step forward in the comprehensive analysis of the many aspects of national strategy. I will also look forward to reading the other books and conference proceedings which are now being prepared by the Center for Strategic Studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SINO-SOVIET STRATEGY

Soviet Strategy 1962–70, Robert Strausz-Hupe.

Future Soviet Foreign Policy, Herbert S. Dinerstein.

Soviet Strengths and Weaknesses, Kurt L. London.

The Sino-Soviet Alliance, Richard L. Walker.

Sino-Soviet Trade and Aid, George E. Taylor.

The Role of Economic Growth, Morris Bornstein.

The Effects of Economic Growth on Sino-Soviet Strategy, G. Warren Nutter.

POLITICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR U.S. STRATEGY

Objectives and Priorities, Stephen D. Kertesz.

Political Requirements, Gerhart Niemeyer.

Vehicles of Political Strategy, Arnold Wolfers.

NATO's Nuclear Dilemma, Henry A. Kissinger.

The Middle East and North Africa, Albert J. Meyer.

The Far East, Frank N. Trager.

Alliance in the Western Hemisphere, William S. Stokes.

The Politicalization of Strategy, William R. Kintner.

Address to the Conference on January 23, 1963, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON.

Address to the Conference on January 24, 1963, the Honorable Walt M. Rostow.

U.S. MILITARY STRATEGIES

Escalation and Its Strategic Context, Herman Kahn.

Toward a Strategy of Supremacy, Stefan T. Possony.

An Approach to Military Strategy, James D. Atkinson.

Nuclear Explosives and the Atlantic Community, Edward Teller.

Managing the Arms Race, Thomas C. Shelling.

U.S. ECONOMIC STRATEGIES

An Approach to Economic Strategy, Virgil Salera.

Military Alliance and Mutual Security, Oskar Morgenstern.

Strategic Leverage From Aid and Trade, James R. Schlesinger.

Developed and Underdeveloped Areas, Karl Brandt.

MEETING STRATEGY REQUIREMENTS IN THE FREE ECONOMY

Budget Trends of the 1960's, Otto Eckstein.

Costs of Alternative Military Strategies, Murray L. Weidenbaum.

National Security and Competing Costs, Roger A. Freeman.

Economic Growth: Issues and Prospects, Henry W. Briefs; Joseph L. Tryon.

Economic Growth and U.S. Strategy, Edward S. Mason.

Monetary and Fiscal Policies in U.S. Strategy, Gottfried Haberler.

Tax Policies, Economic Growth, and Strategy, Norman B. Ture.

Industrial and Human Resources in U.S. Strategy, Irving H. Siegel.

Assuring the Primacy of National Security, W. Glenn Campbell.

PROTECTION OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION FOR THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I introduced legislation which would make it a Federal crime to assault or assassinate the President or Vice President of the United States. A number of my colleagues have introduced identical or similar measures.

I feel strongly that the President and Vice President should be accorded the same protection of Federal jurisdiction which is presently provided to many lesser Federal officials.

It is my hope that a majority of my colleagues will support this measure. I am including with my remarks the following editorials in support of this proposal which have appeared recently in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, the Philadelphia Daily News, the Washington Post and the Norristown (Pa.) Times Herald:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Nov. 27, 1963]

VOIDS THAT NEED FILLING

When Congress resumes its normal deliberations it ought to consider legislation to fill two voids in our governmental procedures and framework which were accentuated by the assassination of President Kennedy.

One is the lack of a firm procedure for decisionmaking concerning the continuity of Government and the transition of leadership in the event a President is seriously incapacitated. What would have happened, for example, if the assassin's bullet had resulted in severe brain damage rather than death?

The problem has been debated before, without conclusion. It has been suggested that some groups such as the Supreme Court, should be duly constituted to make such decisions on the basis, of course, of the best available medical advice. Or that there should be provision for a decision on a temporary transition of the leadership responsibility in the event the incapacity is deemed temporary, as well as on a permanent transition if the incapacity is felt to be permanent. The questions are difficult, but should be faced.

The other void is created by the absence of legislation making it a Federal offense to assault or assassinate the President or the Vice President.

Congressman SCHWEIKER of Montgomery County has already introduced legislation to correct this oversight. As things stand now, a number of lesser Federal officials are given the protection of Federal jurisdiction, but procedures governing the trial and the penalty for the assault or assassination of the President or the Vice President are solely determined by the laws of the State in which the crime occurs.

It was this void in our laws which left Lee Harvey Oswald a State, rather than a Federal, prisoner. Inefficient local police work made possible the murder which has deprived the Nation of the possibility of learning the full story of his crime. If the law had made him a Federal prisoner, the outcome would almost surely have been different.

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, Nov. 27, 1963]

SCHWEIKER'S BILL A MUST

We hope Congress will act quickly in passing a bill to be drawn up by Congressman RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Montgomery County Republican, making it a Federal crime to kill, assault, or conspire to harm the President or Vice President.

The bizarre slaying of assassination suspect Lee Harvey Oswald by a self-appointed executioner points up the need for taking jurisdiction in these cases away from local police.

An attempt, or the actual taking of the life of our Chief Executive or Vice President, is not only of national concern, but also has worldwide repercussions. It is essential that crimes of this nature be covered by Federal law.

We trust that President Johnson's order to the FBI to investigate the slaying of Oswald by nightclub operator Jack Ruby will be thorough and complete. The American conscience calls for it.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1963]

MAKE IT A FEDERAL CRIME

Certainly the law should be amended to make the assassination of the President a Federal crime. It is ironic indeed that the criminal who murdered President Kennedy violated only the law of Texas. Actually his foul deed was a crime against the Nation—one of the most serious crimes against the Nation in this century.

As the law now stands, severe penalties are prescribed for felons who murder or attack Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, FBI agents, postal inspectors, Secret Service officers, customs agents, and various employees of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. But this law for the "protection of officers and employees of the United States" does not, strangely enough, cover the President or members of his Cabinet.

Presumably the need for Federal law in this field has not previously been emphasized. When Lincoln was assassinated, the country was still under martial law. The assassin of President Garfield was prosecuted in the District of Columbia and the assassin of President McKinley in New York. There is a strong presumption that Texas would have convicted Lee Harvey Oswald of the slaying of President Kennedy if Oswald himself had not been killed as he was being transferred to the county jail. But the serious bungling of this vital case by the Dallas police constitutes a strong argument for the direction of such delicate operations by the FBI from the very beginning.

The events in Dallas have shown all too clearly that Federal officials should have been in charge of the police work from the beginning. High crimes against the Nation cannot be safely left to investigation and prosecution by local officials of the community in which such crimes happen to take place. As soon as Congress resumes its operations, Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania, will introduce a bill to extend the protection of section 1114, United States Code, to the President and Vice President. We hope that it will be given prompt attention by the Judiciary Committees and that they will also include within the terms of the bill other officials in the line of succession to the Presidency. Perhaps agency heads, their deputies and Members of Congress should also be included.

[From the Norristown (Pa.) Times Herald, Nov. 29, 1963]

PROTECTING OUR LEADERS

The legislative proposal of Congressman RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, that attack upon a President or Vice President shall become a Federal crime, is being well taken throughout the Nation.

Mr. SCHWEIKER has submitted his bill to the House of Representatives. There seems to be no reason for any Member to oppose its passage.

Mr. SCHWEIKER admitted last weekend that he was amazed, as were all of us, to learn that attack upon many lesser Federal officers is a Federal offense, but that the law does not apply to a President or Vice President. It would seem amazing that some Congressman, throughout all the years of the democracy, did not think this necessary, particularly since President Kennedy was not the first of his rank assassinated.

Correction is certainly in order and Mr. SCHWEIKER is to be commended for his leadership toward such correction.

A bill to be offered in the Senate is similar, but would also authorize Federal protection status for Presidents-elect and Vice Presidents-elect. This may pose problems since those elected are not Federal officers until they are sworn in and inaugurated. It might develop a loophole.

But the two surely can be fitted together in such a manner that, when properly written, there will be full Federal protection for our top commanders.

When the safety of the men in highest rank of our Nation is involved, certainly they deserve our highest and most powerful force of legal protection.

FOUNDATION OF NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the RECORD excerpts of an address by my good friend John Peterson, a member of the Steering Committee of the Foundation of North American Indian Culture, given before the Exchange Club of Bismarck, N. Dak., on December 2. Mr. Peterson outlines the basis of support now secured by the Indian Culture Foundation and projects what additional support will be necessary to insure total foundation success. The purpose of the foundation is to preserve and enhance North American Indian culture, and, in so doing, to change the stereotyped image of the North American Indian.

Indian leaders from throughout the United States and Canada, Indian entertainers from New York City, Indian royalty from Canada and the United States, and Indian culture enthusiasts from all over the Midwest will gather in Bismarck, N. Dak., December 6–7, for the first annual membership meeting of the recently organized Foundation of North American Indian Culture.

Mr. Peterson's remarks follow:

EXCERPTS OF AN ADDRESS BY JOHN PETERSON, BISMARCK, MEMBER OF STEERING COMMITTEE OF FNAIC, BEFORE BISMARCK EXCHANGE CLUB, DECEMBER 2, 1963, BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Will the Foundation of North American Indian Culture succeed? This question is on the minds of many in Bismarck and throughout North Dakota as well as on the minds of many persons vitally concerned with Indian matters all over the United States and Canada.

The organizers of the Indian Culture Foundation are well aware that not only has such a venture never before been attempted but also that its program covers an entire continent with a multiplicity of activities and some large-scale budgetary goals.

Although the program of the foundation is big, broad, and imaginative; although there has been nothing like this in the past; although it was only a remote dream of a handful of Bismarck citizens just a scant 4 months ago, this foundation of North American Indian Culture very definitely will succeed for one positive reason.

The Indian Culture Foundation is destined for great success because it has one basic purpose which has earned for it strong support both locally and internationally. That purpose is simply to present, honestly and truthfully, the North American Indian and his heritage as it was and is; and to encourage, by modern methods, the restoration among Indians of lost and latent arts, talents, and abilities that will help raise Indian people to new levels in our society.

In simpler terms the foundation's purpose is to work toward doing away with an old image—a bad stereotype caused by two generations of second-rate Hollywood movies and centuries of mistreatment and abuse by the white man.

Out of these efforts will come not a new image of the North American Indian but only a correct image—a correct image of a race that possesses many talents which are far superior, in some respects, to those of other races in modern society. Out of these efforts will come a public recognition by the more than 200 million persons in Canada and the United States who are non-Indian that the 700,000 North American Indians in these two countries have a very distinct contribution to make—if given the chance to perpetuate what they have done and to show what they can do today in such fields as art, handicrafts, music, entertainment, the dance, and literature.

Because of its basic purpose, the foundation will succeed since this purpose is right and it is just. And since it is right and just, the respected Indian leadership of Canada and the United States will assemble in Bismarck later this week to chart the long-range goals of the Indian Culture Foundation.

This Indian leadership is coming to North Dakota because they, like the foundation organizers, recognizes that something has to be done soon to preserve all that was great and gifted of past Indian culture—or it will be lost for all time within the matter of a few more short years. Furthermore, this Indian leadership, like the foundation organizers, recognizes much more can be done to effectively encourage greater use of the skills and talents of contemporary North American Indians.

We have already seen strong evidence of Indian support for the foundation program—through participation at the approaching annual meeting by the National Congress of American Indians and the National Indian Council of Canada—to indicate outstanding success for the foundation. These Indian groups represent large numbers of tribes in the two nations, and tribal participation is essential to foundation success.

And if the hard work on this December 6–7 meeting by some 100 dedicated persons in the headquarters city of Bismarck and the home State of North Dakota is an indication, there is no question but what the foundation will achieve the necessary local backing. The work of these 100 North Dakota citizens will be multiplied into the hundreds and thousands in the months ahead as the foundation prepares for its first annual North American Indian Exposition next August, for construction of its headquarters facilities by 1966, and for establishment of an International Indian Museum by the late 1960's. The enthusiasm is there.

With local involvement and United States and Canadian Indian participation in the foundation program assured, the Indian Culture Foundation will have little trouble in presenting its cause to the large foundations and corporations for necessary funds to carry on the vital activities of this long-delayed program. We have just begun our job, but our cause is right and we will succeed.

NAVIGATIONAL COMPUTER SYSTEM

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, our Government has paid the developer of a navigational computer system $950,000 of his total cost of $1.3 million and has allowed this developer to claim this equipment as a patented item. My authority for this statement is the General Accounting Office, which has assisted me in investigating this case. This is the kind of inefficiency and slipshod work being done daily in the Department of Defense procurement sections, the kind of inefficiency that must be cleaned up.

Mr. Speaker, this case of an equipment known as the AN/ASN 33 first came to my attention June 18, 1963. In bid documents that I have picked up daily at the Small Business Administration, I found a procurement being conducted by the Chicago Procurement District for this equipment.

It was to be a sole source—no competition—procurement with only one manufacturer given an opportunity to bid. One item called for purchase of manufacturing drawings, the Army contending it did not possess them at the time.

When the military says it does not have drawings for an equipment it has purchased several times, my curiosity is aroused. I called Col. Thomas Davis, of the Chicago Procurement District of the Army, to request information about the equipment.

Colonel Davis told me that the sole source producer of the equipment claims it as a patented, and therefore, proprietary item. In short, Mr. Speaker, the developer had developed the equipment at its own expense and therefore claimed it as its own, which would be only fitting and proper.

Colonel Davis also told me that he was informed the sole source producer did not plan to bid on the manufacturing drawings section of the procurement. Therefore, as it is easy to see, there would still be no manufacturing data to allow competitive procurement.

Mr. Speaker, from that day to this, the Army's attitude has been to back up the developer's claim of proprietary rights. Its entire course has been to rationalize its position. At no time, in my opinion, did it really try to penetrate to the core of the problem.

I inquired in writing on June 25, 1963, as to the proprietary claims. On June 29, 1963, Colonel Davis answered, stating the Army's position that, since developer claimed proprietary rights, no manufacturing data could be made available for competitive bidding.

Later, Col. James E. Foster, of the Army's Electronics Materiel Agency in Philadelphia, backed up Colonel Davis.

To take as short a time here as possible, Mr. Speaker, I shall simply say I was not entirely satisfied with the Army's explanations. I asked the Comptroller General to look into the history and background of this equipment. I stated to him my feeling there might be Government money tied up in it. In my opinion, if Government money goes into a project, Government benefit and competitive procurement data should come out of it.

The General Accounting Office reported to me on November 4, 1963. I shall quote pertinent parts of the report.

The GAO said:

> We estimate that from 1950 to 1960 the Government paid about $950,000 of the $1.3 million of the development costs for the AN/ASN 33 and its predecessor systems, but did not acquire manufacturing drawings, or a royalty-free license to use drawings that would be suitable for obtaining competition in the procurement of any of the products resulting from this development work.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, GAO reported the Government had spent $700,000 out of a total development cost of $800,000 for a commercial product of the developer which parallels the AN/ASN 33.

GAO concluded that:

On the basis of the relationship between Government sales and commercial sales during the period that development costs for this computer and predecessor systems were incurred, the Government has borne a significant portion of such costs.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, what the Army contends and what an unbiased agency such as GAO has uncovered, are as different as day and night.

This is the kind of inefficiency and mismanagement we have in some of our military purchasing areas.

The Army allowed a developer to lock up a piece of equipment as its own, without really checking. It was easier, less work to take the line of least resistance and pay an inflated price of $11,000 per average unit for the system. To date, about $1 million has been spent on the ASN 33. Competitive purchasing could have cut this cost in half, based on my findings in past cases. Someone in the Army, however, let the developer claim this item as a commercial product without checking; and that is perfectly obvious to me in light of the GAO's findings.

This is another case which shows how superficial is the work being done by purchasing sections of the military. A town or a county would go bankrupt in a week with such buying policies.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we in Congress force the military to completely revamp its buying policies. Progress is being made. Some of the mistakes are finally being admitted and corrected, as I have shown here in the past few days. But much needs to be done, and every day the job is delayed costs the taxpayers of this country dearly.

It is also my opinion that more changes are needed in armed service procurement regulations to insure that our Government will get data to permit competition where it even indirectly contributes to contractor-sponsored, independent research and development programs.

Mr. Speaker, industriousness must replace inefficiency. Penetrating study must supplant the superficial look given many cases by military purchasing agents. Hard work must replace the lackadaisical attitude held by many who spend our tax money. A "protect the taxpayers' interest" attitude and a willingness to admit and correct errors must replace the "sweep it under the rug" policy that is squandering millions of tax dollars a year.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we must, as President Johnson so eloquently said last Wednesday, get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar we spend. In military purchasing today, I am positive that is not the case.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY EXPRESSWAY, CHICAGO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] 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. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, November 29, 1963, the City Council of Chicago met at the request of Mayor Richard A. Daley and passed the following ordinance:

Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Chicago:

SECTION 1. The name by which the Northwest Expressway shall be known is "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Expressway."

SEC. 2. The commissioner of streets and sanitation is authorized to place the proper signs bearing the name set forth in section 1 along said highway.

SEC. 3. This ordinance shall take effect upon passage.

The John Fitzgerald Kennedy Expressway is one of the most recent improvements for automobile travel in the great city of Chicago. It links our famous Loop with O'Hare Field and northwestern suburbs in Chicago. The late President Kennedy was the first Chief Executive of the United States to officially travel its length. He paid a visit to Chicago last spring arriving at O'Hare Field to motorcade to the Loop.

The welcome extended to late President Kennedy by the people of Chicago was heartwarming. They lined the expressway from O'Hare to the Loop and masses gathered at his destination. Many carried signs of greetings; many waved flags; and many just waved, but all shouted "Hi" in the friendly manner credited to Chicagoans. As a good portion of the highway bisects the Eighth Congressional District, which I represent, I was more conscious of the multitude of people that were present along the roadside. There were people dressed in expensive clothes; there were people in working clothes; there were priests, nuns, and other men of the cloth; and there were children of all ages. Every class was represented and it was a spontaneous expression of admiration and confidence for the leader of our country. Chicagoans felt very close to this great man and wanted him to know it.

Chicago's reaction to his tragic death cannot be described by words. It was a deep personal loss, which will never be fully understood. Therefore the renaming of the Northwest Expressway to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Expressway is the voice of the people of Chicago for the everlasting memory of a great leader, a great American, but most of all a dear friend.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN] 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. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], who has informed the House of the action of the City Council of the City of Chicago in further honoring our late great President by renaming the great artery connecting the Loop with O'Hare Field and the northwestern suburbs surrounding Chicago.

The name of John F. Kennedy will long be remembered, and this is another instance of the love of his people for a man whose dedicated life was cut off all too shortly.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] 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. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the persistent and conscientious effort which has been put forth on behalf of fairer principles of summer student employment in the Federal Government by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]. He has bucked the bureaucracy. He has diligently amassed statistics. He has refused to be deterred. He has truly been a sterling champion of those able students who, without friends and "insiders" in the bureaucracy, sincerely wish to serve their country and gain valuable experience by working a summer in Washington, D.C.

As an old teacher of political science, as a longtime member of the executive branch, and also as a personal friend of several chairmen of the Civil Service Commission, I have watched with increasing awe and at times alarm the manner in which many appointments are made to summer positions here in Washington, D.C. I have sponsored programs every summer which have enabled hundreds of students from my own congressional district to spend a week in Washington, working in a congressional office, observing Congress and its committees in operation, and interviewing key officials. These students are chosen on a merit basis by a bipartisan committee consisting of one Republican House Member, one Democratic House Member, and a university professor of political science. I might add that I enforce an apportionment system in the 13 counties of my district, insuring geographic distribution of the winners of the "Week in Washington" contest.

Invariably, fired by an interest in governmental affairs, these students who come to Washington as juniors in high school want to return in later years to gain some experience in the executive branch. They start writing me in September asking me how to get summer jobs. I then ask the Civil Service Commission how to proceed, what civil service exams they should take to qualify, and whom they should contact. The Civil Service Commission gives me an inconclusive answer. They tell me that the Federal service entrance examination is open only to col-

lege juniors and seniors. They tell me that there is a civil service exam for the physical sciences but none for the social sciences. The correspondence piles up. The Civil Service Commission tells me that each student ought to get in touch with each Government department, that employment has been decentralized. The departments start a long and usually fruitless correspondence, without clearly defining what will qualify a student for summer employment. I make repeated inquiries on behalf of outstanding students who I know are able to contribute to the agencies in which they are interested. Weeks pass by, and I again make contact. Then suddenly the agencies become interested in my inquiry, but they advise me that they are sorry, but it is too late as all their hiring has been done for the summer.

I daresay many other Members have had similar experience with bright, personable, imaginative, and able students—not political hacks, but young men and women who we know will be able to "cut the mustard."

Now maybe it is just my frustration with the existing system which makes me so enthusiastic about the bill sponsored by my colleague from Texas. I have talked on several occasions with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, John Macy, an able administrator, who has told me that he opposes this bill. I just hope that the 301-to-18 vote in the House of Representatives today will convince the Civil Service Commission and all the agencies of Government that they are going to have to shake up their procedures for summer employment if they wish congressional support and sympathy for their position. These procedures should make it crystal clear that summer employment of students is to be on the basis of merit, not politics; on the basis of what you know instead of whom you know; on the basis of open and competitive examinations announced far enough in advance and publicized well enough in the hinterlands so anyone can apply; and on the basis of ability instead of what relatives or friends you have or strings you can pull.

I want to rise to the defense of my colleague from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] whom some have said is trying to put politics into summer employment, or to set up some kind of a pork barrel. Nothing could be further from the truth. What he is trying to do by his bill is to take this system and shake the bureaucratic deadwood out of it, and then put it on a merit basis so the average American in all parts of our great land can have an equal chance to compete.

I certainly am happy that the Beckworth bill has passed the House by an overwhelming vote, and I hope that the Civil Service Commission does something radical to improve this impossible situation. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I hope they get so mad down there they will turn over a few tables and turn over a few new leaves and make it clear to students in all 50 States of the Union that they have a chance to work for Uncle Sam next summer if they can qualify on an announced examination.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON—"A MAN OF MANKIND, AS BIG HIMSELF AS THE NATION HE MUST NOW GOVERN"

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday, December 1, the Boston Herald published a tribute to President Lyndon B. Johnson which was written by Leslie Carpenter, chief of the Boston Herald-Traveler's Washington Bureau.

He has been a personal friend of President Johnson for many years. In writing about President Johnson, he knows and understands his subject.

I know the Members of the House will read this article by Mr. Carpenter about a great leader whom he describes as "a man of mankind, as big himself as the Nation he must now govern."

A MAN OF COMPLEXITY—FLAME OF HUMAN SPIRIT SURGES THROUGH JOHNSON

(By Leslie Carpenter)

WASHINGTON.—Surging always through President Lyndon B. Johnson is the flame of the human spirit.

And that more than anything else gives fire to the behavior pattern, the goals, the ambition, the hopes, the dreams, and the attitudes of this extremely complex man.

He is an immensely generous man who has deep respect and affection for his fellow man. He races though life at great speed, his mind filled with big and important problems and objectives. But he never fails, somehow, in all the hurry to think of the thoughtful gesture, the kindness.

IMMENSELY KIND

He is a man whose heart is as big as his mind and they work together like the perfect machine.

President Johnson, that big man who must now, in his private sadness, lead the Nation, has spent his 55 years learning more from men than from books. He trusts and respects human beings more than the printed word.

The men and women who have meant the most to him through the years have come from all economic groups and greatly varying backgrounds and education. He has learned something from each of them, and his own life, as well as his political and personal direction, have been shaped by those lessons.

THOUGHTS OF OTHERS

In the 20-odd years I have known President Johnson as a personal friend, I have many times heard him quote thoughts of other friends who were of a different race and who had little education.

"Now," the man who is now the U.S. President would say, "isn't he absolutely right?" No one could disagree that he was.

In thousands of conversations with President Johnson over the more than two decades I have known him, I have never heard him at any time cast a reflection on a man's race or religion, even in humor. There is no question in my mind that he never had such a thought.

POLITICAL DANGERS

Although he represented a State in Congress where it was politically dangerous to have a thinking man's outlook toward the equality and dignity of all human beings, Johnson always felt that way.

Years ago, President Johnson used to have a sign on the wall of his office. It had been given to him by a friend and it said: "You ain't learning anything when you're talking."

Johnson has always been inclined to talk a lot—and to ask an avalanche of questions. But he also has always known how to listen.

Few men in public life seek as much advice as has always been the case with him. He wants three things when he turns for advice, and they are: (1) The best minds he can tap on the subject; (2) both sides of the subject presented with the best possible facts to support each; and (3) every point boiled down to the facts without wasteful adjectives, adverbs or needless elaboration.

GRASPS QUICKLY

The President can grasp anything immediately. There is no point in emphasizing a word. If it is a word, he takes it in for all its meaning.

He has always made his own decision. The closest friend he ever had couldn't influence him if he felt that friend was wrong.

He could hardly have chosen a career other than public life. His unique talents and gifts were long ago recognized by the business world, and he was offered many positions which would have made a more comfortable life for him and his family.

BUSINESS WORLD

One friend who had watched him operate for 8 years as the most powerful and influential Senate majority leader in history once remarked: "You know if he had gone into the business world, he might have become the first man ever to be president of the Chase National Bank, Du Pont, and Ford Motor Co. all at once."

President Johnson has always said that he wants "can-do" people around him. But he is himself the most "can-do" man who ever could and did.

WORLD ON FIRE

For many years before a tragedy as horrible as the Nation will ever experience thrust him into the Presidency, Johnson rushed through life as if the world were on fire and maybe no one except him had access to water.

His wife once put his excessive energy and force this way: "Lyndon behaves as if there were no tomorrow coming and he had to do everything today."

The story is true that his father used to wake him as a boy by shaking one leg and declaring: "Get out of bed: every boy in town is already 15 minutes ahead of you." Time was to him, after that, always too precious to waste.

SENSE OF URGENCY

There was a sense of urgency about his father, Samuel Ealy Johnson. His mother, Rebekah Baines Johnson, was a quiet lady of grace and refinement, unusually beautiful until her death in her seventies.

She shaped her son's greatest gifts, his character and his feeling for people. She had spent most of her life as the wife of a rancher in the lonely hill country of Texas reading, and she read philosophy to her son.

He took it in like a blotter, as he has all the experiences of his life, for they have made him what he is today.

CREATURE COMFORTS

President Johnson is a man who relishes the creature comforts, the fine clothes, the happiness which material things might bring to his wife and daughters, the fine cattle which graze on his ranch, the dog which he loves and loves him, the bath which has been drawn before he gets into it.

All of these things have a meaning to him, because he does not want to travel through life second class, and he wants no fellow man to do it either.

Anyone who knows Johnson well recognizes that there is a collision between two forces which drive him: urgency and kindness.

TASK AT HAND

He gives everything of himself to the task at hand, and when he realizes another isn't, his temper flares. He might shout in rage to a secretary who has not lived up to his expectations for perfection. But when she gets home that night, she will find flowers from him and an apology. Or there will be some other way of showing that he is sorry.

A completely busy man can frequently leave the wrong impression.

Only casual acquaintances, in the great speed of life, have ever failed to understand President Johnson.

Those who know him at all understand he never had a petty thought—or was willing to listen to one.

He is a man of mankind, as big himself as the Nation he must now govern.

ETERNAL LIGHT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] 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. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we mourn, in our own way, the passing of President Kennedy, and it is not always easy to transmit our feelings. Some are gifted in expressing that which we may feel, and I offer here a poem written and composed by Mrs. Jessie M. Williams, of Chicago, Ill., on the day President Kennedy passed away:

ETERNAL LIGHT

Somewhere a candle flickers
Somewhere a voice is hushed
Somewhere all hearts are saddened
Somewhere a life was crushed

Somewhere the peace he fought for
On land and on the sea
Somewhere he gave his all
For his love of humanity

There's a mound upon a hillside
An eternal light to never cease
A Nation bows in reverence
For the man who fought for peace.

THE PASSING SCENE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] 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. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I seldom use the privilege afforded Members of Congress to put printed matter into the RECORD.

Today I am asking consent because of the contents of William S. White's column entitled "The Passing Scene."

Out of the torrent of words, out of the flood of comments and observations on our new President Lyndon B. Johnson I find the attached appraisal one worthy of the attention of all Members of Congress and the whole peoples of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker I present for the RECORD "The Passing Scene" by William S. White:

THE PASSING SCENE: SWIFT DECISIONS AND FIRM LEADERSHIP

(By William S. White)

President Johnson, profoundly relieved and thankful that the country has so rallied in unity and strength from the shock of the assassination of his predecessor, now proposes to keep up the momentum of his administration on every front without pause or letup.

These recent urgent days have shown to the Nation the rapidity of decision and vigor of the new President in a crisis time. What these days have not yet shown is that these attributes are a part of Mr. Johnson's ordinary political life.

In all the circumstances, of course, he simply had to decide and to act firmly and quickly and more or less all at once all along the whole range of the enormous problems of an office thrown upon him without an instant's warning.

RACING AGAINST FEAR

He was racing against nothing less than national fear and potential national hysteria and chaos and an ominous tide of confused bitterness and counterbitterness.

He won the race. But his instantaneous series of unhesitating actions—necessarily taken at times by telephone and with almost dizzying speed as he pressed one button after another to give clipped directives and a sense of sad but rocklike Presidential calm to one momentarily shaken official after another—were unusual only in the tragic atmosphere that surrounded them.

Their speed and firmness were standard operating procedure for a man long known to his old colleagues in the Senate as tireless in action and fretful only when there was nothing much that needed to be done. Of these qualities of decision much more will be seen.

Mr. Johnson, in short, has always believed, in every office he has held, that the enemy of sound and creative public policy is any loss within its leaders of the great elan that comes when the initiative is maintained and fully used.

Doubly and triply he believes this to be true of the office of the Presidency, seeing it as the distilled and ultimate delegated power of the Nation itself—a power which must not be allowed to waste away or to become diffused into nothingness by absence of bold action at the top.

To him a moment lost is not only something to be deplored. It is a grave spoilage. For in his view history in the present world runs with that nation which does not sit down to rest after each task but finishes one only to reach with zest for another task to finish.

He will therefore never carefully divide his duties and programs into something labeled "domestic" and something labeled "foreign," giving a priority to the one or the other. To him a problem is a problem, and the problems and challenges of national leadership—whether across thousands of miles of ocean or simply up Pennsylvania Avenue on Capitol Hill—are all big and urgent.

He will be neither a domestic nor a foreign affairs President. He will only be President—a job he considers to be indivisible.

CAPACITY FOR PERSUASION

Even as he is pressing Congress on his domestic legislative program he will be pressing his purposes on the international scene with what is his greatest operating skill. This is a capacity for persuasion to his point of view—already long since known to Congress—which before many weeks will be about equally known to the world's leaders, some of whom he has already met and will meet yet again and again.

Most of all, he will never willingly lose his and the Nation's present momentum in behalf of a rest here and there.

He will not get from Congress this year all the legislation he wants, and perhaps not even next year. But he will get some of it; and he will always come back and back until at length he gets it all. And allied statesmen—and potential enemy chieftains, too—will find in him what the late President Kennedy also found in him:

A skilled, seemingly casual, negotiator needing no mass of papers and no briefcases, with an absolutely untroubled certainty as to where the real point in every discussion lies.

LAST SPEECH FOR PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] 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. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the last public remarks by our late and beloved President Kennedy were made in Fort Worth, Tex., on that tragic day of his assassination. He spoke at a breakfast meeting of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce in the Texas Hotel.

It was my privilege to be in attendance that morning. I had accompanied the President to Texas, and had been with him on his visits to San Antonio and Houston on November 21, the day before his life was snuffed out.

On the morning of November 22, in Fort Worth, President Kennedy was in wonderful spirits. His trip had been a huge success, the large crowds had given him a warm welcome. His usual good humor was very much in evidence.

President Kennedy spoke that morning of confidence, confidence in many things. He spoke of the stature of our defenses, of the wonderful new TFX fighter plane, of Fort Worth Congressman JIM WRIGHT, of the part Texas has played in the development of our Nation. I believe the full text of President Kennedy's remarks, the last he was to make in public, should be read and absorbed by all of us:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE FORT WORTH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, TEXAS HOTEL, FORT WORTH, TEX.

I know now why everyone in Texas, Fort Worth, is so thin, having gotten up and down about nine times. This is what you do every morning.

Mr. Buck, Mr. Vice President, Governor Connally, Senator Yarborough, Jim Wright, members of the congressional delegation, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Attorney General, ladies and gentlemen, 2 years ago, I introduced myself in Paris by saying that I was the man who had accompanied Mrs. Kennedy to Paris. I am getting somewhat that same sensation as I travel around Texas. Nobody wonders what Lyndon and I wear.

I am glad to be here in JIM WRIGHT's city. About 35 years ago, a Congressman from California who had just been elected received a letter from an irate constituent

which said: "During the campaign you promised to have the Sierra Madre Mountains reforested. You have been in office 1 month and you haven't done so." Well, no one in Fort Worth has been that unreasonable, but in some ways he has had the Sierra Madre Mountains reforested and here in Fort Worth he has contributed to its growth.

He speaks for Forth Worth and he speaks for the country, and I don't know any city that is better represented in the Congress of the United States than Forth Worth.

And if there are any Democrats here this morning, I am sure you wouldn't hold that against him.

Three years ago last September I came here, with the Vice President, and spoke at Burke Burnett Park, and I called in that speech for a national security policy and a national security system which was second to none, a position which said not first but, if, when and how, but first. That city responded to that call as it has through its history. And we have been putting that pledge into practice ever since.

I want to say a word about that pledge here in Fort Worth, which understands national defense, and its importance to the security of the United States. During the days of the Indian War, this city was a fort. During the days of World War I, even before the United States got into the war, Royal Canadian Air Force pilots were training here. During the days of World War II, the great Liberator bombers, and which my brother flew with his copilot from this city, were produced here.

The first nonstop flight around the world took off and returned here, in a plane built in factories here. The first truly intercontinental bomber, the B-36, was produced here. The B-58, which is the finest weapons system in the world today, which has demonstrated most recently in flying from Tokyo to London, with an average speed of nearly 1,000 miles per hour, is a Fort Worth product.

The Iroquois helicopter from Fort Worth is a mainstay in our fight against the guerrillas in South Vietnam. The transportation of crews between our missile sites is done in planes produced here in Fort Worth. So wherever the confrontation may occur, and in the last 3 years it has occurred on at least three occasions, in Laos, Berlin, and Cuba, and it will again—wherever it occurs, the products of Fort Worth and the men of Fort Worth provide us with a sense of security.

And in the not too distant future a new Fort Worth product, and I am glad that there was a table separating Mr. Hicks and myself—a new Fort Worth product, the TFX. Tactical fighter experimental—nobody knows what those words mean, but that is what they mean, tactical fighter experimental—will serve the forces of freedom and will be the No. 1 airplane in the world today.

There has been a good deal of discussion of the long and hard fought competition to win the TFX contract, but very little discussion about what this plane will do. It will be the first operational aircraft ever produced that can literally spread its wings through the air. It will thus give us a single plane capable of carrying out missions of speed as well as distance, able to fly very far in one form or very fast in another. It can take off from rugged, short airstrips, enormously increasing the Air Force's ability to participate in limited wars. The same basic plane will serve the Navy's carriers, saving the taxpayers at least $1 billion in costs if they built separate planes for the Navy and the Air Force.

The Government of Australia, by purchasing $125 million of TFX planes before they are even off the drawing boards, has already testified to the merit of this plane, and at the same time it is confident in the ability of Fort Worth to meet its schedule. In all these ways, the success of our national defense depends upon this city in the Western United States, 10,000 miles from Vietnam, 5,000 or 6,000 miles from Berlin, thousands of miles from trouble spots in Latin America and Africa or the Middle East. And yet Fort Worth and what it does and what it produces participates in all these historic events. Texas, as a whole, and Fort Worth bear particular responsibility for this national defense effort, for military procurement in this State totals nearly $1¼ billion, fifth highest among all the States of the Union. There are more military personnel on active duty in this State than any in the Nation, save one—and it is not Massachusetts—any in the Nation save one, with a combined military-civilian defense payroll of well over a billion dollars. I don't recite these for my partisan purpose. They are the result of American determination to be second to none, and as a result of the effort which this country has made in the last 3 years we are second to none.

In the past 3 years we have increased the defense budget of the United States by over 20 percent; increased the program of acquisition for Polaris submarines from 24 to 41; increased our Minuteman missile purchase program by more than 75 percent; doubled the number of strategic bombers and missiles on alert; doubled the number of nuclear weapons available in the strategic alert forces; increased the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe by over 60 percent; added 5 combat-ready divisions to the Army of the United States, and 5 tactical fighter wings to the Air Force of the United States; increased our strategic airlift capability by 75 percent; and increased our special counterinsurgency forces which are engaged now in South Vietnam by 600 percent. I hope those who want a stronger America and place it on some signs will also place those figures next to it.

This is not an easy effort. This requires sacrifice by the people of the United States. But this is a very dangerous and uncertain world. As I said earlier, on three occasions in the last 3 years the United States has had a direct confrontation. No one can say when it will come again. No one expects that our life will be easy, certainly not in this decade and perhaps not in this century. But we should realize what a burden and responsibility the people of the United States have borne for so many years. Here a country which lived in isolation, divided and protected by the Atlantic and the Pacific, uninterested in the struggles of the world around it, here in the short space of 18 years after the Second World War, we put ourselves, by our own will and by necessity, into defense of alliances with countries all around the globe. Without the United States, South Vietnam would collapse overnight. Without the United States, the SEATO alliance would collapse overnight. Without the United States the CENTO alliance would collapse overnight. Without the United States there would be no NATO. And gradually Europe would drift into neutralism and indifference. Without the efforts of the United States in the Alliance for Progress, the Communist advance onto the mainland of South America would long ago have taken place.

So this country, which desires only to be free, which desires to be secure, which desired to live at peace for 18 years under three different administrations has borne more than its share of the burden, has stood watch for more than its number of years. I don't think we are fatigued or tired. We would like to live as we once lived. But history will not permit it. The Communist balance of power is still strong. The balance of power is still on the side of freedom. We are still the keystone in the arch of freedom, and I think we will continue to do as we have done in our past, our duty, and the people of Texas will be in the lead.

So I am glad to come to this State which has played such a significant role in so many efforts in this century, and to say that here in Fort Worth you people will be playing a major role in the maintenance of the security of the United States for the next 10 years. I am confident, as I look to the future, that our chances for security, our chances for peace, are better than they have been in the past. And the reason is because we are stronger. And with that strength is a determination to not only maintain the peace, but also the vital interests of the United States. To that great cause, Texas and the United States are committed.

Thank you.

COTTON SUPPORT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 29, 1963, the gentleman from Arkansas obtained a special order to address the House at the conclusion of the business on that day. There was, of course, no legislative business, the preceding day being Thanksgiving Day.

The gentleman took this opportunity to comment upon a speech which I delivered to the House on October 17, 1963, concerning the cotton support program.

Apparently, his purpose was to rebut various tables and figures which I included in the RECORD of October 17 in support of my contention that the American public pays an annual subsidy by virtue of the cotton support program, of $608,008,132.

It was my purpose in making this speech to disclose certain inequities and deficiencies in the cotton program, and point up the fact that the program, while resulting in millions of dollars to large Western growers of cotton, affords but minimum assistance to smaller farmers, notably small Southeastern farmers.

Reviewing briefly my remarks of that date, it was my contention—as it is today—that when the U.S. Government undertakes to purchase cotton from any eligible producer at a price of 32.47 cents per pound through the nonrecourse loan program of the Commodity Credit Corporation, this action creates an artificial price for all cotton, whether placed in loan or sold in private channels. The difference between the support price of of 32.47 cents and the price that would obtain in a free market—without cotton supports—is, I contend, a subsidy. The term "subsidy" was defined at page 19795 of the RECORD as follows:

> Subsidy computed by multiplying rate of 8½ cents per pound by number of bales produced in the allotment categories shown.

Everyone knows that the world price for 1 inch Middling cotton is 24 cents per pound. Consequently, the Government's program of supporting prices at 32.47 cents per pound creates a differential of 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 per bale—for every pound of cotton grown on allotment acreage.

It is, therefore, a simple matter to determine the total amount of this subsidy for the year treated in my speech, 1961. You simply multiply total domestic production by 8½ cents per pound to derive the national subsidy of $608 million.

This was perfectly clear in my remarks of October 17. There followed an analysis of just who among the 928,761 cotton farmers of the United States shared this subsidy. I was startled by the figures—322 growers with 1,000 allotment acres or more shared subsidies totaling $36,590,761, averaging $113,656 per grower. This is compared with 652,387 small farmers, with allotment of 10 acres or less, who received a total of $40,787,449, or the incredibly small amount of $63 each—approximately $5 per month.

On the occasion of my address to the House, I included the names of farmers—insofar as could be obtained from the Department of Agriculture—having allotments of 1,000 acres or more, the effective allotment, measured acreage, and estimated yield for each such farm. Thereafter, I computed the production of each farmer, and based upon production, following the very simple formula, computed the amount of subsidy received by each farmer. In some instances this subsidy was as great as $2,232,737 for the J. G. Boswell interests in Arizona and California. The Kern County Land Co., under this formula, received the benefit of a subsidy of $2,026,992.50.

The subsidy is computed for each of the 322 farms, all appearing in the October 17 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Now Mr. Speaker, on last Friday in his remarks and by insertions consisting of several tables and some 23 letters, the gentleman from Arkansas quarrels with my use of the term "subsidy." Apparently, he would equate subsidy only to the payments made to producers who export cotton, or, possibly, to the amount of nonrecourse loans advanced on bales placed in Government storage.

Other gentlemen, during the course of this discussion on last Friday, took the same position—to wit, that it is inaccurate to term as a subsidy that increase in price of domestic cotton brought about by virtue of the cotton support system.

I am happy to join issue to this point. It seems to me that the entire Nation would do well to consider carefully our agricultural program, and the cotton program is a good point of departure. I believe the gentlemen who took issue with my remarks last week have performed a service by placing this vital issue before the House. The consuming public has been in the dark long enough. It is indeed time that sophistry and legerdemain be swept away, and that the public see this program for what it is.

Mr. Speaker, the price support system does create a subsidy. An inflated price, paid by the consumer, is as much a subsidy as a check drawn on the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In Webster's Dictionary, the term "subsidize" is defined as follows: "To aid or promote, as a private enterprise, with public money."

Does not the public money available to every eligible grower in the form of nonrecourse loans from the Commodity Credit Corporation, which undertakes to pay 32.47 cents per pound for cotton regardless of world conditions and market factors, aid and promote the private production of cotton? Does not the fact that an instrumentality of the Government is bound by law to pay 32.47 cents per pound to any eligible grower, set the price of cotton moving in private channels? Can anyone believe that a producer would sell at 24 cents—the world price—when he can dispose of his cotton to the Government for 32.47 cents? Can anyone believe that a buyer would pay 8½ cents per pound more than the world price if he could find a grower who would sell for less? Under the present cotton support program, the eligible producer has a guaranteed customer—the Government—at a guaranteed price. To the extent that this guaranteed price exceeds the price he could obtain without any such guarantee, every cotton farmer is subsidized. Today the guaranteed price exceeds the world price by 8½ cents per pound. Accordingly, the farmer is subsidized to the extent of 8½ cents per pound for every pound of cotton grown.

And, because the differential is 8½ cents per pound, every cotton farmer receives a subsidy calculated by multiplying 8½ cents by each pound he produces. Hence, the California interests which produced 52,535 bales in 1961 received a subsidy of $2,232,737.

To say that the nonrecourse loan program is nothing more than a mechanism to provide for orderly marketing processes is to avoid reality. To say that the only subsidy involved in the cotton program is payment under the export program is to overlook the facts. To say that 32.47-cent cotton—guaranteed by the Government in the face of a 24-cent world price—enables the farmer only to hold onto cotton until the market reaches an encouraging point, is to deny what any realist should freely admit.

Mr. Speaker, there is a subsidy—paid by the consumer, on every pound of cotton grown in the United States. That subsidy will continue for so long as there exists a differential—at 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 per bale—between the Government's guaranteed price and the world market's competitive price.

If gentlemen deny that a subsidy exists, let them explain away these facts. If gentlemen quarrel with my disclosures, let them attempt to show to the contrary. On October 17, I stated to this body that the cotton subsidy costs the American public over $608 million in 1961, and that this subsidy aids, in the main, large western growers. Today, on December 3, 1963, I reiterate that statement. I will be happy for any Member to show wherein I am wrong.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. Yes. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I appreciate your according us an opportunity to be here this evening and discuss this matter. I am sorry the gentleman was not present at the time the special order was accorded me last Friday. I just want to say to the gentleman that you had brought out in the RECORD previously that there were a number of farmers, the so-called large farmers, who grow more than 1,000 acres of cotton, and that that total, according to the record from the Department of Agriculture, is 286 across the whole country. That is the total. But out of that 286 no mention has been made of the fact that there were 2,691 tenants and sharecroppers who were working on those 286 farms. Here, for example, in your remarks earlier you stated that John F. Twist at the Twist plantation in Crittenden County, Ark., received a subsidy in the amount of $71,187.50. What I did is, I took that $71,187.50 and divided it by the total number of bales of cotton, as your statement revealed, which was produced by the Twist plantation, numbering 1,675, and that gave me the sum of $42.50, as you have just stated; $42.50 subsidy was paid to J. F. Twist plantation on each bale of cotton that was grown on his allotment.

Now, I have a letter from John F. Twist, who is the operator of this Twist interest at Twist plantation, and among other things he says this:

> Several observations of interest can be made from these facts. First, that Mr. WELTNER submits these production figures obtained from the Department of Agriculture but omits the information also of record in the Department of Agriculture that the J. F. Twist acreage allotment is shared by eight additional farmers.

It was not just J. F. Twist, a big farmer, but is divided up into eight small operations. In many instances that does exist throughout those I have had occasion to go into and check. Now I will continue reading.

> Eight additional farmers renting from the plantation and operating separately in every regard except for paying rentals. These 8-family operations produced 1,409 bales of the 1,856 bales produced in 1961.

The next clear fact is that 1,825 bales of the total production of 1,856 bales was sold to domestic mills.

Now, out of the total production on that plantation of 1,856 bales, 1,409 bales were sold to domestic mills at the regular price of 32.47 cents for Middling Inch cotton on which there is no subsidy paid whatever.

The gentleman does bring out the point today that the difference between those two figures of 1,856 and 1,409—some of those did go into the Commodity Credit Corporation loan.

Mr. WELTNER. I did not bring out that point. I maintained that because the Government guarantees prices on every pound of cotton produced by an eligible grower at 32.47 cents, there is a subsidy on every pound of cotton grown to the extent that that price differs from the world market price. And as the gentleman from Arkansas knows, as he stated a moment ago, by dividing the number of bales sold by the Twist plantation into the amount of the subsidy, it came out, I believe, in the words of the gentleman from Arkansas, that "there was a subsidy of $42.50 per bale."

Mr. GATHINGS. I did not say that there was a subsidy of $42.50 a bale. I used the gentleman's figures and said that he had arrived at the figure $42.50, to show that that was the way the gentleman had arrived at the total; that is, that every one of these bales of cotton had gone on board a ship and had been shipped for export. That is the amount that was paid when the cotton was put

on board ship for export. And the biggest part of this cotton which we are now referring to was sold to domestic mills on which the full price was paid by the domestic mill. The reason for the legislation that we had before us today is to correct that situation so that we do not charge our domestic mills 32.47 cents a pound for Middling Inch cotton when the mills in Barcelona, Spain, buy that same cotton for 24 cents.

Mr. WELTNER. If the gentleman will yield to me, does the gentleman contend that if the Government did not support—through the nonrecourse loan system—cotton at 32.47 cents a pound it would remain at 32.47 cents a pound in private channels?

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has alleged that many of my constituents had obtained a subsidy, and he laid out in his presentation the amounts in thousands upon thousands of dollars of subsidy that was paid to these people. The gentleman cannot show that because the information I have put in the RECORD disputes the gentleman's figures.

Mr. WELTNER. I am asking the gentleman, does he maintain that the price of Middling cotton grown in this country would remain at 32.47 cents per pound were there no CCC standing ready, willing, and under legal obligation to pay 32.47 cents per pound for every pound of cotton produced on allotment acres?

Mr. GATHINGS. That does not make them lose any money on the cotton if the bales of cotton are sold to domestic mills for 32.47 cents.

Mr. WELTNER. I submit that the gentleman has not answered my question. May I phrase it another way? What would be the price of cotton per pound——

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has not answered my question. Why is it that he has alleged that so many of my constituents in the State of Arkansas have drawn subsidies when they have not done so?

Mr. WELTNER. I have merely stated, I submit, what a subsidy is. If the gentleman will refer to page 19795 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the occasion of my address of October 17 he will see underneath the table this note:

"Subsidy" computed by multiplying rate of 8½ cents per pound by number of bales produced in the allotment categories shown.

That is exactly what I contend a subsidy is. It is a subsidy paid, not by a check written by the Commodity Credit Corporation, not the export subsidy for goods shipped overseas, but paid by the public, because the public has to pay 8½ cents more for that cotton than they would if there were no Commodity Credit Corporation supporting the price at 32.47 cents per pound. That is my sole contention as to subsidy. I am happy that the gentleman has quarreled with me, because it seems to me that this point should be made crystal clear. I contend there is a subsidy for every pound of cotton grown in this country so long as the Government is willing to buy that cotton at a price greater than it would bring were there no support program.

Mr. GATHINGS. If the gentleman will yield further, if 10 million bales of cotton is produced in this country and you sold 10 million bales to the domestic mills for 32.47 cents per pound, would there be any subsidy at all involved?

Mr. WELTNER. There would be so long as——

Mr. GATHINGS. Who would be paying any subsidy if the mills bought that cotton at that price?

Mr. WELTNER. There would be a subsidy so long as the price that every farmer can get for his cotton through the Commodity Credit Corporation exceeds the market price of the cotton, and that difference is 8½ cents a pound or $42.50 per bale.

Mr. GATHINGS. The Commodity Credit Corporation is not involved in that situation at all.

In addition, the gentleman brought out various other farmers from my State and alleged that they had obtained such a subsidy, as the gentleman says, of 8½ cents a pound which is $42.50 a bale, as though it had gone into export channels, while some two out of every three bales produced in this country go to the domestic mills only.

Mr. WELTNER. I am not quarreling with that at all. When I defined subsidy in my speech as 8½ cents per pound, because of the support of the Government of the price at 8½ cents per pound higher than the world price, it is quite simple to figure. Nowhere did I state that all of this cotton went into the warehouse, nor did I state that all of the cotton received the export subsidy. I defined subsidy as the differential of 8½ cents per pound, which, of course, is the differential in the support price and the world price.

I think it is well that the gentleman raises the issue as to whether this is a subsidy.

Mr. GATHINGS. I do raise that issue. The gentleman says that W. M. Smith & Son of Cross County, Ark., received a subsidy of $58,310 on 1,372 acres of cotton.

Mr. WELTNER. That is figured at $42.50 per bale because of the Government's price-support program.

Mr. GATHINGS. You have alleged and you have explained your attitude with respect to it, but you have alleged that they had received that money. Well, the letter that they send in here disputes that fact. They set out here that in addition to the operation that they themselves are engaged in there are many tenants listed here. Arch Whalley has a 40-acre allotment; Levell Hinton, 35; Dorsey Parker, 25; J. C. Parker, 25; Travis Barnes, 15; Noland Stafford, 25; and many, many tenants are involved there in that operation.

They go on and state just exactly how many bales of cotton went into domestic channels.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me on this occasion.

Mr. WELTNER. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I did not want to inject myself into this discussion because I know there are other people who are more qualified than I to discuss these problems about price support which I have, during my years in Congress, supported as a means of giving the farmer a price for his production which would justify him in the cost of the production of that commodity. I do know that there are a great many misunderstandings and it is difficult for anyone to know the intricacies about this whole program.

The gentleman has made his position very clear. Of course, I think the record does not yet disclose that you do not distinguish the difference between the fact that the subsidy is always a condition we have recognized as the payment for something that is not earned.

The domestic market for cotton is such that there is no subsidy involved. In the world market there is, depending on how you look at the whole thing. But that was not the question I wanted to raise. I did want to get that in the record, however.

I do not think the gentleman intended to reflect on any individual or any farmer, certainly not one of our State institutions, but he included a table which stated the State of Arkansas from the production of cotton at the Arkansas State Penitentiary received a subsidy of $70,890. Of course, the State penitentiary is an institution of the State of Arkansas. I am advised by that institution that they had a cotton crop in 1961, to which the gentleman referred. There were 2,517 bales involved, and their cotton crop was auctioned off in the field to the highest bidder. The cotton price was 105 points over the loan. That is, the Commodity Credit guaranteed a support price, as I understand it, but nevertheless it was more than the loan. The highest bidder was James H. Frost & Co., Pine Bluff, Ark., for a private institution. The entire crop of cotton was auctioned off in the usual traditional American way, and they got a price for it which was paid by the highest bidder. I do not believe the implication that the State penitentiary received a subsidy from the Federal Government is quite correct.

Mr. WELTNER. They received 8.5 cents per pound subsidy for their cotton.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman defines that on the world market price which is only 5 million of the total production of the cotton crop where 8 million of it goes into the domestic market.

Mr. WELTNER. Is it the gentleman's opinion, were there no price support in this country, that cotton would maintain that price?

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think it would. I remember when the cotton price at a certain given time of that year was 20 cents, but the farmers because of the economic conditions sold a large part of that cotton the same year, 1920, at less than 5 cents. So the gentleman's theory of economics, if he is proposing any theory, does not bear out the economic relationship of the farmer and what the Government has tried to do to maintain stability in prices like we have in our commerce and industry. That is controlled, as the gentleman knows, by

production and demand. If the demand goes up, the production goes up.

Mr. WELTNER. That is the point I am making. In the case of cotton there is a guaranteed demand at 32.47 cents, notwithstanding world conditions, notwithstanding anything else. Every producer can take his cotton and receive 32.47 cents.

If the gentleman agrees with me that that price would not obtain without a price support system, he must agree that there is a subsidy from a price support that differs from the world price.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman contend that the minimum wage would be $1.25 if the Congress of the United States did not provide a minimum wage of $1.25?

Mr. WELTNER. No, I do not contend that.

Mr. HARRIS. Are you going to say that the minimum wage of wage earners is a subsidy?

Mr. WELTNER. What I am saying is that wages are maintained by the existence of the Fair Labor Standards Act which requires payment at a certain level.

Mr. HARRIS. So are the agricultural products of the country which come under the price support program which is maintained.

Mr. WELTNER. That is correct. I thank both gentlemen for joining in this debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Under the gentleman's interpretation of subsidy, I would assume that he would say to the extent that the tariff protects the manufacturer of farm implements or other products, for example, to the extent that he is protected and is able to sell his product for a higher price, he would call this protection a subsidy.

Mr. WELTNER. I would call it a subsidy paid by the consumer who is required to pay a higher price because of the tariff law, just as he is required to pay a higher price because of the cotton support program.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman would say that the payment of 8.5 cents a pound on American cotton that is exported is a subsidy paid by the Government, and the support price on cotton that is not exported is paid by the consumer. Is that the gentleman's philosophy?

Mr. WELTNER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman goes into that field, then subsidy covers the whole earth like a blanket—all segments of our economy, industry, agriculture, labor, and so forth.

Mr. WELTNER. I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Texas. I think it is well while we are considering a revision of our cotton program to examine this. I did not make a speech on October 17 to call for an end to all subsidies. I made a speech to show the direction in which this increased cost paid by the consumer is going. I made this speech to show that the small southeastern farmer has a very small part of this $680 million amount that is paid by the consumer.

Mr. MAHON. Would the gentleman agree with this, that as a result of the farm program initiated under Republican and Democratic administrations agriculture has been given a stability and a base which has enabled the farmer to produce with assurance, and under these circumstances and in this atmosphere the American farmer has been able to provide food and fiber at the most phenomenally low rate, relatively speaking, of any place in the world? As to the so-called subsidy, while paid by the consumer, as the gentleman says, the subsidy of maladjustment and other factors might very well make the consumer pay more than if there were not a so-called subsidy as defined by the gentleman.

Mr. WELTNER. I certainly would not contend we should completely eliminate the price-support system. I did not treat it that way in my speech on October 17, and I do not do so today. It seems to me that there is a very sound proposal before the Congress in the Talmadge bill. This involves price supports. No one will deny that. It involves a higher support price than 32.47 cents for the smallest producers, and it involves a much lower support for larger producers, whose need, if any, is far less than the small grower. At the same time, the Talmadge plan would end two-price cotton, and set cotton on the road back to free enterprise.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), from December 2 through December 7, 1963, on account of illness (an operation).

Mr. PEPPER, for Tuesday, December 3, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WELTNER, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. STAEBLER, on Tuesday next, for 1 hour.

Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. STAEBLER) for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. TUPPER), for 1 hour, on Friday, December 6, and for 1 hour on Monday, December 9, and in each case to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include statistics and a table.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. TAFT in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 4, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1405. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1406. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1407. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the proposed move of the Veterans' Administration regional office from Dallas to Waco, Tex.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1096. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8190. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1838. An act for the relief of

Hannah Robbins; with amendment (Rept. No. 942). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1182. A bill for the relief of Willy Sapuschnin; with amendment (Rept. No. 943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1355. A bill for the relief of Stanislawa Ouellette; with amendment (Rept. No. 944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4085. A bill for the relief of Tibor Horcsik; with amendment (Rept. No. 945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4284. A bill for the relief of Chrysanthos Kyriakou; with amendment (Rept. No. 946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5982. A bill for the relief of Peter Palermo; with amendment (Rept. No. 947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6313. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kuryj; with amendment (Rept. No. 948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6591. A bill for the relief of Constantine Theothoropoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 950). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7533. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Dousopoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 212. An act for the relief of Yoo Sei Chun; without amendment (Rept. No. 952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 697. An act for the relief of Misako Moriya; without amendment (Rept. No. 953). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 966. An act for the relief of Yukio Iseri; without amendment (Rept. No. 954). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grün (Susanne Roth); with amendment (Rept. No. 955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1097. An act for the relief of Despina J. Sanios; without amendment (Rept. No. 956). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1272. An act for the relief of Viktor Jaanimets; without amendment (Rept. No. 957). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1479. An act for the relief of Dr. Demetrios Flessas and Dr. Eugenia Flessas; without amendment (Rept. No. 958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1516. An act for the relief of Ana Murgelj; without amendment (Rept. No. 959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1570. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock; without amendment (Rept. No. 960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 57. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9320. A bill relating to the dutiable status of certain articles, including articles containing foreign materials, which come into the United States from its insular possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9321. A bill to insure certain minimum prices to dairy farmers for milk sold to Federal installations located in States in which minimum prices for milk are established pursuant to State authority and not pursuant to a Federal milk marketing order; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 9322. A bill to permit coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 and the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority heretofore retired or hereafter retiring under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 9323. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 9324. A bill to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9325. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 9326. A bill to license and regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9327. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to require that firearms shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce to individuals within the United States must be delivered through local law enforcement officials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 9328. A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 9329. 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. FORD:

H.R. 9330. A bill to permit the State of Michigan to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for State and local policemen and firemen (except those in Wayne County); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9331. A bill to permit the State of Michigan to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for policemen and firemen in Kent and Ottawa Counties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 9332. 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. MONTOYA:

H.R. 9333. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize loans for waste disposal systems and other facilities providing community services, and for additional financial aid; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 9334. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 9335. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Sarpy County, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 9336. A bill to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, to encourage the exportation of cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9337. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that the penalties for homicide prescribed in such title shall apply to any person who kills the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, or the head of any executive department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9338. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9339. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 9340. 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9341. A bill to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.J. Res. 825. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 826. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 827. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial statue to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of American rocketry; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.J. Res. 828. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 829. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 830. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 831. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.J. Res. 832. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.J. Res. 833. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Con. Res. 242. Concurrent resolution fixing the date for the sine die adjournment of the first session of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document in a form suitable for framing of the inaugural address of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; 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. POOL:

H.R. 9342. A bill for the relief of Marie Tippit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 9343. A bill for the relief of Juliana Antonana De Pares; 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:

473. By Mr. HANNA: Petition of the Wilderness Committee of Orange County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

474. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Grant B. Youngs, secretary Plumas Unified School District, Quincy, Calif., relative to Federal in-lieu-of-taxes payments to States for apportionment to counties within the Federal Forest Reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture.

475. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate legislation causing the late, great President John Fitzgerald Kennedy to be forthwith awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

476. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., proposing that the U.S. House of Representatives resolve itself into a special "strange interlude" session for Members to confess openly the number of times they heard U.S. citizens stating words to the effect that they would like to see the late President dead, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1963

(Legislative day of Friday, November 29, 1963)

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

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

O Thou God of all men: Blind and deaf would we be should we bow in this Chamber at our altar of prayer without a sense of solemn gratitude and gladness that while the Nation's losses are grievous, Thou hast given to us so much.

We come in remembrance of lives greatly lived, whose record is our heritage. Be with us in deepened gratitude as we think of those who strove for truth and, when they found it, spoke it; for those who could not see evil without crying out against it; for those who felt in their own hearts the pain of injustice done to others; and for those, no longer here, who condemned oppression, challenged tyranny, and fought for liberty.

In the midst of today's continuing struggle between the true and the false, between love and hate, grant by Thy grace to us whose courses are not yet finished, new fortitude and reinforcement for the times in which we live, until by patience, persistence, and by a daring that turns not back, we become sufficient for the tasks committed to our hands.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 27, and Friday, November 29, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of November 29, 1963, the Secretary of the Senate reported that on November 29, 1963, he had received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 2267. An act to amend Public Law 88-72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

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.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9291) to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that it is my understanding that under the agreement entered into in regard to House bill 8667, authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, the time limitation is to go into effect at 1 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations, and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the quarter ended September 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial report of the United Nations, as of June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE AWARD NOTICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a Nobel peace prize award notice, issued by the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, Oslo, Norway (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the final settlement of claims relating to 10 such claims (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CONCESSIONS CONTRACTS IN HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the concession contract with the Majestic Hotel Co., to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the concession contract with the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., under which the concessioner is authorized to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate sundry letters and telegrams in the nature of petitions, signed by sundry citizens of the United States, relative to the death of the late President John F. Kennedy, which were ordered to lie on the table.

IMPROPER EMPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES—RESOLUTION OF 1963 NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee, a resolution approved at the 1963 national convention of the Military Order of the World Wars. The resolution is entitled "Improper Employment of Armed Forces," and expresses the position of the Military Order of the World Wars against the Gesell report and its implementing order.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROPER EMPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES

(Resolution by the Military Order of the World Wars, 1963 National Convention)

Whereas the Gesell Committee, appointed by the President to investigate the equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro personnel of the armed services, and of their dependents within the United States, has made certain recommendations including:

(a) Steps should be taken to insure that a sense of responsibility for problems of off base discrimination replaces the prevalent notion that matters outside the gate are of no concern to the base commander of military installations.

(b) The commander should develop a plan under which military personnel of all races would be permitted to patronize only those facilities which receive his express approval.

(c) Numerous other recommendations that would involve the intrusion of our military commanders in the economic, social, and political mores of the civilian community; and

Whereas the Secretary of Defense has implemented certain recommendations of the Gesell report and held certain recommendations in abeyance.

Whereas the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has introduced legislation designed to nullify directives already issued by the Secretary of Defense, and to prevent others, which would implement other recommendations of the Gesell report: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the companions of the Military Order of the World Wars, in annual convention at San Antonio, Tex., on October 11, 1963, That we are unalterably opposed to this use of the Armed Forces for a purpose beyond its traditional and natural function of national security; and be it further

Resolved, That this dilution of the effort and work of the military by its use to apply social, economic or political pressure by sanctions or restrictions is a totally unwarranted usurpation of power under our Constitution and savors of the police state, and we urge the Secretary of Defense to rescind his implementing directives of the Gesell report; and be it further

Resolved, That should the Secretary of Defense fail to rescind his directives on a voluntary basis, then this order urges the passage of the legislation proposed by the House of Representatives, designed to restore and maintain the proper function of our military services to prevent further usurpations and to restore the traditional checks and balances in our Government.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

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

S. 2275. A bill to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86-3, for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 675).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of nominations was submitted:

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

Walter F. Edmundson, and sundry other candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2351. A bill for the relief of Bethesda Lutheran Hospital, St. Paul, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2352. A bill relating to sick leave benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police Force, and the White House Police Force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2353. A bill for the relief of Gabriella Quattrochi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2354. A bill for the relief of David Lee Bogue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2355. 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.

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

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK):

S. 2356. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making any charge for certain licenses and permits; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

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

S.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to require that there appear on standard silver dollars hereafter minted a likeness of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO PRINT FOR USE OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CERTAIN INFORMATION ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. McNAMARA submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be

printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works not to exceed two thousand additional copies of the hearings on Water Pollution Control, S. 649, and related bills, by the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution during the current session of Congress.

MINTING OF SILVER DOLLARS BEARING THE LIKENESS OF THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, during the past week, Senators have felt it appropriate to propose legislation designed to memorialize our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. These proposals are entirely fitting and express a genuine desire to pay appropriate tribute to a great man and to fix for posterity a lasting tribute to an outstanding leader.

I have joined as a cosponsor of some of this legislation including the bill sponsored by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to create a Memorial Commission. My thought in this connection is that some central control should be established to assure that the memorials established be comparable to the dignity which John Kennedy brought to the Office of the President.

Today I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which provides that standard silver dollars hereafter bear a likeness on one side of our late President. In my judgment, this could effectively serve as a constant reminder to the citizens of this Nation that President Kennedy stood for fiscal responsibility and proposed programs which would have improved the national economy and provided American taxpayers relief from oppressive tax burdens. I hope that the committee will actively consider and favorably report this bill and that the Memorial Commission, if it is eventually established, will also find it to be a suitable method of honoring President Kennedy.

Mr. President, I ask that this bill may lie on the desk throughout the remainder of this week for the addition of those who may wish to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 2355) to provide that standard silver dollars shall hereafter bear on one side a likeness of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROHIBITION OF IMPOSITION OF CERTAIN FEES AND CHARGES BY THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from imposing fees and charges for obtaining permits or licenses for the construction, installation, or operation of any radio station required by Federal law or regulation of any Government agency, unless such charge or fee is specifically authorized by Federal law other than title V of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act of 1952.

Legislation of this nature is needed because of action recently taken by the FCC in docket No. 14507, which would impose on January 1, 1964, a schedule of fees for the filing of applications for most licenses issued by the Commission.

I do not quarrel with the Commission's general premise that certain recipients of licenses obtain special benefits beyond those which accrue to the general public and should therefore pay a reasonable charge for the special benefits received. However, all recipients of licenses do not fall into that category.

Many persons apply for radio licenses because they are required to do so by Federal law or regulations of another Federal agency. For example, owners and operators of aircraft, both private and commercial, are required by regulations of the Federal Aviation Agency to have two-way radios in their aircraft. The purpose of the FAA regulations is to promote safety.

Certain oceangoing vessels are required by the Communications Act of 1934 to have two-way radios.

Where the use of a radio is required by Federal law or another Federal agency in the interest of safety, I do not believe a fee should be imposed upon the applicant for a license. The achievement of a high degree of safety, such as through the use of a radio on civil aircraft, is of benefit not only to the individual applicant, but also to all other users of the airways and to all people on the ground under the airways and around the airports.

There is absolutely no justification for alleging that these licensees receive special benefits above those received by the general public. An imposition of a fee would be unjust and unsound.

This bill would prohibit the FCC from imposing a fee or charge for obtaining a radio license or permit only in those cases where radios are required by Federal law or regulation of another Federal agency.

To allow the Commission to impose fees in such cases would be unfair to the licensees and would be detrimental to the interests of safety, which other Federal agencies are endeavoring so earnestly to promote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2356) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making any charge for certain licenses and permits, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK), was received, read twice, by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, 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 title IV of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST CERTAIN CHARGES

"SEC. 417. The Commission shall not make any charge for obtaining a permit or license for the construction, installation, or operation of any radio station which is required by Federal law or by regulation of any Government agency, unless such charge is specifically authorized by Federal law other than title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the bill which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has just introduced is, in my opinion, an extremely important one. A situation now exists in which, in many cases, the Federal Communications Commission imposes fees for transmission, whereas the same transmitters have been required by other agencies of the Government, largely for purposes of safety.

It is incomprehensible to me that when one agency requires a transmitter to be incorporated in equipment, another agency should require that a fee be paid for what another Federal agency requires to be installed in the first place.

I hope that the bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma, of which I am happy to be a cosponsor, may be considered at an early date.

DESIGNATION OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AS THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], a joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and I ask unanimous consent that it remain at the desk until Friday, December 6, for the addition of the names of those of my colleagues who may wish to join as cosponsors.

This joint resolution authorizes the redesignation of the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center and authorizes an appropriation of funds by the Congress, which in the aggregate will equal amounts given, bequeathed, or devised to the trustees of the Center from sources other than appropriated Federal funds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed

in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as a mark of respect and affection for President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as a recognition of his abiding desire to promote and encourage the arts in America, and as a commemoration of his great services to the Nation and people of the United States, the National Cultural Center provided for by the Act of September 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1698, as amended, shall be known hereafter as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, for payment to the trustees of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center for use in accordance with section 5 of the Act of September 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1699, amounts which in the aggregate will equal amounts given, bequeathed, or devised to said trustees pursuant to said section. When so specified in the pertinent appropriation act, amounts appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available without fiscal year limitation.

TAX RELIEF INCENTIVE TO INDUSTRY FOR POLLUTION CONTROL—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 336)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to H.R. 8363, the tax bill. The purpose of this amendment is to encourage the construction of industrial waste treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of all expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such equipment in any one of 5 years after purchase. The amendment is cosponsored by Senators BARTLETT, BAYH, BIBLE, BOGGS, BREWSTER, CANNON, DODD, FONG, GRUENING, HART, HUMPHREY, INOUYE, KUCHEL, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCINTYRE, MILLER, MOSS, MUSKIE, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PELL, RANDOLPH, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Mr. President, the Senate this year has passed two bills greatly strengthening the Nation's air and water pollution control laws. The attack on both these dangers must go forward. But, I learned as a Governor and again as head of the Federal agency administering these programs that solving problems of this sort requires not only a constructive program of governmental assistance but also the active cooperation of those in the local communities upon whose efforts real progress ultimately depends.

If we are to clean up our air and our water, a large part of the job must be done by private industry at the local level. But we cannot simply point the finger at private industry and say, "You are causing some of the pollution—do something about it." We must frankly recognize that the purchase and installation of equipment to control pollution is a big expense. And unlike many capital outlays that ultimately produce new profits, these costs basically serve the health and safety of the public. Therefore, there must be some public sharing with private industry of the economic impact of these expenditures.

Under existing Federal tax laws, expenditures for treatment works to control water and air pollution must be capitalized and the cost deducted as depreciation over the useful life of the machinery or equipment. This requirement fails to recognize that pollution control equipment, unlike most industrial plant and machinery, does not contribute to the revenue producing capacity of the business. And present tax law provides no incentive to industrial polluters to install needed treatment facilities.

The form of tax relief proposed today has been recommended by the 1960 National Conference on Water Pollution, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board. The official policy statement of the National Association of Manufacturers "urges provision for sufficient income tax deductions to offset the cost of such nonrevenue producing facilities within a 5-year period, if desired, rather than over the useful life of the facilities." Just recently my proposal was indorsed by the Manufacturing Chemists Association and earlier in the year by a representative of the National Canners Association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the text and an analysis of the amendment and that the amendment remain at the desk for the balance of the week in order that other Senators who wish to cosponsor it may do so.

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

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

At the proper place in title II of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. . TREATMENT WORKS TO CONTROL WATER AND AIR POLLUTION.

"(a) DEDUCTION OF EXPENDITURES.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 183. EXPENDITURES FOR TREATMENT WORKS TO CONTROL WATER AND AIR POLLUTION.

"'(a) TREATMENT AS EXPENSES.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—A taxpayer may elect to treat expenditures (or any portion thereof) paid or incurred by him during the taxable year in connection with his trade or business for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of—

"'(A) any certified water pollution control treatment works (as defined in subsection (c)), and

"'(B) any certified air pollution control treatment works (as defined in subsection (d)) as expenses which are not chargeable to capital account. The expenditures so treated shall be allowed as a deduction.

"'(2) DEFERRAL OF YEAR OF DEDUCTION.—A taxpayer who during any taxable year has paid or incurred expenditures to which paragraph (1) applies may elect to treat such expenditures (or any portion thereof) as having been paid or incurred in any of the four taxable years following the taxable year in which such expenses are paid or incurred, to the extent such expenditures are not treated as having been paid or incurred in any prior taxable year.

"'(b) ELECTIONS.—

"'(1) TIME.—The election provided by subsection (a)(1) shall be made not later than the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for the taxable year in which the expenditures are paid or incurred. The election provided by subsection (a)(2) shall be made not later than the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for the taxable year in which the expenditures (or portion thereof) are treated as having been paid or incurred.

"'(2) MANNER; REVOCATION.—The elections provided by subsections (a) (1) and (2)—

"'(A) shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations; and

"'(B) may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate.

"'(3) CERTIFICATES REQUIRED.—No election may be made under subsection (a) with respect to any expenditures unless the certificates required under subsection (c)(1) or (d)(1), as the case may be, have been issued with respect to the certified water pollution control treatment works or the certified air pollution control treatment works for which such expenditures were paid or incurred.

"'(c) CERTIFIED WATER POLLUTION CONTROL TREATMENT WORKS.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term "certified water pollution control treatment works" means so much of any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, used to control water pollution by removing, altering, or disposing of wastes from any type of manufacturing or mining process, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances—

"'(A) the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of which is completed after December 31, 1963;

"'(B) which the State certifying authority has certified to the Federal certifying authority as having been constructed, erected, installed, or acquired in conformity with the State program or requirements for control of water pollution; and

"'(C) which the Federal certifying authority has certified to the Secretary or his delegate as beneficial to the control of water pollution and in furtherance of the general policy of the United States for cooperation with the States in the prevention and abatement of water pollution under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.). No person shall be required in order to obtain certification from the State certifying authority or the Federal certifying authority with respect to any expenditures to divulge trade secrets or secret processes and all information reported shall be confidential.

"'(2) STATE CERTIFYING AUTHORITY.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "State certifying authority" means the State water pollution control agency as defined in section 11(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

"'(3) FEDERAL CERTIFYING AUTHORITY.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "Federal certifying authority" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"'(4) STATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"'(d) CERTIFIED AIR POLLUTION CONTROL TREATMENT WORKS.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term "certified air pollution control treatment works" means so much of any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, used to control atmospheric pollution or contamination by removing, altering, or disposing of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants from any type of manufacturing or mining process—

"'(A) the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of which is completed after December 31, 1963;

"'(B) which the State certifying authority has certified to the Federal certifying authority as having been constructed, erected, installed, or acquired in conformity with the State program or requirements for control of atmospheric pollution or contamination; and

"'(C) which the Federal certifying authority has certified to the Secretary or his delegate beneficial to the control of atmospheric pollution or contamination and in furtherance of the general policy of the United States for cooperation with the States in the prevention and abatement of atmospheric pollution and contamination under the Act of July 14, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857 et seq.). No person shall be required in order to obtain certification from the State certifying authority or the Federal certifying authority with respect to any expenditures to divulge trade secrets or secret processes and all information reported shall be confidential.

"'(2) STATE CERTIFYING AUTHORITY.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "State certifying authority" means the State air pollution control agency as defined in section 6(a) of the Act of July 14, 1955 (42 U.S.C. 1857e).

"'(3) FEDERAL CERTIFYING AUTHORITY.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "Federal certifying authority" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"'(4) STATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"'(e) LIMITATIONS.—

"'(1) PROFIT-MAKING TREATMENT WORKS.—If it can reasonably be expected that the taxpayer will derive a profit from the operation of any certified water pollution control treatment works or certified air pollution control treatment works, through the recovery and profitable utilization of wastes, or otherwise, the expenditures with respect to such treatment works which would otherwise be taken into account for purposes of subsection (a) shall be reduced by the amount of such expenditures—

"'(A) which are attributable primarily to the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, used in such profit-making operation; and

"'(B) which would not have been paid or incurred but for such profit-making operation.

"'(2) ADJUSTMENT FOR PRIOR DEPRECIATION DEDUCTION.—If—

"'(A) the taxpayer elects under subsection (a)(2) to treat any expenditures to which subsection (a)(1) applies as having been paid or incurred in any taxable year following the taxable year in which such expenditures are paid or incurred, and

"'(B) any deduction has been allowed under section 167 (relating to depreciation) with respect to the certified water pollution control treatment works or air pollution control treatment works for which such expenditures were paid or incurred,

the amount otherwise allowable as a deduction under subsection (a)(1) for the expenditures so treated shall be properly reduced in such manner and to such extent as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations.'

"(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following item:

"'Sec. 183. Expenditures for treatment works to control water and air pollution.'

"(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 263 (a)(1) (relating to disallowance of deductions for capital expenditures) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'or' at the end of subparagraph (D);

"(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof ', or'; and

"(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"'(F) expenditures for certified water pollution control treatments works and certified air pollution control treatment works deductible under section 183.'

"(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963."

The analysis presented by Mr. RIBICOFF is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF AMENDMENT TO ENCOURAGE THE CONSTRUCTION OF INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT WORKS TO CONTROL WATER AND AIR POLLUTION

This amendment affords income tax relief to individuals, corporations, etc., undertaking to construct industrial waste treatment works by permitting them to deduct the cost of these facilities as ordinary and necessary business expenses in computing their income tax and by allowing them to elect to take such deductions either in the year the expenditures were incurred or to defer them over a 5-year period. This permits the entire cost to be deducted in a single year, instead of being capitalized and depreciated over a period of years.

A new section is added to part VI of subchapter B of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations. The new section, to be designated "section 183," permits a taxpayer to elect to treat as deductible expenditures (or any portion thereof) paid or incurred by him during the taxable year in connection with his trade or business for the construction, erection, installation or acquisition of any certified water or air pollution control treatment works.

The section further permits a taxpayer who has paid or incurred such expenses to elect to defer such deductions by treating these expenditures (or any portion thereof) as having been paid or incurred in any of the 4 years following the taxable year in which actually paid or incurred.

The section specifies when such election shall be made and in what manner it may be revoked.

Deductibility is conditioned on the construction of such facilities after December 31, 1962, and on the certification of State and Federal authorities that the facilities are in conformity with State and Federal pollution control laws.

The deduction is limited to such portion of the expenditures as is incurred in connection with the construction of treatment facilities from which the taxpayer derives no profit.

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment (No. 337), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8363, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FONG submitted an amendment (No. 338), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8363, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE, OREGON—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 339)

Mr. MORSE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1137) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROTOCOL AMENDING INTERIM CONVENTION ON CONSERVATION OF NORTH PACIFIC FUR SEALS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of the United States has transmitted to the Senate today Executive O, 88th Congress, 1st session, a certified copy of a protocol amending the interim convention on conservation of North Pacific fur seals, signed at Washington on February 9, 1957, which protocol was signed at Washington on October 8, 1963, on behalf of the Governments of Canada, Japan, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the protocol, that the protocol and message from the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol amending the interim convention on conservation of North Pacific fur seals, signed at Washington on February 9, 1957, which protocol was signed at Washington on October 8, 1963, on behalf of the Governments of Canada, Japan, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America.

The provisions of the protocol were initially formulated by the North Pacific Fur Seal Conference held at Tokyo from February 18 through March 1, 1963.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 29, 1963.*

PROTOCOL MODIFYING THE EXTENSION TO THE NETHERLANDS ANTILLES OF THE CONVENTION WITH THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be

removed from Executive P, 88th Congress, 1st session, being a protocol modifying and supplementing the extension to the Netherlands Antilles of the convention between the United States and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes, which was transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States. I also ask unanimous consent that the protocol and message from the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the protocol, signed at The Hague on October 23, 1963, modifying and supplementing the extension to the Netherlands Antilles of the convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the supplementary protocol.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 29, 1963.*

SUPPLEMENTARY CONVENTION WITH SWEDEN RELATING TO THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there was transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States Executive Q, 88th Congress, 1st session, a supplementary convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Sweden relating to income and other taxes signed at Stockholm on October 22, 1963, modifying and supplementing the convention and accompanying protocol for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, signed at Washington on March 23, 1939. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the supplementary convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the supplementary convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Sweden relating to income and other taxes signed at Stockholm on October 22, 1963, modifying and supplementing the convention and accompanying protocol for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, signed at Washington on March 23, 1939.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the supplementary convention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 29, 1963.*

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, TO ELIMINATE PAYMENT OF OVERTIME SERVICES OF CUSTOMS OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2173) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the Act of February 13, 1911, to eliminate those provisions which require payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees, at its next printing.

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

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO REDUCE INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] be included as a cosponsor of amendment No. 329, dealing with income tax credit for higher education costs.

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

AMENDMENT OF CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1961, RELATING TO LOANS TO CERTAIN FARMERS OR RANCHERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of November 14, 1963, the names of Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FONG, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. RANDOLPH were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2307) to amend the emergency loan authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize such loans in areas where credit is not otherwise available because of serious economic conditions for farmers or ranchers, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE on November 14, 1963.

NOTICE OF CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been requested by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], to announce that it has been necessary to cancel the foreclosure hearings scheduled by the subcommittee for December 4 and 5.

In March 1962 the subcommittee undertook a study of VA and FHA foreclosure trends and the housing agencies, as well as the General Accounting Office, were asked to submit reports on a large number of questions pertaining to this subject for further study by the subcommittee. It has been the hope of the subcommittee chairman that hearings could be held on the basis of these reports and the subcommittee study to determine whether legislation or further administrative action by the housing agencies was necessary in this area. Now that it has become necessary to cancel the hearings, the subcommittee chairman hopes to conclude the foreclosure study for the time being by publishing a committee print surrounding this entire subject. It is his further hope that the committee print will be available within the near future.

AMENDMENT OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936 TO ENCOURAGE THE SETTLEMENT OF JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY — NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2222

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, tomorrow morning, December 4, at 10 o'clock a subcommittee of the Commerce Committee will begin hearings on S. 2222. The bill contemplates an amendment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in order to encourage the settlement of jurisdictional disputes in the maritime industry.

The bill was introduced by me as a consequence of two work stoppages that occurred; the first, with reference to the ship *America* and, the second, with reference to the nuclear-powered ship *Savannah*. Both of these ships ply on the high seas. Both of them have been stopped from sailing because of jurisdictional disputes between two or more labor unions.

The bill which will be the subject of hearings by the subcommittee tomorrow, if approved, would provide as follows: There shall be no strike, lock-out, or interruption of work in connection with any dispute within the maritime industry which involves the interpretation or application of an unexpired collective bargaining agreement or agreements or working rules or conditions thereunder

and which involves or affects two or more organizations of employees, or the representatives of such organizations, who have taken opposing positions in such dispute. Any such interunion dispute shall be settled by the procedures indicated in section 1004 or if not so settled then by the procedures specified in section 1005 thereof.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am not acquainted with the proposed legislation. What, specifically, is the purpose of the bill? Is it for the purpose of resolving the difference in jurisdictional strikes?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The sole purpose is to require a settlement by conciliation of disputes between two labor unions but which affect the shipping companies and, primarily, the public. It provides only that when the two unions cannot agree, and there exists a genuine interunion dispute, the ultimate remedy shall be compulsory arbitration.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the cases to which the Senator has referred, was there a dispute between the employees and the employer?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the dispute in which the ship *America* was involved, the operator of the ship was completely innocent. The dispute was between two labor unions. One labor union demanded that the employer dismiss an engineer. The union to which the engineer belonged insisted that there could not be a dismissal under the facts.

It is rather interesting to note that on September 14 this ship was about to leave the port of New York, with 956 passengers on board. They were waiting to sail. The time for departure arrived and went by. Announcement had to be made to the 956 passengers that, because of a dispute between two unions, the ship could not sail. The 956 passengers, although completely embarked in their cabins, had to get off the ship.

My bill declares that when such a situation develops, in which two unions are engaged in an argument and are unable or unwilling to settle their dispute, the operator and the general public shall not be compelled to suffer, but that there must be compulsory arbitration between the two unions.

This is not the arbitration of a dispute between an employer and the union; it is arbitration of a dispute between two unions.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The hearings will begin at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. It is my understanding that the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and the Maritime Commission are not yet prepared to express an opinion on the merits of the bill. It is my sincere hope that the U.S. Government, through the Department of Commerce, the Maritime Administration, and the Department of Labor, will speak up on this subject. My hope is that they will see the injustice of what is happening in work stoppages resulting from jurisdictional disputes between two or more unions and will therefore support the bill which if passed will provide a remedy for the wrong.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that, on November 29, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2267) to amend Public Law 88–72 to increase the authorizations for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 201 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

Statement delivered by him at the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee hearings on the proposed medical care for the aged through social security.

RADIO AND TELEVISION COVERAGE

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I am very proud to note that our Maryland and District of Columbia radio and television stations—shocked and grieved, like the rest of America, by the assassination of President Kennedy on Friday, November 22—immediately rallied from the shock, though not from the grief, to keep every Marylander and District of Columbia resident constantly informed through the awful hours and days of sorrow. I recognize that all normal broadcasting was canceled, so that countless thousands in their homes and offices could be electronically transported to the scenes of the sad but impressive obsequies, and made aware of the fact that, despite the shock, our Government continues strong and uninterrupted. I recognize, too, that nothing was spared in the energy of men, the use of equipment, and the expenditure of huge sums of money by the Maryland and District of Columbia radio and television segment of our private enterprise system to avoid the vacuum that otherwise would have existed in the information and the intelligence of the people of America and those of the world. This was surely the broadcast industry's finest hour and a most impressive demonstration of the power for the best in public service that resides in the freedom of American enterprise. In this time of grief at our national bereavement, but of pride in our national stability, it is laudable that the industry has pledged itself anew to ever greater efforts to preserve that stability in the free enterprise system and to protect it against bureaucrats who continually harass the industry and often seek to burden and hinder it with the crippling hand of unwarranted and unnecessary control.

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNOR AND COUNCIL OF STATE OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, AND EXPRESSING CONFIDENCE IN THE LEADERSHIP OF OUR NEW PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on November 26, 1963, the Governor and Council of State of the State of North Carolina adopted a resolution praising the character and achievements of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and expressing their confidence in the leadership of our new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

Resolved, That the Governor and council of state do hereby record their grief and deep sorrow at the tragic, untimely death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, and pay tribute to his wise leadership of our Nation during times of great crisis. As he passes, we salute his gallant and courageous spirit. All Americans are indebted to him for his devotion to the cause of peace, and for his efforts to persuade mankind to turn from the path of dictatorship to the ways of democracy and freedom.

And the Governor and council of state do further record their confidence in the leadership of our new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, who, wise and experienced in the ways of government, is already summoning the Nation to go forward under his firm guidance. The initiative taken in this crisis by President Johnson is reassuring to our people and to the people of the world, reminding us that the Government of the United States continues to live and to reign.

It is ordered that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and the President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I rise to offer my tribute to the memory of an outstanding American whose death is mourned by men of good will of all religious persuasions throughout our land and in all countries of the world which value freedom, peace, justice.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver was far more than a leader and driving force of his temple in Cleveland for more than 45 years. He truly belonged to the entire Nation.

Rabbi Silver, of the fifth generation of rabbis, with a son who also is a rabbi, was in the tradition of the Old Testament prophets. His voice sounded strong and clear, with the passion of an Amos, when injustice was being done to Jew or Protestant or Catholic or Muslim.

He was unafraid to speak his mind when duty called. Great orator and scholar that he was, he devoted all his talents in behalf of those who were culturally or economically deprived.

Freedom was his passion and his passion for justice and peace was as well known here in the Nation's Capital as it was to those who needed his help in his childhood home of New York City or in any other part of our Nation.

Many here remember well Rabbi Silver's voice, as he said special prayers at the inauguration of President Eisenhower. Many of us here remember the kindness, the thoughtfulness, the humor, and the gentleness of the man who died on Thursday at four score and ten years.

He belonged to all of us, whatever our political or our religious affiliation. He feared not to stand up and be counted and to speak his mind. So had the admiration and respect of all men who believe in peace, justice, and brotherhood.

Rabbi Silver today is mourned, not alone by us, but by all men who know that the preservation of liberty is a never-ending task.

Our hearts go out to his family and I offer my deepest sympathy to them in their bereavement.

To his congregation, to those all over the world to whom his labors meant so much, his death removes a noble champion and a friend.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE FIFTH CONVENTION OF THE AFL-CIO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the AFL-CIO at its fifth constitutional convention, recently concluded, passed a number of resolutions on foreign policy which deserve the attention and consideration of all Americans. The resolutions deal with the unity and strength of the Western World, the need for peaceful but highly vigilant relations with the Soviet Union, the desirability of firm initiatives on the part of the United States to seek a moratorium and end to the tensions in the Middle East, a strong condemnation of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and support for the Genocide Convention which is one method of reaffirming to the world our dedication to the principles of human dignity and religious freedom.

Mr. President, in my view, these resolutions, concise and meaningful, cut through to the very heart of some of the most basic issues facing the American people in relationships with foreign nations.

Mr. President, I join with the members of the AFL-CIO in the firm conviction "that a united, strong, and prosperous West will be able to attract more and more the developing nations to our side, to extend the frontiers of freedom, to defeat the ambitious imperialist plans of the Communist camp, and to preserve the peace of the world."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of these resolutions.

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

RESOLUTION 202—FOR UNITY AND STRENGTH OF THE WESTERN WORLD

The West has, through unity and strength, succeeded, in the last 15 years, to insure security and a large measure of prosperity for the democracies, to grant increasing help to the developing countries, and to prevent international communism from attaining its goal of world domination.

This unity and strength were achieved through the close cooperation between Europe and the United States which began with the Marshall plan and was followed, a few years later, by NATO. At the same time European integration proceeded with the creation of the Coal and Steel Community, Euratom, and the Common Market. Thus, the road to a fully unified Europe, in firm partnership with the United States, seemed to be open.

However, this hopeful development has, in recent months, been endangered by discord among our European allies, with the result that closer ties between the United States and Europe have been impaired and Western unity and strength weakened. The disarray in the Western Alliance has been brought about largely by the fact that European integration has been halted through the refusal of the European Economic Community to admit Great Britain as a member, by a trend to transform the Common Market into a closed, inward-looking and protectionist organization, and by the determination of the French Government to follow, in many respects, a policy of going it alone.

Allied disunity has manifested itself in disagreement over NATO strategy, especially in the nuclear field; friction over trade between the United States and other European nations; withdrawal of the French fleet from NATO control; divergent views on the war in Vietnam; contradictory trade practices in regard to Communist countries; differences in the United Nations (expenses for U.N. peacekeeping missions), etc.

This turn of events is all the more disturbing, since firm joint efforts by the West are needed to protect the vital interests of the democratic countries, to meet the growing wants of the new nations, to thwart Communist expansionist designs, and to preserve world peace. In spite of the limited test ban treaty, the world has yet to witness any real relaxation of tension and can ill afford bickering, distrust, and dissension among the members of the Atlantic community.

The fifth convention of the AFL-CIO views with concern the present situation in the Atlantic Alliance. We fervently hope that our Government will spare no effort to resolve the present disputes among the allies and to build an evermore effective and powerful Western community.

To that end, the United States should continue to encourage the European nations to widen the Common Market by admitting Great Britain and other democratic countries which might wish to join it, and to develop into a collective political entity. Such a unified, powerful and prosperous Europe would be a truly equal partner of the United States, sharing full responsibility in all questions affecting Western interests. The closest cooperation between the United States and Europe is particularly necessary at a time of negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. All impressions of American-Soviet bilateralism must be avoided. Our European allies should be fully informed and their advice and agreements should be sought. In this connection, our Government did well to offer a unified Europe a greater share of nuclear control in the projected multilateral atomic missile fleet.

It is especially urgent for the United States not to make any unilateral decisions on NATO strategy. American labor reiterates its firm conviction that a strong American military presence in Europe is indispensable to the defense of that continent and to the national security of the United States. Any withdrawal of American forces from Germany is bound to raise doubts about U.S. determination to defend Europe. Such a reduction of our forces would only make Moscow still more reluctant to grant any important concessions and would arouse distrust of our intentions by our allies.

In view of the formidable Soviet military power and the continued Soviet refusal to guarantee the freedom of West Berlin, our armed strength in Germany must always be maintained at an adequate level. At the same time and in a spirit of true partnership, our allies should make a more adequate contribution to the cost of the collective (NATO) defense and in regard to providing more of the urgently needed conventional forces. Only when its defense posture is strong enough, can the West deter Soviet aggression.

In this conviction, we regard closer political cooperation between the United States and its allies. Our Government should energetically strive for a common Western policy on all important aspects of international affairs—toward the Soviet bloc, Communist China, and southeast Asia. New machinery should be set up to provide an institutional framework for full, continuous consultation, and joint decisionmaking.

European-American partnership in political and defense matters also presupposes economic partnership. Without freer trade, the United States cannot fulfill its military commitments and responsibilities towards the poorer people of the world. The AFL-CIO sincerely hopes that next year's trade negotiations under GATT will result in an expanded and freer flow of goods within the free world and, thereby, promote the economic wellbeing of the free peoples.

More coordination is also called for in the endeavors by the free countries to help the emerging nations. Western Europe should assume a fairer and larger share of the aid load. Exchange of information and joint planning by the donor countries are imperative in order to obtain maximum results beneficial to recipient nations.

The AFL-CIO is firmly convinced that a united, strong and prosperous West will be able to attract more and more the developing nations to our side, to extend the frontiers of freedom, to defeat the ambitious imperialist plans of the Communist camp, and to preserve the peace of the world.

RESOLUTION 203—FOR PEACEFUL RELATIONS BETWEEN NATIONS

The Soviet dictatorship—under Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev—has at various times waged campaigns for peaceful coexistence with the non-Communist world. The scale and scope of all these campaigns were determined by the requirements of Soviet foreign policy and by the tactics which the Russian Communist Party prescribed, at a particular moment, for promoting the international Communist movement.

Since the close of World War II, a most important development has led Moscow to step up its drive for peaceful coexistence. Through the revolution in technology, an arsenal of new weapons was developed—intermediate and intercontinental missiles with nuclear warheads. The terrifying destructive capacity of these weapons has aroused the deepest fear of another global war and a worldwide desire for peace. Seeking to exploit this great peace mood in order to advance its aforementioned ends, Moscow has intensified and expanded its peaceful coexistence drive, particularly since 1952.

Regardless of differences among them, all Communists maintain that peaceful coexistence is a form of practical class war. While propagandizing political and economic coexistence between nations with different social systems, the Soviet and other Communist governments have made the waging of ideological warfare a matter of principle to be pursued unrelentingly. Khrushchev

has repeately insisted that peaceful coexistence in the field of ideology is * * * treachery to the cause of the workers and peasants. It is under the flag of waging ideological warfare, while simultaneously propagandizing peaceful coexistence, that Moscow is striving to dominate the world and remold it on the Soviet pattern—by subversion and similar means, if possible, but by force if necessary. While rejecting the notion that war is inevitable, Khrushchev has explicitly stressed the admissibility, nay necessity, of waging wars for liberation or so-called revolutionary wars. In his emphasis, the Soviet dictator presupposes that the Communist Parties will define and decide what is and what is not a war of liberation. Thus, the Communists can wage any war for the overthrow of any government which does not suit or serve Soviet interests.

In this light, it is most significant that during the very years of the Kremlin's intensified campaign for peaceful coexistence, Moscow instigated the wars for liberation in Korea, Laos, and Vietnam; suppressed the revolt in East Germany and the Hungarian democratic revolution; built the wall of shame in Berlin; threatened to rocket-bomb West European nations; and stealthily placed its missiles in Cuba. On the latter occasion, a global atomic holocaust was avoided and world peace preserved only because the United States demonstrated the necessary determination and promptly mobilized superior strength to force Khrushchev to remove the missiles he denied emplacing.

As long as the Soviet rulers outlaw peaceful coexistence in the matter of one's attitude to life—that is, coexistence with what they call bourgeois ideology—grave tension and dangerous conflicts are bound to plague the world. Surely, the leaders of Soviet communism must realize that nations consist of individuals and that they cannot be separated from ideas and ideals of life. Given the present ideological division of the world and Moscow's unalterable basic aim of world domination, the ideological warfare waged by the Kremlin has put insuperable obstacles in the path of peaceful economic and political competition and a genuine contest of ideas to assure friendly relations and world freedom. Under such circumstances, mankind can, at best, have painful and precarious rather than peaceful relations.

The world does not need new blueprints or schemes to live in peace and harmony. If the Soviet Union and the other Communist countries were to join the free nations in faithfully fulfilling the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the U.N. Charter, the entire world would today be free from suspicion, intrigue, subversion and the threat of war. Full Soviet compliance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would provide far better guarantees for the preservation of world peace and the promotion of human freedom than any pact or treaty ever could.

The Western democracies must meet the Soviet peaceful coexistence strategy with measures designed to strengthen their national security and the foundations of freedom, to prevent war and preserve world peace.

Then, toward overcoming the destructive consequences of the ideological warfare which the Soviets insist on waging, our country and its allies should demand that the Communist dictatorships remove the barriers they have set up to prevent their peoples from having a free exchange of opinions with the people of the democratic countries. This inevitable struggle between the Communist and the democratic world can never become exclusively a struggle of ideologies and a peaceful emulation (Khrushchev), unless and until identical rules apply to all its contestants.

In this connection, the proponents of the conflicting ideologies must have equal right of access to the people whom they would convince. It is essential that there be actual compliance with article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which provides that "everyone has the right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." Also, every member state must abide fully by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 13, section 2, which provides that "everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country." Furthermore, our Government should support the idea that every U.N. member state obligate itself to permit and encourage the widest circulation among its people of all reports and documents issued by the United Nations, its special committees, and its specialized agencies. In addition, each member state should permit entry to its territory, encourage, and assist the representatives of the U.N. and of its various specialized agencies in connection with the furtherance of their designated assignments and tasks. With this in mind, each government should permit its own citizens to have full opportunity to acquaint themselves with and render help to the U.N. and its undertakings.

Information centers like USIA should be opened, on a reciprocal basis, in the various member states. All rules and regulations hampering or limiting the free use of these centers by the people at large should be eliminated. Books, periodicals, and newspapers published in the various member states should be freely exchanged by universities, professional bodies, and scientific institutes and also be made available to the people as a whole. An exchange of uncensored broadcasts on world developments should be arranged. All jamming of radio services should be discontinued.

Finally, all nations should pledge to settle their differences and disputes by peaceful means and in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

RESOLUTION 204—THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The fifth convention of the AFL–CIO notes with great interest three important developments in the Middle East. The Nasser dictatorship has stepped up its building of an arsenal with a massive array of offensive weapons. Iraq and Syria have undergone Baathist Party revolutions which have great potential significance for the entire Arab world. The Republic of Israel has come forward with a realistic peace offer.

We can only hope that the governments of the various Arab countries will be guided, above all, by the interests of their people and will, therefore, respond favorably to Premier Eshkol's proposal for (a) compensating Arab refugees for the land they abandoned when they fled from Israel; (b) lifting the travel restrictions on Arabs within the State of Israel; and (c) launching a development program in the Galilee highlands with a view of providing the Arabs living in this region with fertile land.

Peaceful and freedom-loving people everywhere can only welcome unity of the Arab peoples for their common well-being, social progress, and peaceful relations with their neighbors. Attempts by the military dictatorship in any one country, under the flag of so-called Pan-Arabism, to subvert the institutions of other Arab countries, impose on them a foreign regime, or overtly or covertly annex them, are the very opposite of genuine Arab unity, hostile to its underlying principle of free and voluntary cooperation and federation. Such moves by any Middle East military dictatorship can be just as grave a threat to peace and freedom as Arab-Israeli tension and conflict.

The Convention fervently hopes that all governments in the Middle East will focus their thoughts and actions on improving the conditions of life and labor for their own people; will recognize the right of national independence, territorial integrity, and inviolable sovereignty of all their neighboring states; and will rely only on peaceful methods for the solution of any issues or differences between them. All the peoples of the Middle East, Arabs and Israeli alike, would serve their vital national interests most effectively and greatly aid world peace as well as establishing relationships among themselves in accord with President Kennedy's declaration which the U.N. General Assembly enthusiastically welcomed on September 20, 1963: "Chronic disputes which divert precious resources from the needs of the people or drain the energies of both sides, serve the interests of no one—and the badge of responsibility in the modern world is a willingness to seek peaceful solutions."

In this realization, the fifth convention of the AFL–CIO urges that:

1. All nations of the Middle East pledge their adherence to a 3-year moratorium on all border strife and transgressions.

2. This 3-year period of freedom from belligerent attitudes and bellicose actions should be actively utilized for exploring the possibilities of settling through negotiation all outstanding issues and differences dividing the various Arab nations and engendering Arab-Israeli hostility and for developing a program of joint action by all the Middle East nations to overcome illiteracy, illness, and poverty in their midst.

3. Our Government should grant economic or any other aid only to those Middle East countries which pledge themselves to honor such a 3-year moratorium.

4. Our Government should desist from rendering further help to any government which violates the principle of freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal against any nation.

5. In line with the position unanimously adopted by all parties in the Bundestag (June 1963), Federal German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard should act to have effective legal brakes placed on the continued activities of German scientists and technicians in the production of missiles and other weapons of mass destruction for the Nasser government which openly seeks to employ them for the conquest and domination of the other Arab peoples and the annihilation of Israel.

RESOLUTION 205—SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM AND GENOCIDE

Since the destruction of the Nazi dictatorship in Germany, anti-Semitism, as an official state policy, and anti-Semitic propaganda have become more pronounced in the U.S.S.R.

The present Kremlin rulers are blaming the Jewish population of the U.S.S.R. and making them scapegoats for the evil consequences of the regime's unsound economic policies. The Kremlin has singled out Jews for persecution for so-called economic crimes. Thousands of Russian Jews have suffered the severest penal sentences, including, in many instances, the death penalty, for offenses that nowhere in the civilized world would even be considered crimes. Criminal offenses are being fabricated in order to carry out campaigns for absolving the ruling Communist Party clique of blame for their own mistaken policies.

Trials of accused Jews are set up to mislead the public rather than to assure justice. Toward this end Soviet newspapers and broadcasts issue reports designed to whip up anti-Jewish hysteria. The Jewish names of the accused are emphasized. At times, they are accused of having committed their so-called crimes in the local synagogue. Their family ties in Israel and elsewhere are pointed up. The persecution of Jews is employed

to foster the Soviet policy of intensifying hostility against Jews in the Arab world with a view of preventing Arab-Israeli peace.

In addition, the Soviet authorities place Russian Jews under a variety of other disabilities. Far more than other religious communities they are denied the most elementary requirements for practicing their religion. Jewish culture, which was brutally suppressed under Stalin, is being stifled under Khrushchev. The Jewish theater has been suppressed; the teaching of Yiddish and Hebrew to the young stopped; books in Yiddish prohibited, and a systematic program is being carried out to uproot and destroy all aspects of Jewish cultural life. Despite all their talk about liberalization, Khrushchev and his aids are thus persisting in the anti-Semitic practices of the Stalin era and reverting to the notorious anti-Semitic course of their Czarist predecessors: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention of the AFL-CIO, representing free American workingmen and women of all races, creeds, and colors, believing firmly in the application of the principles of the United Nation Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights, in our own Nation and in all others, hereby demands that the Soviet regime cease its persecution and discrimination against the Jewish people in the U.S.S.R.

In this connection, we strongly urge the U.S. Senate to ratify the U.N. Genocide Convention which was unanimously adopted by the United Nations 15 years ago and which has since been ratified by 64 countries.

We further demand an immediate end to the Soviet Communist policy of singling out the Jewish people for special punitive treatment. We demand that the Jewish people be accorded the same conditions and facilities that prevail for other peoples in Soviet Russia with respect to the use of their own language, the practicing of their religion and their national culture.

In line with the traditional humanitarian policy of our country, as demonstrated by President William Howard Taft's cancellation of the U.S. trade treaty with Czarist Russia in protest against its persecution of the Jews, we urge our Government to bring all necessary diplomatic pressure on the Soviet Union and to consider the application of economic sanctions against the U.S.S.R. in order to hasten the end of its anti-Semitic policies and practices.

We call upon our friends and brothers throughout the international labor and democratic movements to join us in raising their voices against Soviet anti-Semitism.

THE REFUGEE ISSUE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, once again the United Nations is considering the issue of the Palestinian refugees. Once again the nations of the world are faced with the need not only to provide for temporary financing, but also to consider the long-range outlook for peace and prosperity in the Middle East.

For 15 years, Mr. President, this issue has been before the United Nations. Yet, with all due respect for those who have worked hard and conscientiously, it is clear that little that is new or really fruitful has been offered in the course of these annual debates, and little that would offer a satisfactory promise of a final solution. In 1948, when the issue was new and when the State of Israel had just come into being, the United Nations called for the repatriation of Arab refugees "wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbors." Yet, Mr. President, from that time forward, despite the insistent pleas of the Arab nations for the repatriation of refugees, every effort has been made to insure that repatriation would be an impossibility from a practical point of view. The Arab States have left no stone unturned to inculcate among these unfortunate refugees a pan-Arab fervor and a hatred of Israel that make it completely impossible for the State of Israel to assimilate these refugees as citizens. It is, in other words, completely impossible for these refugees, steeped in President Nasser's hate propaganda, to "live in peace as loyal citizens of the State of Israel."

Mr. President, from the point of view of reaching a satisfactory solution that will offer the prospect of genuine peace in the Middle East, and not merely provide lipservice to an unworkable compromise, it is time for the United States and for the other free nations of the world to take a long, hard look at the situation in the Middle East. There is only one satisfactory method for nations to resolve outstanding differences—and that is through negotiation. There can also be no doubt that the best atmosphere for fruitful negotiation is one in which border incidents and aggressions are deliberately discouraged by all parties, in which hate propaganda is brought to an end, and in which both parties consider the constructive points to be gained by a realistic process of negotiation.

Mr. President, I am convinced that as long as the United Nations stands by resolutions adopted in 1948—resolutions which have been deliberately interpreted to the advantage of one party and the disadvantage of others, there is little hope that a satisfactory conclusion will ever be found to the tensions which now impede economic development in many parts of the Middle East.

Mr. President, it is disturbing to me that this year, as last year, the United States has taken the lead in compromising the language of the pending United Nations resolution to appease Arab sentiment, without considering or giving adequate attention to the serious problems created for the State of Israel.

Such action can only undermine the confidence of the State of Israel and lead to increasing pressure on the part of Arab nations.

Mr. President, the special Political Committee of the UN has already approved by a vote of 83 to 1 a resolution along the lines of last year's. The 1 vote in opposition by the State of Israel and the 12 abstentions should certainly make it clear to U.S. officials who are responsible for the supposed compromise language that it leans heavily in favor of the Arab States. It is perhaps too late this year for the United States to call for a new look at the entire Middle Eastern situation. But there is time for the U.S. Government to review again over the coming year the facts of the situation and the physical impossibility for Israel to accept thousands of hostile refugees within its confines. Before another session of the General Assembly comes around, I sincerely hope that our Government will be in a position to take a fresh look at the problem and come up with a more constructive, more objective and more sensible approach than has unfortunately been the case to date.

LOVE FOR OUR FELLOW MAN

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "The Missing World," written by David Lawrence, editor of the U.S. News & World Report, appeared in the December 9, 1963, issue of the U.S. News & World Report.

Mr. Lawrence comments on President Johnson's recent plea for "tolerance" and "mutual understanding" among our people, and he adds to that plea the necessity of love for our fellow man. It is through love for our fellow man and our enemies that we will understand others, and it is through understanding that we can have tolerance. Tolerance will help resolve disputes between individuals and economic or social groups and will permit the self-examination and simple honesty needed on both sides so desparately.

It is fitting at this time that this plea be sounded throughout the Nation and the world. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MISSING WORD

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson, in his address to Congress, spoke eloquently of the need for a "new fellowship." He assured the whole world that America would continue to seek the advancement of human welfare and the maintenance of peace for mankind. As for domestic affairs, the President pleaded for an end of the mood of bitter controversy through which America has been passing. He uttered these words of advice:

"The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and to respect one another. So let us put an end to the teaching and the 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."

But to what mood shall we turn—to an attitude of passivity and indifference as injustices go uncorrected? After we have stopped denouncing as fanatics those persons who disagree with our views, how shall we proceed to bring about "the tolerance" and "mutual understanding" of which the President spoke so feelingly?

Plainly there is one word missing. It is a word often ignored. It is a word that presents not only the alternative to hate but points the way through which bitterness can be removed from human hearts. The word is "love." Its meaning is set forth in the Sermon on the Mount as follows:

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shall love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy.

"But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you."

This passage doesn't mean that your opponent is necessarily right and that you are wrong. It doesn't mean that one must abandon a justifiable viewpoint and adopt

that of an adversary. It does suggest that reason must be substituted for anger. How can we begin to come to an understanding with those who are lined up on the other side of a controversy? Certainly not by calling names or by attributing reprehensible motives to people holding opposite views. For this can only widen the cleavage. It does no good to accuse anyone of immaturity or senility just because he does not agree with your philosophy.

How then can disputes be resolved between individuals and between economic or social groups?

Self-examination and simple honesty are needed on both sides. Love includes not only respect and understanding but also a willingness to listen to or read what others may be saying. President Johnson called for "tolerance" and "mutual understanding."

Too often the outbursts of anger that we note in modern life are the result of superficial or inadequate study of the basic issues that divide us. Too often we assume toward one another an arbitrariness which insists that there is only one side and that the other side must be rejected out of hand. But have we examined thoroughly the facts behind the differences that arise among us?

Do we seek to understand the human motivations which tell us that coercion, even by law, cannot by itself win the hearts of those who dissent? Can we produce tranquillity by a process of enforced conformity which has failed to take into account the many causes of individual friction? Do we cure hate merely by imprisoning those who have become embittered?

Jesus gave us the eternal advice which man has again and again disregarded. To love your enemy means to try at least to understand him. To do good to your opponents and to pray for those who despitefully use you and persecute you is to invoke the true spirit of conciliation.

We now are in the midst of a period of mourning for the President of the United States who was slain by a madman. It seems illogical to accuse the whole community of guilt or to point the finger of blame at this or that faction or ideological group among us or at the teachers or preachers of contentious doctrines here and abroad.

Society is, of course, always to blame for any failure to restrain dangerous persons who may resort to acts of violence. But it is an oversimplification to say that a deranged man—who sought vengeance for personal grievances and grudges—was incited to crime just because an atmosphere of bitterness happened coincidentally to surround the public controversies of the day.

Controversy itself can, through healthy discussion, advance rather than retard human progress. For the best solutions to our problems can come when there is full debate by the people, instead of the suppression practiced under totalitarian systems of government.

We have the God-given opportunity to love one another, which means to help one another. We can help one another by trying to understand one another.

We cannot abolish hate by edict. We can overcome its evil expression only by learning the meaning of the missing word: Love.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, in these still sorrowful days following the tragic murder of President Kennedy, much of the world is looking back into the past to find out what kind of man Lyndon B. Johnson is and what kind of President he will be. To the readers of the Anderson Independent in Anderson, S.C., this will not be a difficult task because this newspaper has been most competent in its endeavor to keep readers fully informed on the former Vice President and Senator. The transition of readers in Anderson to a full understanding of our new President will be less difficult than for some citizens in other communities.

In this connection, I bring to the attention of the Senate an outstanding editorial on President Lyndon Johnson entitled "President Lyndon Johnson: God Blessed United States With Leadership." I commend this editorial to every member of the Senate and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT LYNDON JOHNSON: GOD BLESSED UNITED STATES WITH LEADERSHIP

On the morning of May 18, 1961, the Independent published an editorial headed "Lyndon Johnson: We Are Fortunate to Have Him as Our Vice President." We concluded with this statement:

"If Providence should strike down President Kennedy, he would be our next head of state. We should thank our stars that we have such an astute, patriotic, aggressive, determined man as Lyndon Johnson in the position of undoubted power and prestige he holds today."

Prophetic? Not necessarily so. Reassuring when such a man was only a heartbeat from the presidency? Certainly.

Men of good will throughout the world pray today for him as he assumes the almost superhuman task as President of the United States.

One of the most important and consoling of facts is that the late President John F. Kennedy—perhaps with prophetic vision of his own—took Lyndon Johnson fully into his confidence on all major issues and dangers confronting this Nation.

Thus President Johnson assumes the office with full knowledge of these issues and dangers, and with the stated determination to carry on unbroken the aims and the hopes of John F. Kennedy.

These aims and hopes are carefully mapped plans for a better nation, a more peaceful world, and determination that the United States of America shall continue to exercise the world leadership it holds.

Background of the two men was drastically different. The one, President Kennedy, was born into a world of luxury. The new President began his career in Texas as a boy shining shoes.

Yet because this is America, because both believed in the American dream, because both were endowed with intellectual and dynamic strength, they became at the same time the only U.S. leaders elected by the vote of the whole Nation.

Some months ago in an interview Lyndon Johnson, speaking as Vice President, had this to say:

"President Kennedy and members of his staff and his Cabinet have given me every opportunity to be aware of all the important decisions that have been made and to participate in them and to make any recommendations I care to make.

"And I have been a party to those decisions—some important ones—the deliberations in connection with the invasion of Cuba and again last October when we had the missile crisis in Cuba.

"We had some 35 National Security Council meetings, meetings of the Executive Council of the Security Committee, of which I was a member. And I participated in all but one of those meetings.

"My recommendations were asked and received, considered. And in both instances, I was a party to both decisions. Although I want to make it abundantly clear that the responsibility is with the President and the President made the decision and accepted responsibility for it."

That crisis and its problems were but one of the many when Lyndon Johnson sat by President Kennedy's side and was consulted and fully informed.

Such procedure was a far cry from the time when the Vice-Presidency was looked upon as a dead end road where his only duties were to preside over the Senate. Americans may thank Almighty God for the wisdom and foresight of the late President Kennedy in taking his Vice President into full confidence.

Thousands of Anderson area residents recall Lyndon Johnson, campaigning here for the Democratic ticket in 1960. He spoke at the Anderson Fairgrounds and we said that those who heard him "will never forget the man and his message." (Anderson County and the Third Congressional District went overwhelmingly for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket.)

We described him as "an intellectual man, a natural leader, a man well schooled in practical politics and statesmanship. He has a down-to-earth touch, and yet he moves among the mightiest with complete ease and assurance. What is more, they listen to him and believe him."

Even then we saw him as a "world leader who is more and more capturing the attention and respect of all nations" which he has proven time and again since.

What is the philosophy of President Johnson? Here it is in his own words:

"I believe every American has something to say and, under our system, a right to an audience.

"I believe there is always a national answer to every national problem. Believing this, I do not think there are necessarily two side to every question. However, sometimes * * * often * * * there is a right side and a wrong side.

"I believe achievement of the full potential of our natural resources, physical and human, is the highest purpose of governmental policies next to the protection of those rights we hold inalienable.

"I believe waste is the continuing enemy of our civilization. I believe that the prevention of waste * * * waste of resources, of human lives, and opportunity * * * is the most dynamic of the responsibilities of our Government."

Yet, as the Independent commented more than 2 years ago, "he is not an ivory tower philosopher, an idle dreamer, a visionary without the power and energy to turn dreams into reality."

A measure of the new President, heartening to the Nation in estimating his stature, is to be found in the first simple statement he made upon taking the oath of office:

"I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask for your help, and God's."

The Nation knows that with President Johnson doing his best there is nothing to fear, that the country will go forward, and the world leadership will remain firmly in the grasp of the United States of America.

As the new President assumes his burdens, we extend to him the heartfelt and prayerful hope that a nation united by tragedy and realization of his problems will uphold his arms and give him new strength in the crucial months and years ahead. (The Harris nationwide poll will disclose tomorrow that 70 percent of the people of the United States feel that Lyndon Johnson will make an excellent President.)

The Independent is confident that the new President will have the full support of the people of South Carolina.

SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, today we received notice that the first contingent of 1,000 American troops is about to be withdrawn from South Vietnam. The withdrawal will still leave a great number of American technicians and trainees working over there in an effort to fight communism, which is attacking throughout that whole area.

The south Asian situation has been growing increasingly difficult over the past 3 or 4 years. It was hoped, at least by many in the State Department and the CIA, that the coup which recently took place would substantially increase the effort to counteract the Communists in South Vietnam.

Recently, an article entitled "Vietnam Coup Has Its Price," written by Marguerite Higgins and published in the Evening Star commented on what is happening in the war in South Vietnam since the coup has taken place.

I believe Marguerite Higgins is well known to all Senators. Not only is Marguerite Higgins well qualified on the subject but also the article itself casts some doubt on the speed of the success of our efforts in South Vietnam.

The article should be of interest to all Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM COUP HAS ITS PRICE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

SAIGON.—President Johnson has inherited Vietnam's problems at a time when the situation is likely to get worse—in terms of battles and terroristic attacks—before it gets better.

There already has been a setback in the war against Communist Vietcong since the coup d'etat occurred November 1. But this was predictable.

Those Americans who felt that the coup d'etat was in the interests of the United States were fully warned that a price would have to be paid for getting rid of President Ngo Dinh Diem and his brother, adviser, Ngo Dinh Nhu.

For example, it is impossible to replace nearly 40 province chiefs who are the backbone of the war effort without creating uncertainty and a hiatus in authority that amounts to an invitation to the Communists to increase their pressure.

MORE TERRORISM

The price paid for the coup d'etat included a sharp rise in terroristic bombing attacks in Saigon. President Diem's police and special forces may have been guilty of brutality, but they did manage to reduce terrorism inside Saigon to almost nothing.

In the crucial and rich Mekong River delta area, there have also been important losses of real estate. On a visit to the 21st Division area near Mytho in August of this year, I was able to drive in a single unarmed jeep through a large strategic hamlet complex of which Maj. Olen O'Connor, the sector adviser, was very proud. The area had been virtually immune to Vietcong harassment for the entire year.

But in revisiting the area this month, Maj. O'Connor said the entire hamlet had been completely infiltrated by the Vietcong in operations begun November 3, two days after the coup d'etat.

GAINS TEMPORARY

These gains, hopefully, are temporary and will be reversed when the new military junta has a chance to put its mind back on the war.

Despite the sadness of any setback, the stepped-up tempo of the Vietcong could be of use if it dispelled the myth that dancing in the streets of Saigon and the popularity of the military junta would work some magic on the war. This is misleading nonsense.

If popularity or democracy really were the best weapon against communism, Czechoslovakia's Jan Masaryk would not be dead today and Czechoslovakia would not be Communist. Czechoslovakia's democratic ways could not save it from the Communist coup d'etat of 1948.

In talking of popularity in Vietnam, the question must be asked, "Popularity with whom?"

CRITICAL INTELLECTUALS

The military junta's popularity is with the citified, educated students, particularly those of Saigon and Hue. But these intellectuals form a small percent of the population in the city which in turn represents less than 10 percent of Vietnam's largely peasant population of 14 million.

Further, the intellectuals of Vietnam always have been undisciplined, driven by factionalism and jealousies and convinced that constant criticism is a mark of intelligence.

In six different trips to Vietnam this reporter has found students and intellectuals markedly uninterested in fighting or winning the war against the Communist Vietcong—if it means a contribution from them.

Now, many students are hailing the death of Mr. Diem, in contrast to peasants who take a wait-and-see attitude. And none of the students showed any change in their aversion to help the war effort.

COURTS DANGER

In its earnest efforts to be "liberal" and please the Americans with its democratic image, the military junta has begun to court the same danger of "mobocracy" that brought on a crisis in such Asian countries as Korea.

Just last week in Hue, 10,000 students demonstrated to demand the firing of teachers who had failed to denounce Mr. Diem vigorously enough to suit them. There have been similar demonstrations in Saigon and the provinces.

This Asia version of on-to-the-guillotine has been encouraged by the excesses of the Saigon press.

Even the most anti-Diem Vietnamese of them all, the Buddhist leader, Thich Tri Quang, a militant one-time member of the Communists Vietminh liberation movement, complained about the Saigon press over an interview which quoted him, but which he said he had never given.

The targets of some of the Saigon press smear campaigns include Gen. Paul Harkins, head of the American military mission.

The Saigon press, even at one point, set up a cry for the blood of President Diem's 94-year-old mother.

HANDICAPS GENERALS

Under pressure of this extremism, the military junta has arrested many persons without confronting them with any legal charges and merely on the suspicion of having been "excessively loyal."

These pressures from the mob, and the Vietnam press, are clearly handicapping the generals from getting their minds off the political aftermath of the coup and back on to the war.

Said a British official currently in Vietnam, who was instrumental in winning the anti-Communist guerrilla war in Malaya:

"A certain degree of authoritarianism is necessary to win this type of war. When I see what license and scurrility result from the so-called new freedoms here, I think people—and press—of Vietnam need discipline far more than the people of Malaya."

FINANCIAL HOLDINGS AND HISTORY OF FINANCIAL DEALINGS OF SENATOR PROXMIRE, OF WISCONSIN, SINCE AUGUST 1957

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit, for the RECORD, my financial holdings and the history of my financial dealings since I was elected to the Senate in August 1957.

When I was first elected to the U.S. Senate, my principal financial interest consisted of ownership of my home in Madison, Wis., one automobile, two small checking accounts and one savings and loan account. In addition, I was the 50-percent stockholder in the Artcraft Press Co. of Waterloo, Wis.

Because I was appointed to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Senate, I sold my equity interest in the Artcraft Press Co. to Harry Mikalson, of Lake Mills, Wis., who had owned the other 50-percent interest in the firm. I made this sale a few weeks after my 1957 election. Mikalson in turn financed his purchase through a note to be liquidated over a period of years with my father, the late Dr. Thodore S. Proxmire. That note has been steadily reduced. The little that remains of the note is still in the undistributed portion of my father's estate.

When the estate of my father was settled after his death on December 16, 1959, I agreed with my sister—the other principal heir—that she was to receive the holdings in banking stocks of my late father in order to avoid any possible conflict of interest on my part that might develop because of my membership on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

I did inherit holdings in a variety of stocks and bonds, the annual income from which has varied between $5,000 and $6,000. Late this year I sold all of the common stocks I owned. Accordingly, my present financial holdings consist exclusively of U.S. Government obligations; bills, notes, and bonds; checking accounts in one Washington and two Madison, Wis., banks; a savings account at the Credit Union National Association in Madison; ownership of my home in Madison, from which I now receive $150 monthly in rental income; ownership of my home in Washington, which I acquired in 1959; the furnishings in the homes in Washington and Madison; and ownership of one 1962 automobile.

In addition, I have trust custody over a small savings account for my daughter, Elsie, and my son, Ted, and over 11 shares of stock in the Milwaukee Braves baseball team for my son, Ted.

I owe mortgages to the Credit Union National Association in Madison on my home in Madison and to the Perpetual

Building Association of Washington, D.C., on my home in Washington.

To the best of my knowledge, this is an accurate record of my financial holdings and obligations:

Stockholdings inherited and sold by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE *by October 1963 or earlier*

Description	Shares
General Motors	70
American Cyanamid	50
Monsanto Chemical Corp	54
Union Carbide Corp	23
National Lead Co	20
American Can Co	50
American Home Products Corp	75
Merck and Co	25
Parke, Davis & Co. (purchased by WILLIAM PROXMIRE; later sold)	100
Pfizer, Chas. & Co	98
General Electric Co	25
International Telephone & Telegraph Co	50
Corn Products Co	200
Industrial Ceramics	135
General Foods Corp	50
Continental Casualty Co	63
Aluminum Co. of America	25
Anaconda Co	50
Union Bag-Camp Paper Co	50
Phillips Petroleum Co	50
Royal Dutch Petroleum Co	56
Sinclair Oil Co	50
Standard Oil Co., New Jersey	40
Armco Steel Corp	50
United States Steel Corp	50
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	25
Central & Southwest Corp	100
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York	108
Southern Co	50
Southern California Edison Co	114

THE GENOCIDE TREATY SHOULD BE RATIFIED NOW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee has had before it for a long time the Genocide Treaty. For some 10 or 12 years it has been pending before that committee. Three administrations have asked for its passage. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of Senators would approve it.

The treaty is certainly in the interest of humanity. It is a treaty which in good conscience it would seem that we should approve almost automatically. The terrible fact is that brutal governments have exterminated millions of people as the Nazis exterminated the Jews in Germany. The formal dedication of this great Nation to stop this genocide by affirming this treaty would advance the cause of humanity throughout the world.

The Washington Post recently published an editorial commenting on the treaty, expressing the fervent hope that it would be brought up and approved in the near future. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, as well as other material explaining the treaty and the reasons why its approval by the Senate is so important and desirable.

There being no objection, the editorial and additional material were 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-statemen, 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.

RESOLUTION 205—SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM AND GENOCIDE

Since the destruction of the Nazi dictatorship in Germany, anti-Semitism, as an official state policy, and anti-Semitic propaganda have become more pronounced in the U.S.S.R.

The present Kremlin rulers are blaming the Jewish population of the U.S.S.R. and making them scapegoats for the evil consequences of the regime's unsound economic policies. The Kremlin has singled out Jews for persecution for so-called economic crimes. Thousands of Russian Jews have suffered the severest penal sentences, including, in many instances, the death penalty, for offenses that nowhere in the civilized world would even be considered crimes. Criminal offenses are being fabricated in order to carry out campaigns for absolving the ruling Communist Party clique of blame for their own mistaken policies.

Trials of accused Jews are set up to mislead the public rather than to assure justice. Toward this end Soviet newspapers and broadcasts issue reports designed to whip up anti-Jewish hysteria. The Jewish names of the accused are emphasized. At times, they are accused of having committed their so-called crimes in the local synagogue. Their family ties in Israel and elsewhere are pointed up. The persecution of Jews is employed to foster the Soviet policy of intensifying hostility against Jews in the Arab world with a view of preventing Arab-Israel peace.

In addition, the Soviet authorities place Russian Jews under a variety of other disabilities. Far more than other religious communities they are denied the most elementary requirements for practicing their religion. Jewish culture, which was brutally suppressed under Stalin, is being stifled under Khrushchev. The Jewish theater has been suppressed; the teaching of Yiddish and Hebrew to the young stopped; books in Yiddish prohibited and a systematic program is being carried out to uproot and destroy all aspects of Jewish cultural life. Despite all their talk about liberalization, Khrushchev and his aids are thus persisting in the anti-Semitic practices of the Stalin era and reverting to the notorious anti-Semitic course of their Czarist predecessors: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention of the AFL–CIO, representing free American working men and women of all races, creeds and colors, believing firmly in the application of the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights, in our own Nation and in all others, hereby demands that the Soviet regime cease its persecution and discrimination against the Jewish people in the U.S.S.R.

In this connection, we strongly urge the U.S. Senate to ratify the U.N. Genocide Convention which was unanimously adopted by the United Nations 15 years ago and which has since been ratified by 64 countries.

We further demand an immediate end to the Soviet Communist policy of singling out the Jewish people for special punitive treatment. We demand that the Jewish people be accorded the same conditions and facilities that prevail for other peoples in Soviet Russia with respect to the use of their own language, the practicing of their religion and their national culture.

In line with the traditional humanitarian policy of our country, as demonstrated by President William Howard Taft's cancellation of the U.S. trade treaty with czarist Russia in protest against its persecution of the Jews, we urge our Government to bring all necessary diplomatic pressure on the Soviet Union and to consider the application of economic sanctions against the U.S.S.R. in order to hasten the end of its anti-Semitic policies and practices.

We call upon our friends and brothers throughout the international labor and democratic movements to join us in raising their voices against Soviet anti-Semitism.

FOR PEACEFUL RELATIONS BETWEEN NATIONS

The Soviet dictatorship—under Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev—has, at various times, waged campaigns for peaceful coexistence with the non-Communist world. The scale and scope of all these campaigns were determined by the requirements of Soviet foreign policy and by the tactics which the Russian Communist Party prescribed, at a particular moment, for promoting the international Communist movement.

Since the close of World War II, a most important development has led Moscow to step up its drive for peaceful coexistence. Through the revolution in technology, an arsenal of new weapons was developed—intermediate and intercontinental missiles with nuclear warheads. The terrifying destructive capacity of these weapons has aroused the deepest fear of another global war and a worldwide desire for peace. Seeking to exploit this great peace mood in order to advance its aforementioned ends, Moscow has intensified and expanded its peaceful coexistence drive—particularly since 1952.

Regardless of differences among them, all Communists maintain that peaceful coexistence is a form of practical class war. While

propagandizing political and economic coexistence between nations with different social systems, the Soviet and other Communist governments have made the waging of ideological warfare a matter of principle to be pursued unrelentingly. Khrushchev has repeatedly insisted that peaceful coexistence in the field of ideology is * * * treachery to the cause of the workers and peasants. It is under the flag of waging ideological warfare, while simultaneously propagandizing peaceful coexistence, that Moscow is striving to dominate the world and remold it in the Soviet pattern—but subversion and similar means, if possible, but by force if necessary. While rejecting the notion that war is inevitable, Khrushchev has explicitly stressed the admissibility, nay necessity, of waging wars for liberation or so-called revolutionary wars. In his emphasis, the Soviet dictator presupposes that the Communist Parties will define and decide what is and what is not a war of liberation. Thus, the Communists can wage any war for the overthrow of any government which does not suit or serve Soviet interests.

In this light, it is most significant that during the very years of the Kremlin's intensified campaign for peaceful coexistence, Moscow instigated the wars for liberation in Korea, Laos, and Vietnam; suppressed the revolt in East Germany and the Hungarian democratic revolution; built the wall of shame in Berlin; threatened to rocket-bomb West European nations; and stealthily placed its missiles in Cuba. On the latter occasion, a global atomic holocaust was avoided and world peace preserved only because the United States demonstrated the necessary determination and promptly mobilized superior strength to force Khrushchev to remove the missiles he denied emplacing.

As long as the Soviet rulers outlaw peaceful coexistence in the matter of one's attitude to life—that is, coexistence with what they call bourgeois ideology—grave tension and dangerous conflicts are bound to plague the world. Surely, the leaders of Soviet communism must realize that nations consist of individuals and that they cannot be separated from ideas and ideals of life. Given the present ideological division of the world and Moscow's unalterable basic aim of world domination, the ideological warfare waged by the Kremlin has put insuperable obstacles in the path of peaceful economic and political competition and a genuine contest of ideas to assure friendly relations and world freedom. Under such circumstances, mankind can, at best, have painful and precarious rather than peaceful relations.

The world does not need new blueprints or schemes to live in peace and harmony. If the Soviet Union and the other Communist countries were to join the free nations in faithfully fulfilling the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the U.N. Charter, the entire world would today be free from suspicion, intrigue, subversion and the threat of war. Full Soviet compliance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would provide far better guarantees for the preservation of world peace and the promotion of human freedom than any pact or treaty ever could.

The Western democracies must meet the Soviet peaceful coexistence strategy with measures designed to strengthen their national security and the foundations of freedom, to prevent war and preserve world peace.

Then, toward overcoming the destructive consequences of the ideological warfare which the Soviets insist on waging, our country and its allies should demand that the Communist dictatorships remove the barriers they have set up to prevent their peoples from having a free exchange of opinions with the people of the democratic countries. This inevitable struggle between the Communist and the democratic world can never "become exclusively a struggle of ideologies and a peaceful emulation" (Khrushchev), unless and until identical rules apply to all its contestants.

In this connection, the proponents of the conflicting ideologies must have equal right of access to the people whom they would convince. It is essential that there be actual compliance with article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which provides that "everyone has the right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." Also, every member state must abide fully by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 13, section 2, which provides that "everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country." Furthermore, our Government should support the idea that every U.N. member state obligates itself to permit and encourage the widest circulation among its people of all reports and documents issued by the United Nations, its special committees, and its specialized agencies. In addition, each member state should permit entry to its territory, encourage, and assist the representatives of the U.N. and of its various specialized agencies in connection with the furtherance of their designated assignments and tasks. With this in mind, each government should permit its own citizens to have full opportunity to acquaint themselves with and render help to the U.N. and its undertakings.

Information centers like USIA should be opened, on a reciprocal basis, in the various member states. All rules and regulations hampering or limiting the free use of these centers by the people at large should be eliminated. Books, periodicals, and newspapers published in the various member states should be freely exchanged by universities, professional bodies, and scientific institutes and also be made available to the people as a whole. An exchange of uncensored broadcasts on world developments should be arranged. All jamming of radio services should be discontinued.

Finally, all nations should pledge to settle their differences and disputes by peaceful means and in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The fifth convention of the AFL–CIO notes with great interest three important developments in the Middle East. The Nasser dictatorship has stepped up its building of an arsenal with a massive array of offensive weapons. Iraq and Syria have undergone Baathist Party revolutions which have great potential significance for the entire Arab world. The Republic of Israel has come forward with a realistic peace offer.

We can only hope that the governments of the various Arab countries will be guided, above all, by the interests of their people and will, therefore, respond favorably to Premier Eshkol's proposal for (a) compensating Arab refugees for the land they abandoned when they fled from Israel; (b) lifting the travel restrictions on Arabs within the State of Israel; and (c) launching a development program in the Galilee highlands with a view of providing the Arabs living in this region with fertile land.

Peaceful and freedom-loving people everywhere can only welcome unity of the Arab peoples for their common well-being, social progress, and peaceful relations with their neighbors. Attempts by the military dictatorship in any one country, under the flag of so-called Pan-Arabism, to subvert the institutions of other Arab countries, impose on them a foriegn regime, or overtly or covertly annex them, are the very opposite of genuine Arab unity, hostile to its underlying principle of free and voluntary cooperation and federation. Such moves by any Middle East military dictatorship can be just as grave a threat to peace and freedom as Arab-Israeli tension and conflict.

The convention fervently hopes that all governments in the Middle East will focus their thoughts and actions on improving the conditions of life and labor for their own people; will recognize the right of national independence, territorial integrity, and inviolable sovereignty of all their neighboring states; and will rely only on peaceful methods for the solution of any issues or differences between them. All the peoples of the Middle East, Arabs and Israeli alike, would serve their vital national interests most effectively and greatly aid world peace as well by establishing relationships among themselves in accord with President Kennedy's declaration which the U.N. General Assembly enthusiastically welcomed on September 20, 1963: "Chronic disputes which divert precious resources from the needs of the people or drain the energies of both sides, serve the interests of no one—and the badge of responsibility in the modern world is a willingness to seek peaceful solutions."

In this realization, the fifth convention of the AFL–CIO urges that:

1. All nations of the Middle East pledge their adherence to a 3-year moratorium on all border strife and transgressions.

2. This 3-year period of freedom from belligerent attitudes and bellicose actions should be actively utilized for exploring the possibilities of settling through negotiation all outstanding issues and differences dividing the various Arab nations and engendering Arab-Israel hostility and for developing a program of joint action by all the Middle East nations to overcome illiteracy, illness and poverty in their midst.

3. Our Government should grant economic or any other aid only to those Middle East countries which pledge themselves to honor such a 3-year moratorium.

4. Our Government should desist from rendering further help to any government which violates the principle of freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal against any nation.

5. In line with the position unanimously adopted by all parties in the Bundestag (June 1963), Federal German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard should act to have effective legal brakes placed on the continued activities of German scientists and technicians in the production of missiles and other weapons of mass destruction for the Nasser government which openly seeks to employ them for the conquest and domination of the other Arab peoples and the annihilation of Israel.

FOR UNITY AND STRENGTH OF THE WESTERN WORLD

The West has, through unity and strength, succeeded, in the last 15 years, to insure security and a large measure of prosperity for the democracies, to grant increasing help to the developing countries, and to prevent international communism from attaining its goal of world domination.

This unity and strength were achieved through the close cooperation between Europe and the United States which began with the Marshall plan and was followed, a few years later, by NATO. At the same time European integration proceeded with the creation of the Coal and Steel Community, Euratom, and the Common Market. Thus, the road to a fully unified Europe, in firm partnership with the United States, seemed to be open.

However, this hopeful development has, in recent months, been endangered by discord among our European allies, with the result that closer ties between the United States and Europe have been impaired and Western unity and strength weakened. The disarray in the Western alliance has been brought about largely by the fact that European integration has been halted through

the refusal of the European Economic Community to admit Great Britain as a member, by a trend to transform the Common Market into a closed, inward-looking and protectionist organization, and by the determination of the French Government to follow, in many respects, a policy of going it alone.

Allied disunity has manifested itself in disagreement over NATO strategy, especially in the nuclear field; friction over trade between the United States and other European nations; withdrawal of the French fleet from NATO control; divergent views on the war in Vietnam; contradictory trade practices in regard to Communist countries; differences in the United Nations (expenses for U.N. peacekeeping missions), and so forth.

This turn of events is all the more disturbing, since firm joint efforts by the West are needed to protect the vital interests of the democratic countries, to meet the growing wants of the new nations, to thwart Communist expansionist designs, and to preserve world peace. In spite of the limited test ban treaty, the world has yet to witness any real relaxation of tension and can ill afford bickering, distrust, and dissension among the members of the Atlantic community.

The fifth convention of the AFL–CIO views with concern the present situation in the Atlantic Alliance. We fervently hope that our Government will spare no effort to resolve the present disputes among the Allies and to build an ever more effective and powerful Western community.

To that end, the United States should continue to encourage the European nations to widen the Common Market by admitting Great Britain and other democratic countries which might wish to join it, and to develop Europe into a collective political entity. Such a unified, powerful, and prosperous Europe would be a truly equal partner of the United States, sharing full responsibility in all questions affecting Western interests. The closest cooperation between the United States and Europe is particularly necessary at a time of negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. All impressions of American-Soviet bilateralism must be avoided. Our European allies should be fully informed and their advice and agreement should be sought. In this connection, our Government did well to offer a unified Europe a greater share of nuclear control in the projected multilateral atomic missile fleet.

It is especially urgent for the United States not to make any unilateral decisions on NATO strategy. American labor reiterates its firm conviction that a strong American military presence in Europe is indispensable to the defense of that continent and to the national security of the United States. Any withdrawal of American forces from Germany is bound to raise doubts about U.S. determination to defend Europe. Such a reduction of our forces would only make Moscow still more reluctant to grant any important concessions and would arouse distrust of our intentions by our allies.

In view of the formidable Soviet military power and the continued Soviet refusal to guarantee the freedom of West Berlin, our armed strength in Germany must always be maintained at an adequate level. At the same time and in a spirit of true partnership, our allies should make a more adequate contribution to the cost of the collective (NATO) defense and in regard to providing more of the urgently needed conventional forces. Only when its defense posture is strong enough, can the West deter Soviet aggression.

In this conviction, we urge closer political cooperation between the United States and its allies. Our Government should energetically strive for a common Western policy on all important aspects of international affairs—toward the Soviet bloc, Communist China, and southeast Asia. New machinery should be set up to provide an institutional framework for full, continuous consultation, and joint decisionmaking.

European-American partnership in political and defense matters also presupposes economic partnership. Without freer trade, the United States cannot fulfill its military commitments and responsibilities toward the poorer people of the world. The AFL–CIO sincerely hopes that next year's trade negotiations under GATT will result in an expanded and freer flow of goods within the free world and, thereby, promote the economic well-being of the free peoples.

More coordination is also called for in the endeavors by the free countries to help the emerging nations. Western Europe should assume a fairer and larger share of the aid load. Exchange of information and joint planning by the donor countries are imperative in order to obtain maximum results beneficial to recipient nations.

The AFL–CIO is firmly convinced that a united, strong, and prosperous West will be able to attract more and more the developing nations to our side, to extend the frontiers of freedom, to defeat the ambitious imperialist plans of the Communist camp, and to preserve the peace of the world.

LYNDON JOHNSON'S DEFENSE OF INDIVIDUALISM AND INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the clearest and most persuasive statements that I have ever read in support of individualism and independence was written by our former Senate colleague and leader, and now President, Lyndon Johnson.

President Johnson wrote in the Texas Quarterly in 1958 in protest against the tendency to label public officials as liberal or conservative. Many of the words from that statement have since become famous and will become more so as the Johnson administration progresses.

But, the individualism of our new President's essential spirit of that statement—which is the emphasis on President Johnson's independence of ideology and dogma, his insistence on being free to be himself and not labeled an ideological conservative or a liberal—has not been fully grasped. In my judgment, this lack of dogma or rigid ideology is the real genius of the American political system. Nowhere has it flourished better than in the Senate.

Because of the new significance of this statement I ask unanimous consent that the article by the then Majority Leader, Lyndon Johnson, published in the Texas Quarterly be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOHNSON, IN 1958, SAID THAT OPPOSITION TO LABELING OF AMERICANS WAS THE HEART OF HIS BELIEFS

(In 1958, The Texas Quarterly of the University of Texas published this copyrighted article "My Political Philosophy." by Lyndon B. Johnson, now President of the United States. It has been made available to the New York Times through the cooperation of the Houston Chronicle.)

MY POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

I am a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat, in that order.

I am also a liberal, a conservative, a Texan, a taxpayer, a rancher, a businessman, a consumer, a parent, a voter, and not as young as I used to be nor as old as I expect to be—and I am all these things in no fixed order.

I am unaware of any descriptive word in the second paragraph which qualifies, modifies, amends, or is related by hyphenation to the terms listed in the first paragraph. In consequence, I am not able—nor even the least interested in trying—to define my political philosophy by the choice of a one-word or two-word label. This may be against the tide, but if so, the choice is deliberate.

At the heart of my own beliefs is a rebellion against this very process of classifying, labeling, and filing Americans under headings: regional, economic, occupational, religious, racial, or otherwise. I bridle at the very casualness with which we have come to ask each other, "What is your political philosophy?"

INDIVIDUALITY A CORNERSTONE

I resent the question most often not because I suspect it of guile and cunning, but for its innocence, the innocence that confuses dogma wtih philosophy and presumes that the answer can be given in a word or two. Our political philosophies, I have found, are the sum of our life's experience. God made no man so simple or his life so sterile that such experience can be summarized in an adjective. Yet we seem bent today on reducing every man's philosophy to a mere vital statistic, to the next question asked—of professors, students, public officials, job applicants, business executives, labor leaders, and many more—after age, weight, height, and color of eyes and hair.

Inquiries of men's philosophies do not fit this context.

It is a part of my own philosophy to regard individuality of political philosophy as a cornerstone of American freedom and, more specifically, as a right expressly implied in our Nation's basic law and indispensable to the proper functioning of our system.

NO NATIONAL DOGMA

Our basic law—the Constitution—is distinctive among the basic law of all nations, even the free nations of the West, in that it prescribes no national dogma: economic, social, or religious.

Free enterprise, for example, is not mentioned. Nor are our parties or the party system. Nor is there any provision to require allegiance to any dogma or doctrine.

Yet government is an expression of philosophy, and active governments are inevitably guided by philosophers. As I see it, the mandate of our system—and, perhaps, the ultimate genius of it—is that the American people should be the true philosophers of the American Government within the limits upon governmental powers set by our Constitution.

This is an ennobling concept, yet like many things noble and beautiful, it has certain frailties and we seem quick now to crush it. We crush out the individuality of our political beliefs and, by this process of highspeed sorting and classifying of Americans, automate our choice of courses and sterilize our explorations of the reasons why.

REBELLION NOT PROVINCIAL

Some might suggest that my rebellion against this process is a show of the provincial Texan in me. I would disagree. Texans are independent and individual, but not the monopolists of these virtues that we sometimes suppose ourselves to be. The traits are American in origin and, fortunately for the Republic, are deposited quite widely, not part of certain regional hoards. Thus, I believe it is the American in me—even more than the Texan—that now reacts so strongly against the merging of the individual American into the mass in the name of dogma.

I realize, as I say this, that others might point to the Senate where I serve—and where I am, in fact, a designated leader of the majority party—and suggest that the example there of a two-party, two-philosophy system contradicts or is in conflict with this thesis. The opposite is so. Had I not been privileged to serve in Congress, I might never have come to hold the respect for individuality of philosophy that I do.

The very purpose of Congress, in our governmental form, is to arrive at national decisions by bringing together some 531 individuals, representing 170 million individuals, to achieve a consent on the way the Nation should go. Were we bound by rigid dogmas, whatever their name, there would be no more cause for assembling Congress than for bringing the Soviet Presidium together. We are not so bound, and it is part—a great part—of my own philosophy that the Congress reaches a very dubious decision when its choices are made solely by head counts of the partisan division.

TENETS OF BELIEFS

This leads to a listing of the tenets of my own beliefs, the specific tenets of my own philosophy. I would set them down this way:

First, I believe every American has something to say and, under our system, a right to an audience.

Second, I believe there is always a national answer to each national problem, and, believing this, I do not believe that there are necessarily two sides to every question.

Third, I regard achievement of the full potential of our resources—physical, human, and otherwise—to be the highest purpose of governmental policies next to the protection of those rights we regard as inalienable.

Fourth, I regard waste as the continuing enemy of our society and the prevention of waste—waste of resources, waste of lives, or waste of opportunity—to be the most dynamic of the responsibilities of our Government.

These tenets, I concede, are simple. They are certainly personal. For these are not tenets I have embraced or adopted but rather, beliefs I have—over 50 years—developed and come to follow from my own experience.

MAY SEEM IDEALISTIC

In the instance of the first listed, I realize that—in these times—the notion that each American has something to say and the right to an audience may seem excessively idealistic. I do not believe that is so, either in principle or in practice.

I am reminded always in my work at Washington of my own origins. I was born to the hill country of Texas, a remote region then, still remote today, although less so. My neighbors, friends, and relatives there live independently, self-contained if not self-sufficient.

They are distant from many national issues, yet neither their distance nor their limited information on any given subject makes them any less a party to the national decisions we reach in the Halls of Congress. Knowing the folks at Johnson City and Blanco and Stonewall and Hye as I do, I know that it would be much more difficult for me to secure a unanimous agreement among them than among the Senators in Washington. Yet, in this individuality, my neighbors—or the constituency of all of Texas—are not different from Americans everywhere. There is likely to be merit in the views of the minority, quite as much as there is wisdom in the views of the majority. We have, as I see it, an obligation to seek out that merit, if it is there, and not merely to content ourselves with obliging the majority; for the majority's wisdom—however wise—is never the sum of all wisdom.

What we do, too often now, is oblige our patience with expedients. To grant audiences to 170 million Americans would be exhausting. So we make our divisions, our classifications, and our cross-classifications which permit us to forgo the listening and the searching we ought to do. Trouble compounds when, having made our divisions on one basis, we extend the application to other issues and other decisions. Here we adopt in our American political philosophy the pattern not of philosophy but of cults devoted to dogma, and we construct false equations which produce false answers.

This equation process is much a part of our party systems, and contributes to the myth of the concept that "there are two sides to every question." True, there are two parties. That is not the same as two sides. But, by maintaining the two-side concept, we satisfy our consciences—again as a matter of convenience—that when a partisan majority has prevailed there is no need to examine either the majority's side or the minority's side again. Our reasoning is that, since there are two sides, either side would have been acceptable, and hence the answer decided by political strength does not require closer scrutiny.

I think otherwise. This popular view is, I feel, very much counter to our American philosophy based on the thinking of men like Jefferson and Madison. I do not believe we have arrived at an answer until we have found the national answer, the answer all reasonable men can agree upon, and our work is not done until that answer is found—even if the process requires years of our lives.

ALLOWED FOR GROWTH

Here fits the third tenet of my philosophy—and the fourth. Had America been bound by the Constitutional Convention to the philosophies of the 18th century—and by the limits of the wisdom and vision of those times—we would not have the Nation that is ours today. Our rising greatness through more than 180 years has come from our freedom to apply our accumulating knowledge to the processes of our self-government. Or, to state it another way, this has come because America's course has been left to the living. Thus, the 18th-century philosophy of our Constitution has allowed for growth so that it is still strong, still good for our 20th century.

Our Nation, like all nations, is possessed of certain resources—resources of nature, resources of position, and resources of the human mind. Without conquest or aggrandizement, we cannot add to these basics. Thus whatever we are to be we must build from those things at our disposal, and to content ourselves with less than the ultimate potential is to deny our heritage and our duty.

Obviously, having come from a land like Texas, I feel this strongly. Of all endeavors on which I have worked in public life, I am proudest of the accomplishments in developing the Lower Colorado River during the 1930's and 1940's. It is not the damming of the stream or the harnessing of the floods in which I take pride, but, rather, in the ending of the waste of the region.

OBLIGATION ON GOVERNMENT

The region—so unproductive and insignificant in capacity in my youth—is now a vital part of the national economy and potential. More important, the wastage of human resources in the whole region has been reduced. New horizons have been opened for the fulfillment of young minds, if by nothing more than the advent of electricity into rural homes. Men and women have been released from the waste of drudgery and toil against the unyielding rock of the Texas hills. This is fulfillment of the true responsibility of Government.

Conversely, the elimination of waste of this sort carries with it a continuing obligation for Government—at all levels—not to create waste itself by extracting from the people the fruits of their new opportunities through improvident excesses in spending and taxing. This is an increasingly critical area for American Government, but one to which we sometimes apply false standards.

Government can waste the people's resources by inertia, quite as much as by vigor. Government can, for example, fall into a state of complacency over the relative positions of strength between nations in the world. An international stalemate with communism would, I believe, be the greatest waste of American resources and the resources of freedom, even though stalemate produced no war. A vital government cannot accept stalemate in any area—foreign or domestic. It must seek the national interest solution, vigorously and courageously and confidently.

These tenets are the tenets of my political philosophy.

POSITIONS ON ISSUES

Some who equate personal philosophies with popular dogmas might inquire, endlessly, as to my position on this issue or that issue or some other. Philosophies, as I conceive them at least, are not made of answers to issues, but of approaches more enduring and encompassing than that. By these approaches I have set down, I can seek and, I believe, find answers to the issues of 1958 or 1978, as they arise.

By personal choice, I am a Democrat, for I can in that party best apply and express my beliefs.

As for being anything else, the definitions of what I am will have to be applied by others as they see fit for I make no such distinctions myself.

I am, as I said in the beginning, a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat, in that order, and there, for me, the classifying stops.

RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, a great and revered humanitarian, author, teacher, and internationally respected statesman, passed away on Friday, November 29. Rabbi Silver was for 46 years spiritual leader of Cleveland's The Temple, the largest Reform Jewish congregation in the United States.

The loss of this wise and good man is mourned by people of all faiths, not only in Cleveland where we were privileged to count him among our outstanding citizens, but throughout the country and around the world. Abba Hillel Silver belonged not only to The Temple and to Cleveland, he belonged to the world—and particularly to world Jewry—a world whose tragic dimensions are still incomprehensible two decades after the Nazi genocide. Rabbi Silver was a man of ideals and action, possessing a strong and burning social conscience which lit the hearts and minds of all men.

The descendant of three generations of rabbis, Rabbi Silver was born on January 28, 1893, in Lithuania, and came to New York with his family in 1901. Upon receiving his doctor of divinity degree in 1915—having completed a 9-year course in 4 years—he took up his first ministry in Wheeling, W. Va. He came to the temple in Cleveland 3 days after the close of World War I, at age 24.

During his almost half a century of service in Cleveland, he gave unceasingly of his wisdom, his vision, his conscience and his heart to all people. His interests were legion and his good works

were felt on both the national and international scene.

Rabbi Silver was one of the leaders in founding the State of Israel. As a fervent spokesman for the Zionist cause, he took his case to the leaders of the world. On May 8, 1948, Rabbi Silver pleaded the case for Jewish rights in Palestine before the United Nations General Assembly. One week later the State of Israel was proclaimed. Having seen his dream of a Jewish homeland fulfilled, Rabbi Silver turned quickly to other problems on the international scene. More recently, he devoted much of his efforts toward strengthening the United Nations and firmly chastized those neutralist nations who would seek temporary gain at the expense of the world organization.

The high ideals of this outstanding American also helped produce needed social action in America. Rabbi Silver made the cause of the working men and women his own. Back in 1931 he was appointed chairman of the Ohio Commission on Unemployment Insurance. I was privileged to serve with him on that commission. Under his leadership we wrote the first State unemployment insurance law in the Nation. This served as a model for other States. In addition, Rabbi Silver helped to defeat the open-shop policy in the 1920's and the more recent proposed right-to-work legislation. He was a tower of strength in the drive for social justice.

The recipient of many awards, including the 1958 human relations award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Rabbi Silver was honored by his many friends including our late great President John Kennedy only last year.

Abba Hillel Silver will be missed by all of us. I, personally, was honored to count him as a friend. The day before his death, Rabbi Silver worked on a memorial sermon on the death of our late great President John F. Kennedy. The sermon was never delivered. It was printed, however, in the Cleveland Press on Friday, November 29, 1963. In this, his last message to us, the warmth, the wisdom, and the keen insight of Rabbi Silver are everywhere apparent. I commend this sermon, "The Legacy of a President," to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

THE LEGACY OF A PRESIDENT—RABBI SILVER'S SERMON

I have reflected much these last few days on the nature of the universal sorrow which the whole world manifested at the tragic death of President Kennedy.

It was clearly neither formal nor perfunctory. At home and in faraway lands men mourned for him as for a lost brother, as if he were part of their own personal lives, who shared their innermost hopes, and felt their deepest needs.

People of all ages grieved for him, but especially the young. The personality of President Kennedy appealed especially to the youth of the world.

He was a young President and he spoke to the heart of young America and to all who had the hopeful heart of youth everywhere in the world. He was like a young eagle soaring high.

He did not belong to the category of the "tired old statesmen" who were caught and held fast in their weary routines, dreaming of worlds forever gone, the helpless agents of recurrent world disasters.

He was different. There was dawn in his outlook and spring in his call. His was the torch of a new vision.

TOO MANY OF US HAVE LOST OUR WAY

In his acceptance speech as the Democratic nominee for the Presidency, he declared: "Too many Americans have lost their way, their will, and their sense of historic purposes. It is time for a new generation of leadership—new men to cope with new problems and new opportunities."

And in his inaugural address, less than 3 years ago, he sounded a clarion call:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans."

The new generation responded to his summons and challenge. Here, at last, was their true leader, their eloquent spokesman young in years and young in heart, ready to lead them in a new crusade and by the fire of a new faith build a new Jerusalem.

Where did President Kennedy find the torch which he declared would now be passed to a new generation of Americans, "a generation born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage"?

What was this ancient heritage? It was the heritage of the Founding Fathers and the torch was first kindled by them. To use the words of another martyred President, Abraham Lincoln, President Kennedy "returned to the fountain whose waters spring close by the blood of the Revolution."

He invoked the spirit which grows in the Declaration of Independence and in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States. He called upon his generation time and again as did Lincoln, whose loving and faithful disciple he proved to be, "to come back to the great landmarks of the Declaration of Independence."

APPLIED OLD IDEALS TO OUR NEW AGE

He applied the old ideals of our country to the grave problems and the menacing conditions of our new age, and they became even more luminous and more urgently relevant than when they were first promulgated.

An unbroken chain of fervent human aspirations binds the age of Washington, the age of Lincoln, and the age of Kennedy—the unremitting struggles of men for larger freedom, for their basic human rights, for the dignity of man—"the self-evident truths"—"the unalienable rights."

If you lift up your eyes from the fresh grave where President Kennedy now lies at rest, you will see not far away the stately Lincoln Memorial and beyond that the towering Washington Monument. More than mere optical vision embraces these oldest and newest of our national shrines.

A chord of sacred memory, of bounden faith and promise binds them indissolubly together. They represent our Nation's unbroken covenant which time and again is renewed for us by the blood of our martyrs.

I said a moment ago, that President Kennedy was young and that he appealed to the heart of young America, but he was also wise with the wisdom which men, not altogether wisely, associate with age. He had the ardor and enthusiasm of youth but not its inexperience.

HE HAD VISION AND FACED REALITY

He had vision but he was not a visionary. He was an urbane, thoughtful, cultured, well-informed human being, forceful in action but tactful and moderate in speech and manner.

He faced reality. He understood his world—its dangers, its knotted domestic and international problems, some often almost too difficult to unravel. He understood full well the limitations of his high office and his own personal powers to set all things aright.

He realized too that the powers and resources of our country, great as they were, were not unlimited, and that we could neither dictate to the world nor go it alone.

Absolute sovereignty no longer assures us of absolute security. He understood also the limits of military power. The basic problems facing the world today are not susceptible of a final military solution.

But these inevitable limitations and their attendant frustrations did not cause him to seek refuge in inaction. The wisdom of our sages seems to have guided him. "Thine is not the duty to complete the task but neither art thou free to desist from it."

In a dangerously poised world and with an awesome responsibility resting upon his shoulders, he moved cautiously, but he moved, he acted with deliberateness and circumspection but he acted. He failed—but he tried again. He would not permit himself to be angered, or disheartened, or goaded into quick reprisals but neither was he ever deflected from his main purpose.

HE UNDERSTOOD ART OF COMPROMISE

He understood that the art of government was the art of compromise, but never on principles. He stood immovable as a rock when the basic principles of our Constitution or the basic rights of man were involved.

He was not doctrinaire. He knew how to bend as a tree bends before strong winds, but his roots always remained firmly set in the earth. He profited from his mistakes and those of his predecessors, as he did in the case of the Cuban fiasco early in his administration.

He saw clearly the five besetting dangers of our age. He had been summoned to lead our Nation in an hour of maximum danger, but with open eyes and a stout heart he confronted them.

"However close we sometimes seem to that dark and final abyss, let no man of peace and freedom despair. * * * If we can all persevere, if we can in every land * * * look beyond our own shores and ambitions, then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

He faced the danger of the nuclear age. He, more than any of us, understood, because all sources of information were available to him, what a nuclear war would mean to mankind.

He built up the military strength of our Nation so that it might act as a deterrent to aggression and war. But while so engaged, he explored every avenue to discover some basis of agreement whereby the dangers of a nuclear war might be lessened.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN GREAT ACHIEVEMENT

After many repeated trials and failures, he succeeded in arriving at an agreement with the Soviet Union on a nuclear test ban which banned nuclear tests everywhere except underground. It was an important achievement even though it was not a guarantee against nuclear war.

The next step and the next and the final step still remained; but the first step "back from the shadow of war" had to be taken and he took it.

He was opposed to an arms race with the Soviet Union though in the few brief years in office, he unfortunately could make no headway.

"It is * * * our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race; to advance step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has actually been achieved." He ardently pursued peace. In the speech which

he was to deliver in Dallas the day he was assassinated, he declared:

"Our strength will never be used in pursuit of aggressive ambitions—it will always be used in pursuit of peace. It will never be used to promote provocations—it will always be used to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes."

President Kennedy tried to mitigate the bitterness of the cold war. He did not hate. In this he was far ahead of most of our people in whose midst hate now stalks like a dark apparition, like "a pestilence that walketh in darkness, or a destruction that wasteth at noonday."

URGED BOTH SIDES TO SEEK PEACE

He summed up his attitude in his inaugural address:

"To those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request; that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

"So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

But he would not be imposed upon. When he saw a clear and present danger to the security of America he acted with a firmness and dispatch which astounded the world—as when he forced the Soviet Union to dismantle the long-range missile bases in Cuba.

When he felt that an unfair advantage was being taken of the American people, he again acted with startling forcefulness, as when he compelled the powerful steel companies of the United States to rescind their price increases after he had persuaded American labor to accept lower wage terms in order to avert national inflation.

He was not afraid to incur the momentary displeasure of his own people. He had courage and he admired courage. In his book, "Profiles in Courage," he showed how the courage of certain men in public life served America, even though at times it wrecked their own political careers.

LOOKED DEEPLY INTO HIS SOUL

"In whatever arena of life one may meet the challenge of courage, whatever may be the sacrifices he faces if he follows his conscience—the loss of his friends, his fortune, his contentment, even the esteem of his fellow men—each man must decide for himself the course he will follow."

"The stories of past courage can define that ingredient—they can teach, they can offer hope, they can provide inspiration. But they cannot supply courage itself. For each man must look into his own soul."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy looked deeply into his own soul.

He saw the danger to the free world in the condition of misery, improverishment, and backwardness of the underdeveloped countries of the world. Freedom, he knew, cannot thrive in an explosive resentful world which can find its relief from intolerable economic conditions only in revolution.

And so he developed an extensive program of aid to the depressed areas of the earth. He called into being the Alliance for Progress to help the peoples of Central and South America, to mobilize their own resources and energies to raise the standard of living of their people.

He created the Peace Corps, the most noble and beautiful act of his career. He inspired our youth to go to the far corners of the earth to serve without any expectation of monetary reward in order to bring help, guidance, and healing to the desperately needy of the world.

HE SAW DANGER IN BIGOTRY HERE

He saw the danger to our domestic peace and our free institutions in the indurate, century-old discrimination to which the Negro citizens of our country were being subjected and he acted with energy and courage in the face of violent resistance, calumny and personal abuse.

He was compelled to resort to action which was very distasteful to him when bigotry-blinded State Governors in Mississippi and Alabama defied the authority of the Supreme Court of the United States and by their shameless defiance sparked riots and acts of bombing and murder which shamed America in the eyes of the world.

But he was determined that full justice shall be done to the Negro and that the dark ages of segregation, disfranchisement and discrimination in employment shall end for them. He recommended a comprehensive bill on civil rights to the Congress of the United States. He declared:

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL SEEN AS TRIBUTE

"A rising tide of discontent * * * threatens the public safety * * * the events in Birmingham and elsewhere have so increased the cries for equality that no city or State or legislative body can prudently choose to ignore them.

"The result of continued Federal legislative inaction will continue, if not increase, racial strife—causing the leadership of both sides to pass from the hands of reasonable and responsible men to the purveyors of hate and violence."

The sincerest tribute which the Congress of the United States can pay to the martyred President is to pass the civil rights bill now pending. It will be an everlasting memorial to him, even as the Emancipation Proclamation has been to Abraham Lincoln.

He saw the danger of inadequate education and training for the youth of our Nation for the new world into which they are moving. Our Nation needed more schools, colleges, and teachers. "Nearly half of our high school graduates," he declared, "lack either the funds or the facilities to attend college. The Nation cannot afford to maintain its Military Establishment and neglect its brain power."

He recommended bills to improve educational quality, and at the college level, to provide Federal loans for the construction of academic facilities and federally financed scholarships.

One can readily point to many other notable programs and activities of his Presidency. In all of them, he was whole, entire, of one piece, a dedicated servant of justice, fairness, freedom, and peace. He was not always successful. Success is not always the measure of greatness. He was not always in the right. What leader of men ever is?

LIFE WAS FULL OF NOBLE PURPOSE

Most of his work remains uncompleted, even as his life was uncompleted. At the close of every worthy career, much unfinished business remains. He dealt in national and world issues of such wide dimensions that they could not be settled even in a lifetime much longer than was granted him.

But the value of a masterpiece is not the size of the canvas and the glory of a song is not the length of its stanzas. A small pool of clear water may often reflect all the glories of the heavens.

Here was a life replete with the beauty of noble purposes and aspirations, which set in motion great enterprises rich in promise for our Nation and for the world. Here was the American tradition of malice toward none and charity for all embodied in an intrepid young leader who was tragically brought down in the soaring midflight of his resplendent career.

Here is high sorrow for all of us—but also high hope, hope that his life will inspire other lives—that our people will look to his example, his message, and his mission, and, in a chastened spirit, will forgo the hate which turns brother against brother, and people against people, hope that they will resolutely persevere in the ways of progress and peace.

"Jonathan upon thy high places is slain.
"I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan.
"How are the mighty fallen."

TRIBUTE TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in the last sad days many eulogies have been written and many people have spoken true and deeply deserved words about John Fitzgerald Kennedy. One of the most touching was a letter written by the assistant general manager of radio station WDRC in Hartford, Conn. When it was read over the air, the people of my State responded. Thousands of letters poured into the station, expressing agreement, and requesting a copy. These words are spoken from the heart—the heart of an American, who, as he puts it "will never be President—or even make local office." I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

AN OPEN LETTER

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Please forgive me for not writing sooner. I guess we've both been pretty busy, me running my everyday life, and you being President of the United States. It really was up to me to write first because you've been a lot busier than I have.

What I've wanted to do, though, is to thank you. Thank you for being my idea of what a President of this country should be. Now—don't go getting any ideas that I've always gone along with everything you've said or done. Some things, yes. Some things, no. After all, none of us is perfect. I know I can say this to you because you never got real mad and held a grudge about things like that. I guess that's why people found it pretty hard to get mad at you. Like I tell my kids. It's not always just what you do, but the way you do things, the way you treat people, that counts.

Speaking of kids, Mr. President, they're going to miss you. I know mine are. Oh, they're a little young and they really don't know what some of the important things about being President are. My daughter always thought you were her idea of a pretty handsome guy. And my son? Well, a Navy man, especially a PT boat man, is pretty OK. Oh sure, that space stuff is pretty great. But who pulled 'em out of the water? Darned right. You know how kids are. And the kids knew this, I guess. Heck, you even had my boy interested in history. And any man that could do that has to have something. I know I couldn't.

As for me? Gosh, there's so much to say because of the way I feel today. And I just don't know how to say it. Pictures keep going through my mind. Like the way I always saw you trying to tuck your tie inside your jacket around those breezy airports or coming up to the microphone. Then I see you 1 minute up on the cape in your old clothes, just like I like to be, and the next, looking straight on at Mr. Khrushchev at one

of those high meetings. And your voice. I can hear it now. I can't get it out of my mind. Somehow when I was watching you talk on TV, the sound of your voice always sounded like one of those recordings of famous voices out of past history. They had that same ring and the words seemed like words I knew I would be hearing again someday, and so would my children, and theirs. And you know what? The time I was proudest of you was the time we came right up to the brink of a terrible catastrophe, and you talked to us about what might happen. And you stood up and faced it the only way an American should. To me, that was the greatest. Oh I was plenty nervous in those few days. But I sure was glad you were there because after your speech, I knew that whatever happened, I would not be ashamed but proud of you, as President, and of me, as an American.

And now? What can I say. What has happened has happened. I'm so sorry, that I could easily just lie down someplace and cry. I feel all swollen inside, like something wants to bust out. I want to take my feelings out on somebody or something. But at night, after all the radio and TV is shut off and I'm away from these horrible, unfair, unbelievable few days, I get to thinking. I think about you and how you might look down upon this scene. What would you say? And the only line I can hear and your voice is just as plain as day. "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." And you, Mr. President, I don't think you ever even asked. You just did, and unto death. And I've decided to do the same. Not ask what I can do for my country. But to go about doing it. Oh, I'll never be President. I doubt I'll even make local office. But I'll tell you this. I'll be darned sure I have something to say about who does. I'm going to start doing things to help run this great country of ours, Mr. President. And y' know what? I'm going to be doing it for you.

God bless you.

A FRIEND.

(Written by Charles R. Parker, assistant general manager, WDRC, and recorded by WDRC director of news, Joseph Barbarette, for presentation over WDRC on November 25, 1963.)

THE BEEF IMPORT PROBLEM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the impact of beef imports on our livestock industry is a matter of deep concern to me. The present rate of beef importation is indefensible. Between 1956 and 1962 there was an annual average of 890 million pounds of beef imports, while in 1962 these imports jumped to 1.9 billion pounds. The U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that this year imports are running 18 percent ahead of the 1962 level. The Agriculture Department further forecasts depressed markets for domestic beef through at least the middle of 1964.

I have conferred with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] on this most serious problem and I wish to commend him for his foresight and direct approach to the question of foreign imports.

On November 20, at the request of the Senator from North Dakota, the Finance Committee unanimously adopted a resolution which directs the Tariff Commission to immediately begin an investigation on the impact of foreign beef imports on the domestic market and to report to the Senate Finance Committee the results of the investigation not later than June 30, 1964.

I wish to associate myself with the position taken by the Senator from North Dakota, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution of the Finance Committee be printed in the RECORD.

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

NOVEMBER 20, 1963.

Be it resolved by the Committee on Finance, That the U.S. Tariff Commission is hereby directed, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, to make an investigation of the conditions of competition in the United States between beef and beef products produced in the United States and in foreign countries, and to report to the Senate Finance Committee the results of the investigation not later than June 30, 1964.

The report of the Commission shall set forth a summary of the facts obtained in the investigation, including a description of the domestic industry, domestic production, foreign production, imports, including sources of foreign supply, consumption channels, and methods of distributions, price, U.S. exports, U.S. Customs treatment since 1930, and other factors affecting the competition between domestic and imported beef and beef products. In the course of its investigation the Commission shall hold hearings, giving adequate opportunity to interested parties to appear and be heard.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I would like to thank my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota for calling the pending investigation of the impact of beef imports, to the attention of our colleagues.

The steady increase in imports of beef and beef products has reached an alarming level. It was this steadily rising increase in imports that prompted me to present my resolution to the Finance Committee for consideration.

I should also like at this time to commend the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, and the committee members not only for their favorable action on the resolution, but also for the speed in which they acted. It was just 22 days from the time the resolution was presented until action resulted.

A number of interested cattlemen in North Dakota have already expressed an interest in coming to Washington to present testimony. I trust and hope that representatives of the livestock industry from South Dakota and throughout the Nation will make their views known to the Tariff Commission.

SAVING THE RAILROADS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Senator PELL, has authored a worthwhile article on the problem of the American railroads. Senator PELL's article, entitled "Saving the Railroads," appears in the November 22 issue of the Commonweal magazine.

The Senator from Rhode Island has long concerned himself with the railroad industry. His proposals and insights in the Commonweal article is well worth the consideration of the Members of Congress.

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

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

SAVING THE RAILROADS

(By CLAIBORNE PELL)

(CLAIBORNE PELL is U.S. Senator from Rhode Island and a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

Next year along a stretch of curving seacoast south of Tokyo, a unique railroad will begin covering the 310 miles between Tokyo and Osaka in only 3 hours, at a maximum speed of close to 130 miles per hour. These trains will be electrically automated to minimize risks. They will travel a brandnew separate high-speed line offering most attractive center city to center city service every 30 minutes during the day between the major cities, with a coordinated limited express geared to serve 10 intermediate stops.

Such an imaginative plan is urgently needed for our own troubled rail system. In the Northeast, passenger service has become increasingly unprofitable for the two principal rail carriers linked to meet and serve the Boston-to-Washington axis. The Pennsylvania Railroad is currently struggling with deficits. The New York, New Haven & Hartford is in a critical financial condition and has been in receivership since July 1961. Elsewhere in the country, rail companies are narrowly poised between profit and loss, with the overall profit percentage for the entire industry little more than 2 percent.

Tax alleviation has been suggested, and in some cases granted. But neither this nor petitions for merger—now before the Interstate Commerce Commission in complicated multiple form—will provide the ultimate answer. The railroads have simply contracted a sickness that tax relief and mergers cannot fully cure. Modernization is required but it doesn't seem possible without a broad, enlightened plan that promises psychological as well as financial rejuvenation.

The Boston-to-Washington urban complex embraces a highly mobile population of nearly 40 million people in a wide corridor only 50 percent longer than the Tokyo-Osaka area. Adapting American ingenuity to the methods now being pioneered by the Japanese, we could halve the time it takes a rail passenger to go from Boston to Washington. Rails could once again compete with airlines on approximately even terms. By airplane, the New York-to-Washington trip now takes an hour in flight, plus perhaps as much as 2 hours in ground connections. By rail, this trip could be made from center-city to center-city in 2 hours, with the obvious advantages of few or no cancellations for bad weather, and no switching from one mode of conveyance to another.

The overburdening of airlanes and highways alone should prod us into maximum, efficient use of our rail system. City planners warn that the superhighways around our cities are becoming "nooses of concrete" threatening to choke city growth and vitality. It often seems an unquestioned assumption that automobiles will carry most of the travel load in coming generations and new highways eat up the countryside as if there were no alternative. Yet 32 lanes of highway are needed to accommodate the same number of people in 1 hour as can be carried on a single track of rail.

An enlightened new plan involves more than technical skill. The overlapping and competing jurisdictions of various States, cities, and railroads point toward new forms

of cooperation as the bases for rejuvenating rail passenger service.

In June of last year, I introduced in the Senate a resolution which would grant congressional consent to the establishment of a multistate authority to modernize and operate passenger railroad service between Boston and Washington. This led to the establishment of a special task force, appointed by President Kennedy, to study the implications of my proposal, and in turn to a further examination now being conducted by the Department of Commerce. Meanwhile, I have reintroduced my Joint Senate Resolution in the present session of Congress and similar action has followed in the House.

Interstate compacts have become increasingly popular, covering such varied concerns as forest fire prevention, law enforcement, conservation, and shipping and transportation (as in the New York Port Authority). Last year Congress gave its consent to the Delaware River Basin Commission, a compact including New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

These compacts often require strenuous effort. The type I propose must be approved by legislative bodies in my own Rhode Island, in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland; by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; by both Houses of Congress and by the Executive.

No matter how great the effort, however, I am convinced that the results from this investment in railroad modernization can have most instructive application in forming a pattern for other developing megalopolitan areas—in California between Los Angeles and San Francisco; in the Chicago region and eastward to Detroit; in Florida where rapid expansion is taking shape north of Miami.

I believe in a minimum of Federal subsidization. It's often said that the airlines benefit unjustly by Federal funds used in airport construction and that bus lines profit by using publicly financed roads. It's not my wish to quibble with these points, but definitely we should try to allot burdens and advantages on an equal basis, for this lies at the root of healthy competition and our raison d'être as exponents of democratic principles and the capitalistic philosophy.

Under my proposal the railroads would keep their freight service, which is the very backbone of their ability to operate successfully—and the public authority would assume jurisdiction of the unprofitable part of the business: passenger service itself. This is very different from Federal governmental ownership or control, and from Federal subsidization of private industry, which can create unfair privileges for company stock and bond holders.

The renovation of railroad passenger service through the main channel of our northeast corridor will also mean that freight will move more economically, more competitively, for the companies will be permitted to give it their undivided, creative attention. The mails carried by the railroads will be more rapid.

To finance the undertaking, I propose that the public authority raise an initial sum of at least $500 million by issuing 30-year bonds bearing a 3½-percent coupon. The issue would be guaranteed against default by the full faith and credit of the Government. Thus the bonds would have the "triple A" rating most attractive for marketing; and like many public authority bonds their interest would be exempt from Federal income taxes.

This method of financing would entail tax exemption which no private company can be permitted. The proposed sum is a major one, but if the modernization will attract merely the volume of passenger business the railroads possessed 10 years ago—a modest estimate—the proposed bond issue could be retired in 30 years.

In this country we already have railroad cars prepared to travel at nearly the velocity of the Japanese trains. They need only improved tracks. As for the cost: the Japanese undertaking, which entails the construction of a score of major tunnels and bridges, the importation of heavy equipment and surfacing operations along a circuitous route, has been estimated at $458 million. Though the Boston-Washington distance is half again as long, there is no such earth moving to accomplish. Much of our roadbed is relatively straight and level. The sum I suggest and the cost of the Japanese project might be considered to be in some related balance.

The stagnation of the railroads, with low profits and low spirits spiraling into higher fares, poor revenue, and alienation of potential riders, can be arrested if we are willing to recognize that a major action must be taken. Rapid, modern, and courteous rail service—complete with, say, dictaphone equipment, secretarial service, conference facilities, telephones, barbers, and hairdressers—could be the salvation of our railroads and an immensely productive national investment. But it must be done while the cost of rejuvenation and retooling is still within reason.

WHEAT LEGISLATION ADVOCATED

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have advised the Senate on several occasions of new endorsements of a voluntary wheat certificate plan by State farm and wheatgrowers associations.

I have just received the November 29 report from Washington of the National Association of Wheat Growers which adds three more of that organization's State chapters to the supporters of such a bill.

The Nebraska and Wyoming groups adopted a resolution which said:

> Specifically, we propose a voluntary certificate program effective for the 1964 and subsequent crops administered on a basis of bushels for the amount [of wheat] needed for the domestic and export markets * * * with necessary acreage diversion without Government payment.
>
> It is our suggestion that in any new legislation along these lines, or in the regulations pertaining thereto, provision be made for a grower to store excess wheat at his own expense to be used to fulfill his quota during a year of crop failure.

The Oklahoma wheatgrowers resolution said:

> Be it resolved that the Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association favor a voluntary two-price certificate plan with a substitution clause effective, similar to the McGovern plan as now introduced in Congress.

I would like to repeat, Mr. President, that the growing volume of resolutions are not only evidence of approval for the certificate plan on a voluntary basis, but evidence that the wheatgrowers of the Nation overwhelmingly favor enactment of a program effective in relation to the 1964 crop.

TRIBUTE TO REV. JOHN LaFARGE—GREAT RELIGIOUS LEADER AND EDITOR OF AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this past weekend, the United States suffered another great loss. The Rev. John LaFarge, S.J., associate editor and former editor in chief of the outstanding periodical America, passed to his eternal reward.

Father LaFarge symbolizes the highest traditions of his faith, his country, and of the creed of humanity.

His long and distinguished career was crowned commencing in July 1962, when he was first appointed to the editorial staff of America, the weekly journal of opinion edited and published by the Jesuit order.

To America he brought the dedication of a priest, the wisdom of a scholar, the understanding of a profound observer of history, the vigor of a natural-born leader of men.

A champion of social justice, he was one of the founders of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. This outstanding organization has helped assure vitality to America's rural population, just as it has assured vital contributions by it to all America's affairs.

Always a friend of the underdog, Father LaFarge helped lead NCRLC in the fight for the rights of Mexican migrants, Puerto Rican laborers, and Negro sharecroppers.

A member of a family which has made distinguished contributions to American letters, he was, in the finest sense, an outstanding spokesman for the family of man. The policies of America, under his leadership, drew praise from his own faith in the form of a handwritten letter of praise from Pope Pius XII and from members of all faiths.

Gentle but courageous, profoundly American in his roots, yet amazingly fluent in many foreign tongues and familiar with many foreign ways, a man of culture and a man of action, an eloquent voice for both priesthood and laymen, he leaves behind an unforgettable legacy. Bravely, he led causes of brotherhood long before it became fashionable to do so. Profoundly, he symbolized the tradition of service which brought a Father Marquette to explore the American wilderness.

This Nation is indebted to John LaFarge, S.J., explorer of new and noble paths for his country, who has gone to his eternal repose. And God rest his magnificent soul.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to him published in the November 25, 1963, New York Herald Tribune.

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

FATHER LAFARGE, CHAMPION OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

On a pleasant, sunny day 58 years ago, a slim, tall young man whose genial face matched the weather, ran up to a gatekeeper at Grand Central Station. Somewhat out of breath, he said:

"For heaven's sake open the gate and let me through. I'm leaving the world on this train and must make it."

The young man in a hurry was named John LaFarge. He had just returned from Europe; he had been ordained after receiving a licentiate in theology from the University of Innsbruck, Austria, and the reason he had to make the train was that he had entered the Maryland-New York province of the Society of Jesus and was on his way to study with that sternly disciplined order at St. Andrew-on-Hudson in Poughkeepsie.

But far from leaving the world, Father LaFarge went on to become one of his church's most forceful spokesmen on many controversial subjects—especially racial justice—as editor in chief of America, the national Catholic weekly, and champion of many another seemingly lost cause.

Father LaFarge died peacefully in his sleep yesterday at the age of 83. Members of the editorial staff of America found him in bed at Campion House, their residence at 329 West 108th Street. Characteristically, a newspaper was clutched in his hand. His face was wreathed in his perennial smile; this time, he hadn't been in a hurry.

To many of his colleagues, and to the laity of all faiths as well, Father LaFarge was the embodiment of what St. Thomas Aquinas adumbrated as the Roman Catholic ideal: the balance of faith and reason. His convictions on social problems were as deeply seated as those on religion; to him, they were inextricably woven into a passionate mosaic that spelled the salvation of man.

In his autobiography, "The Manner Is Ordinary," published in 1960, he had written:

"The priest speaks for hope. He is not just a foreteller of some future glorious event. By his sacramental action as well as by his words and activities, he conveys to the world Him who is our hope. If the priest himself is accessible in the world of time, it is easier for us to communicate with the world of the eternal, who has made His home—pitched His tent, as St. John says—in time."

GENTLE PHILOSOPHY

His manner was urbane; his arguments were leanly stripped of surplus tissue; he was never known to raise his well-modulated voice no matter how heated the discussion.

"I am not so much trying to persuade people to walk on a certain road as I am to show them the road that I am convinced they are sooner or later going to walk on," he observed on one occasion.

It was this type of gentle philosophy that endeared him to a host of Protestants and Jews, who regard him as a kind of elder statesman of his church.

He was born into a distinguished family on February 13, 1880. His father was John LaFarge, the renowned painter. His mother was the former Margaret Mason Perry. Among his forebears were Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Sergeant, associate justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and widely read writer on jurisprudence, and Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry, whose famous dispatch—"We have met the enemy and they are ours"—announced his victory on Lake Erie in 1813 and won him a shrine in history.

One of his brothers was Bancel LaFarge, the muralist; another was Oliver H. P. LaFarge, a General Motors executive who later became an artist; the third was Christopher LaFarge, who was one of the architects of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York. His nephew was Oliver LaFarge, the Pulitzer Prize-winning novelist.

Father LaFarge was graduted from Harvard University in 1901. After his studies in Austria he pursued his graduate studies at the Jesuits' Woodstock College in Maryland. He taught at Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y., and at Loyola College, Baltimore, Md. He began missionary work in 1910, serving a year as a chaplain at Welfare Island, N.Y. From 1911 to 1926 he did pastoral and educational work in Maryland.

While in that State he helped to found the Cardinal Gibbons Institute for Negroes at Ridge, in 1924, which was closed 9 years later for lack of financial support but which inspired the Catholic Interracial Council, the first of its kind in the United States. Father LaFarge also was a founder of this group and was its chaplain for many years.

Father LaFarge returned to New York in 1926 to join the staff of "America," and thereafter employed its columns frequently to further the cause of social justice. In his view, there is no such thing as pure race; this country has a Negro population group rather than a Negro race, and although there may be ethnic differences, they are in kind, not quality. Closer association between the two groups would not lead to miscegenation, he insisted, since they mixed much more freely while the Negro was in slavery. He also maintained that, from a biological standpoint, there is no argument against intermarriage.

His restive, far-ranging mind delved into other fields. He was fluent in Russian, Slovenian, Bulgarian, Polish, Czech, and Slovak, as well as French, German, Italian, and, of course, Latin, and was considered an authority on Slavic problems. He took an especial interest in the Catholic Church in the Scandinavian countries and for years was chaplain and director of programs for the St. Ansgar's League in New York. He was a rapt student of the Bolshevik revolution and an outspoken foe of communism. While at Harvard he studied music and became an accomplished pianist.

In an interview in 1960, he said:

"Fundamentally, I'm a realist. I am seriously concerned about the moral fiber of America. I'm more afraid of internal decay than I am of external danger—although the hypothesis of our being destroyed by nuclear weapons is a very real one.

"I see in this country a moral erosion which is the result of our very great affluence, our comfortable living, our preoccupation with personal security and our lavish expenditure on luxuries, stimulated by the ever-increasing pressure of advertising.

TOO MUCH MOMISM

"We have altogether too much momism, if you will; too much preoccupation with social conformity and a very marked lack of information and interest regarding those world issues that intimately concern us. * * * It seems that we've drifted into the notion that what is good or bad should be judged only by the question: 'What can you get away with?' "

With the explosion of the civil rights revolution, Father LaFarge's was one of the first voices to speak out against segregation, calling on his church to take an active part.

"It is not a question for Negro citizens alone [to demonstrate]," he insisted. "It's a question of justice for American citizens, and I think as American citizens, whether they are white or Negro, makes little difference. Where wrong is committed, the white man suffers morally just as much as the Negro, and the interest is equal for all."

At one time or another Father LaFarge had been a director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference; vice president and director of the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion; a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; vice president of the American Catholic Historical Association; vice president of the Catholic Association for International Peace; and an originator of the Liturgical Art Society, in New York City.

His honors were numerous: The World Brotherhood Award, the American Liberties Medallion of the American Jewish Committee, an award from the Religion and Labor Foundation of Washington and the annual peace award of the Catholic Association for International Peace were but a few.

In addition to his autobiography, he was the author of the following books: "Jesuits in Modern Times" (1927); "Interracial Justice" (1937); "The Race Question and the Negro" (1942); "No Postponement" (1950); "The Catholic Viewpoint on Race Relations" (1956); and only last month, "An American Amen."

There are no immediate survivors. The body will rest at Campion House until 4 p.m. tomorrow, and then will be taken to the Loyola School Chapel, 980 Park Avenue. A service will be held at 10 a.m., Wednesday, at St. Ignatius Loyola Church, Park Avenue and 84th Street. Burial will be at Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, N.Y.

Father LaFarge's epitaph could well have been written by himself. In an article on the shrine at Lourdes written several years ago, he said:

"For those who do not believe in God, no explanation is possible; for those who do believe in God, no explanation is necessary."

TRIBUTE TO BILL DON MOYERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, few young men have been given so much responsibility in recent years as a young Texan by the name of Bill Moyers. Senators will recall his alert and helpful cooperation and his quiet but effective leadership as a top official of the Peace Corps for the past 2 years.

Mr. President, I am confident that Washington and the Nation are going to hear a good deal more about this unassuming and effective young man in the coming weeks and months.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times on November 30, 1963, entitled "A White House Adviser—Bill Don Moyers."

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

A WHITE HOUSE ADVISER—BILL DON MOYERS

WASHINGTON, November 29.—When he returned to Washington as President a week ago tonight, Lyndon B. Johnson quickly brought to his side a former assistant in whom he placed the highest trust, Bill Don Moyers. Mr. Moyers spent that night at the Johnson home, moved into the White House with Mr. Johnson last Tuesday and has been as close to him as any man in this first trying week of the new administration. He has handled appointments for the President, helped on speeches, made television arrangements.

The assumption has been that Mr. Moyers would soon acquire a formal title as a White House aid, but he says the assumption is wrong. He plans, he says, to go back to his regular work, "the best job in Washington," as Deputy Director of the Peace Corps.

"I'm not an exciting, interesting, mysterious figure behind the scenes," he said today. "I'm just here helping a friend, and when that ends I'll drift away and never be heard of again."

No one would ever question Bill Moyers' sincerity, but the ultimate decision on what he will do is up to the President. He says that, of course, he will do whatever Mr. Johnson asks. In any case, he will clearly be a man to whom Lyndon Johnson turns for help in difficult situations.

CAMPAIGN MANAGER

The President's high confidence in Mr. Moyers is the more impressive because he is just 29 years old—younger even than most of the brilliant team that President Kennedy gathered around him.

For a 29-year-old, he has done a great deal in life. He has supported himself since he was 14. He is an ordained Baptist minister, and he has written for newspapers and television. He has also been a political campaign manager—for Lyndon Johnson in 1960.

Mr. Moyers was born in Oklahoma on June 5, 1934, but the family moved to Marshall, Tex., when he was 6 months old and he will not allow being anything but a Texan.

It was a poor family. His father, who is still living, was an unskilled laborer. To get a formal education he had to hold down a full-time job while in college. He began

at North Texas State College and stayed there for 2 years.

In the summer of 1954 he came to Washington as an intern on the staff of the then Senator Johnson. Even in those few months they achieved a remarkable rapport.

Mrs. Johnson offered Mr. Moyers a job on her radio and television stations in Austin. He took it and transferred to the University of Texas there, finishing college while working full time. He was a journalism graduate—the highest ranking in university history.

He spent a year at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, on a Rotary International fellowship, and then went to Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth.

He had three rural pastorates briefly as a student, but it was his intention to be a teacher rather than a minister. He had accepted a position teaching ethics at Baylor University when the 1960 campaign came along.

Mr. Johnson, running for Vice President, asked Bill Moyers to join his team of assistants. Before long Mr. Moyers was the top man on the team.

Why did an old campaigner like Lyndon Johnson pick a young man with so little political experience as his closest adviser in 1960? The answer seems to be simply respect for Bill Moyers' judgment.

Certainly, to the outsider, they did not seem alike in temperament or personality. Mr. Johnson was flamboyant, earthy, often hot tempered. Mr. Moyers was quiet, simple, and always cool.

A reporter remembers the time crowds were pouring out to meet the campaign plane and Mr. Moyers said to him softly: "Put out that cigarette, you're standing under the engine."

Perhaps Mr. Moyer's very calmness fits in well with the Johnson explosiveness of energy. It is said that he is the only member of the staff whom Mr. Johnson has "never read out of the human race."

Mr. Moyers moved into the Vice President's office in January 1961, but the next month was sent out "on loan" to help at the birth of the Peace Corps. He worked closely with the Corps Director, Sargent Shriver, and earned his highest regard and friendship.

This year President Kennedy nominated Mr. Moyers as Mr. Shriver's deputy. There were attacks in the Senate because he was only 28 at the time. Mr. Shriver, in a letter, said Mr. Moyers had been picked "for one simple reason—he is the best qualified man for the job."

His Peace Corps colleagues regard him as a man of exceptional intellect but, above all, as one with what one colleague called "a tremendous feeling for people."

"Some officials here think in terms of the number of trees planted or injections given," this man said. "Bill thinks in terms of the volunteers, what they need and can do."

Mr. Moyers does not use his middle name, Don. Neither does he use the name William. He is married to the former Judith Davidson, and they have two children.

His family is his only real hobby, friends say. He tries to spend a full hour with his children before leaving for work each morning.

WEST VIRGINIANS CHEERED BY FOREST RESEARCH LABORATORY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail tells of the new hope for economic recovery in West Virginia that has arisen as a result of the Forest Products Marketing Research Laboratory now being operated at Princeton, W. Va., by the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. West Virginians, who once led the Nation in the output of hardwood timber, are confident that the Princeton laboratory will point the way to the opening up of thousands of new jobs in the Appalachian timberlands.

Mr. President, I share this hope with my fellow West Virginians. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I took a group of planners from the Forest Service into the snow-covered woods of West Virginia early in 1961 to convince them of the advisability of locating a forestry products research laboratory in my State. Later that year, I amended the bill making appropriations for the U.S. Forest Service to add $450,000 for such a laboratory to be located at Princeton, W. Va. Because I believe that Appalachian timber holds one of the keys to economic prosperity in the Mountain State, I have worked unceasingly in behalf of the research laboratory. This year I was able to amend the Forest Service appropriation by adding $300,000 to the $100,000 budget request for the laboratory at Princeton, and, therefore, although $50,000 of those funds was lost in the subsequent Senate-House conference, a total of $350,000 was made available for fiscal 1964.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article in the Gazette-Mail, which tells what the new laboratory may mean to West Virginia, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRINCETON'S RESEARCH CENTER—NEW FACILITY MAY LEAD STATE TO FORESTED FIELDS OF WEALTH

(By W. C. Blizzard)

The disappearance of the wooden leg, the wooden nickel, and the wooden cigar store Indian may not have affected you personally. And then again it may have, whether you realize it or not.

For West Virginia at one time was the leading hardwood-producing State in the Nation, and even now ranks eighth in that category. So materials that replace wood, such as plastics and other synthetics, have had a depressing effect upon a segment of the economy important to mountaineers.

In recent years, experts have been pointing out the value of forest products from West Virginia, and the lamentable fact that so little wood is turned into manufactured products within the Mountain State. On November 12, a new Forest Products Marketing Laboratory was dedicated at Princeton, a Federal scientific center intended to find new markets for the timber which covers most of the West Virginia hills.

At that dedication, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, again pointed up the potential of West Virginia forests and forest products. Said he:

"Our forests, which cover more than two-thirds of the land area of our State, give employment to about 15,000 persons in jobs other than those directly related to forestry management. This is insufficient for such a vast and renewable resource.

"If the present timber growth in West Virginia were converted to lumber and then to furniture or other wood products in the State, employment would reach 250,000 men."

BYRD delivered the dedication address, an honor accorded him for the excellent reason that, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, he was responsible for procuring $700,000 for the building of the Federal marketing laboratory and the initiation of an area wood-research program.

The Princeton research center is a facility of the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station with headquarters at Upper Darby, Pa. It is operated by the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Although the Forest Service maintains more than 90 research laboratories of various kinds, the Forest Products Marketing Laboratory at Princeton is the first such facility constructed with the aim of conducting research as to how forest-based industries may make a greater contribution to the social and economic welfare of Appalachia.

The Appalachians, known to the Indians as the "endless mountains," extend from northern Maine to the middle of Alabama and Georgia. West Virginia makes up their wrinkled midriff, a midriff in which the Princeton laboratory is imbedded like a navel.

It is hoped that marketing research conducted at Princeton will alleviate unemployment in the Mountain State, helping forest-use industries to apply wooden splints to the economic dislocation resulting from automation-oriented coal mines.

How did it come about that a Forest Products Marketing Laboratory was located at Princeton, rather than elsewhere in West Virginia? It is known that northeastern forest experiment officials from Upper Darby considered many sites before deciding in favor of the Mercer County community.

One forestry official put it this way:

"A big factor was the attitude of the people and their representatives in the Princeton area. They made it plain they wanted the laboratory, and were willing to go to some pains to get it."

This alertness and aggressiveness was demonstrated by the Mercer County court in a most practical way. It gave about 96 acres of property for the use of the new research facility.

This was the old county "poor farm" property, which was not in use (these county homes for the aged indigent and aged ill have for the most part been put out of business by social security, State agencies, and welfare measures). Broken into two tracts of 32 and 64 acres, respectively, the smaller parcel contains the main laboratory buildings and a 20-acre exhibition forest which may be used as a classroom by students, 4-H groups, garden clubs, and other interested groups. The forest will demonstrate modern multiple-use forestry practices.

The larger tract will be the site of a methods-testing plant, to be completed in 1964, nearly as large as the main laboratory. Here, products and processes will be tested and evaluated for commercial applications.

The new Federal laboratory will divide its initial research into four main marketing categories: primary forest products, such as sawlogs; primary wood manufacturing (lumber, veneer, pulpwood); secondary wood products (flooring, furniture, and plywood); and wood for construction (the largest single market).

As you might guess, the laboratory building is not constructed of steel and concrete. The laminated beams in the auditorium are of oak, the walls of Appalachian cherry. Lobby panels are constructed from elm, red oak, and pecan; and parquetry floors are of beech, maple, oak, and cherry.

This beautiful building, which cost about $450,000, contains 20 offices, a 150-seat auditorium, a library, a staff conference room, a projection and storage room, a lunchroom, a soundproof computing room, a photographic darkroom, a drafting room, a central clerical room, a file room, a mail room, a first-aid room, and a fireproof vault.

In silhouette representation, by the way, the laboratory looks much like a short-legged, long-bodied, bob-tailed pup. This was no doubt unintentional, but may be an interest-

ing Rorschach comment on the architect who designed a building dedicated to products covered by bark. Or it may have been designed by a taxpayer feeling the bite. Or a forest owner hoping for a howling success.

More calmly, now—and more seriously—the Forest Products Marketing Laboratory at Princeton is an installation of which West Virginians may be proud, a research center which will benefit not only the mountaineer economy, but all of Appalachia.

As my own contribution to the profitable uses of wood, I refer you to your television set. No, I don't mean the gleaming cabinet. I mean Ed Sullivan's facial expression.

Ed uses no unsatisfactory substitutes, such as plastic or rubber. That is certain. And he is doing well.

But perhaps this suggestion should be ignored. The stone industry may already have claimed Ed for their own.

TORTOISE AND HARE MOON RACE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the apparent relaxation of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union has lulled some persons into believing that there is no longer such a thing as a race to the moon, that the Russians are prepared to cooperate peacefully with us in exploring outer space. A recent article by the editor of Parade magazine, written in Moscow, should dispel us of that illusion. The article points out that the Russians, despite economic problems, are still embarked on a crash program to reach and control the areas of the moon for their own purposes. We are warned not to act like the silly hare in the fable and allow the tortoise to win the race.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

ARE THE RUSSIANS REALLY QUITTING THE MOON RACE?

(By Jess Gorkin)

Moscow.—Premier Khrushchev's dramatic announcement that Russia is dropping out of the moon race has raised a whole galaxy of questions.

Some skeptics suspect Khrushchev hasn't changed his plans for landing a man on the moon but made his announcement to take the pep out of our program. They recall that the Soviets once swore they were engaged only in peaceful nuclear research while they disguised their nuclear weapons program under the innocent name, Ministry of Medium Machine Building.

Khrushchev's disclaimer has encouraged critics in the United States to demand slashes in the American moon program. They charge that President Kennedy was bluffed into blowing billions to meet a challenge which no longer exists. But anguished Western skeptics, who have been watching the Soviet space program, warn that the Russians will sneak ahead of us if we relax our vigilance and slow down our moon program to a snail's pace.

Many observers believe the wily Khrushchev is giving Russia a tails-I-win-heads-you-lose advantage in the moon competition. If Russia lands the first man on the moon, the world will herald it as a technological triumph and a propaganda victory for communism. If an American reaches the moon first, the world will merely recall Khrushchev's statement and shrug it off.

Conquest of the moon is held to be vital not only to our prestige but to our security. For as outer space becomes navigable, no one really knows what menace a Soviet moon base might constitute.

One fear is that the Soviets might use the moon as a base for lasers. This deadly system, which concentrates light into a narrow, unending and highly destructive beam, could be used to pinpoint, pick off, and pulverize U.S. satellites, missiles, or even missile sites on earth. A similar system under U.S. command could deter Soviet aggression against the free world. Some military weapons men believe that the nation which first establishes such a system, or some other futuristic weapons network on the moon, will control space and the earth in the event of war.

Despite Khrushchev's statement, the confident attitude of their scientists and the pattern of their space activities indicate to Western experts that the Soviet goal is still the moon and beyond.

A GAGARIN, NOT A GLENN

I am convinced that:

The Russians are driving full blast for the moon.

They hold a lead in manned space flight and mean to retain it.

In short, they are determined that the first man on the moon will be a Gagarin, not a Glenn.

The conquest of space has come to mean more to the Kremlin than a mere matter of national pride; it has become part of the Communist dogma. The Soviets are fanatically committed to outdoing the United States in this race. Having declared that nuclear war isn't necessary to achieve world domination, they hope to accomplish the same end by dominating space. Make no mistake, it is powerful fuel, this mixture of national pride, political ambition and doctrinal zeal. On a previous visit here I attended a meeting at which a new sputnik launching was discussed. The Soviet scientists described their achievements in space as simply another first in science for the U.S.S.R.

Many American scientists are skeptical of the value of putting a man on the moon. They claim that the astronaut simply will "go along for the ride," that instrument packages can send back better information at far less cost. Other Americans are genuinely alarmed about the high cost of the moon project. They urge that the money would be better spent on health, education, housing, and other problems on earth.

Khrushchev may joke that in the Soviet Union they say, "Who is impatient on earth, let him go to the moon." But the Russians regard the exploration of space as a most serious matter. The Russians definitely view the exploration of space in terms of Soviet Columbuses and Magellans, of men crossing and charting the vast oceans of nothingness between the planets. They are aware of the tremendous impression their space exploits have made upon the world, especially upon the new nations of Africa and Asia. Western experts believe that the Soviets intend to add to these exploits, not to back away from them.

It is true that the Russian economy is in trouble, that Premier Khrushchev has had to juggle his budget between military and consumer demands. But far from cutting back on space exploration, he appears to be pressing forward with it. He has even diverted scientists from nuclear projects to work on biophysics, the science of maintaining men in space. A Dr. Parin, known to Westerners here as a nuclear physicist, recently received the prized Lenin Medal for his work in space medicine.

As early as 1950, the Russians began to "wire" athletes in action as a preliminary to recording the reactions of men in space. I have seen "wired" athletes being tested in the scientific laboratory in Moscow's Lenin Stadium. They also rocketed dogs aloft to determine the biological effects of space flight. After the first sputnik, the Russians followed up by launching the late, lamented dog Laika in orbit. At least 8 of their first 15 space launchings were experiments leading to manned flight.

From Yuri Gagarin's historic orbit until the recent "doubleheader," when the first space rendezvous failed by a mere 2 miles, the Russians have gone all out for men in space. All their research has been coordinated toward this goal; it is the objective proclaimed by their literature. At this writing, Soviet cosmonauts have logged 382 hours, 20 minutes in space compared to 58 hours, 33 minutes by our astronauts.

RIGOROUS INDOCTRINATION

I have watched Soviet training films, which show how cosmonauts are tested and trained. The space recruits go through a bone- and brain-jarring indoctrination course, which tests their physical and psychological aptitude. They endure hours of lonely silence, suddenly shattered by flashing lights and screeching noises, to determine their reaction to space-flight emergencies. They also are strapped in whirling, catapulting devices similar to but cruder than the equipment used by our own astronauts.

Significantly, the Soviet space program is totally under military control. It reportedly is run by a Council of Ministers. Economic Boss Dimitry Ustinov assigns the priorities; Research Chief K. N. Rudnev directs the technology. But the program is administered by Defense Minister Rodion Malinovsky.

Of course, the Russians talk a lot about their peaceful goals in space just as they used to preach about the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Soviet Academician L. I. Sedov, a leading scientist and spokesman on aerospace matters, says, "There is one large team in Russia that handles all space projects. The same key men are in charge of guidance, tracking and other segments for each of the projects. It is a very large team and it can well take care of several projects in parallel. * * * We have no distinction between military and civilian projects." Western watchers agree that future Soviet spacemen, like today's cosmonauts, will wear the uniform of the Red Army. Reported military goal in space: to establish space stations in orbit, then bases on the lunar surface.

The Soviet rendezvous attempt is believed to have been part of a piggyback plan for sending a man around the moon. The idea is to launch the moon rocket from the back of a sputnik already in orbit. Comments M. V. Keldysh, president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences: "This method of launching has opened up new possibilities for interplanetary flights since it eliminates the necessity of choosing specific dates for moon flights; and it removes the restrictions connected with the fact that not all points on the earth are equally advantageous for launching."

If the Russians succeed in perfecting this docking technique—and they won't fail for lack of trying—they now have the equipment to send a man in a loop around the moon and back. Significantly, the Russians are now working on equipment that can have no purpose other than to land a man on the moon.

How does the moon competition look as it goes into the first lap? The Russians are clearly ahead in their preparations to put men in space. They know more about the medical and psychological problems, especially the problem of weightlessness.

Russia is ahead, too, in exploring the moon with unmanned rockets. One of these took pictures of the hidden side of the moon, developed the photographs on board and transmitted them back to Moscow. Four years later, we still haven't duplicated this feat.

VON BRAUN COMING UP

The chief reason for the Soviet lead, however, is the advantage of bigger boosters. This should vanish in a matter of weeks when our giant Saturn rocket, guided by specialist Wernher von Braun and his team, is scheduled to launch a 20,000-pound satellite

which will outweigh the heaviest Soviet sputnik by at least 6,000 pounds.

The United States is also ahead in the number of launches; in scientific space probes; in weather, navigation, and communications satellites.

Certainly the Russians, despite their early advantage, can be overtaken in space. We are fast catching up with them in equipment, are ahead in many space fields. Khrushchev might also run into serious economic difficulties which could slow his space program down.

Is it possible that the Russians might reconsider President Kennedy's proposal of a joint moon venture? Both the United States and Soviet Union are too far along to integrate their lunar equipment, a task that would be almost hopelessly complex. As one westerner put it: "The Russians would have to change their whole concept of secrecy before we could arrange a joint moon mission." Many experts believe that an exchange of space information is the most that could come out of Kennedy's proposal.

Does Khrushchev secretly plan another classic tortoise-and-hare drama in the moon competition? Millions of experts and nonexperts think so.

THE NEED FOR STRAIGHT THINKING

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the assassination of President Kennedy has angered and revolted every decent American. However, a strong effort has been provoked to place the responsibility for this despicable act on political forces within the country which were opposed to the policies of our late President. By some curious kind of emotional thinking, the finger of accusation has been pointed at rightist and antidesegregation groups, or so-called hatemongers. A refreshing note of sobriety has been sounded in a column by Richard Wilson in the Washington Evening Star of November 27, which should remind us that the accused assassin, Lee Oswald, proudly professed to be a leftist Marxist, and that efforts to connect his dastardly deed to the actions of opposite political movements are exceedingly tenuous and farfetched.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Evening Star be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Evening Star, Nov. 27, 1963]

ASSASSINATION EVOKES ODD VIEWS—MANY SEEN LINKING KENNEDY KILLING TO RACIST, RIGHTIST, DESPITE FACTS

(By Richard Wilson)

The mood of self-examination which has overtaken the country following the assassination of President Kennedy has produced both ludicrous speculation and tortured reasoning.

We can see coming now the tracts entitled "The Conspiracy To Murder John F. Kennedy." In one version it will be an inverse antidesegregation conspiracy using a double-agent Communist to carry out the deed. In another version it will be just a plain Communist conspiracy. Additional versions will prove the ingenuity of the human mind when stimulated by 4 days of unremitting TV-radio programing.

These fantasies are not confined to the lunatic fringe. Here in Washington, simple but seriously intentioned people arrived at the strange conclusion that the murder of the President is related in some amorphous way to the slaying of a desegregation leader in Mississippi.

In spite of the simple facts of the assassination, there are many in this city who will not separate the President's tragic death from the segregation and far right issues. Their tortured reasoning is that the assassin came out of the same pot, that the city of Dallas in the reactionary Southwest had spawned them all and all were equally culpable.

Even the Chief Justice of the United States allowed himself to stray from the path of sound reasoning. The misguided could deduce from his remarks that the extremities of the right in this particular case carried a responsibility for inspiring the extremities of the far left.

It is understandable that reasonable men, shocked and perplexed, should grope for the causes of the savagely incongruous event. But why there should be supposed to be any vague relationship between the assassination of President Kennedy and the assassination of President Lincoln escapes rationality. Lincoln's assassination was indeed the act of a crazed and pitifully inadequate conspiracy that aspired to control of the Nation. That assassination was part of the great Civil War over the issue of slavery and the rights of the States.

All too often, and without sound cause, the events of today are cast in the mold of a century ago, as if the relatively peaceful demonstrations for Negro equality were revolutionary acts. All too often the reaction of the white community of the Nation is related to the cause for which millions of men sprang to arms a century ago.

These exaggerations seem to be part of the uncertain national mood. It could be expected, therefore, that the man-in-the-street last Friday, before the circumstances became known, should conclude that the attack on the President could be traced either to the segregation or the far right issues.

This notion is given up by some only reluctantly and if any twisted version can be made to fit their preconceptions they readily turn to it.

Nothing could have been more repugnant to the vibrant spirit and rational mind of John F. Kennedy.

Now a series of inquiries is beginning. One is by the FBI and the Justice Department into both the assassination and the murder of the accused assassin. Another study will be conducted in Congress in connection with legislation to make a murderous attack on the President and Vice President a Federal crime wherever committed. The State of Texas will conduct a special ex post facto inquiry.

If these inquiries are well conducted they can help to clarify whether or not Oswald, in fact, murdered the President and his probable motives; they can never prove in the legal sense, however, that Oswald was the assassin, and he will remain for all time the accused assassin.

Only a continuing self-examination by those who influence public thinking will find the root causes for the act. It may simply be that the cause lies more in the disorderly, undisciplined, and callous phases of American life than in the ideological concepts that divide the country.

But one simple fact should not be ignored. The accused, and likely, murderer was a proudly professed Marxist; he never boasted of being a segregationist or a far-righter.

THE BROADCASTING MEDIA IN COVERING THE TRAGIC EVENTS OF THE DEATH AND BURIAL OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am sure that all of America holds the communications industry in esteem for the excellent and tireless job which television and radio did in informing the Nation and the world of the tragic events surrounding the assassination of President Kennedy. The broadcasting industry brought unforgettable moments of history alive into the homes of millions.

The presentation of the sequence of events throughout the sad 3½-day period was particularly memorable because of the dedication, accuracy, and good taste of those from the broadcasting industry who worked long and often under difficult circumstances.

Their standards of excellence and public service did credit to us all as a people. Interspersed with news events brought into our homes throughout the country, and, indeed, to other areas of the world, was fine programing of music, literature, poetry and readings in keeping with the atmosphere not only of our tragedy but of our aspirations and culture as personified by President and Mrs. Kennedy in the White House.

For the broadcasting systems and stations, the economic sacrifices were indeed considerable. Yet, what they did was done without question and without complaint in fulfilling their responsibility to the public and to our society. The losses of many million of dollars, while they can never be recovered, I am sure was not, and is not, uppermost in the minds of the executives, whose concern is rather to keep faith with our Nation in the difficult sorrowful days, and in this they served nobly. There have been times when the communications media may have brought justifiable criticism in questions of taste in commercialism and programing. But, in all fairness, they deserve the public respect and commendation due them at this time.

In my own home State of Rhode Island, Mr. Joseph P. Dougherty, president of the Rhode Island Broadcasters Association, put out a letter to his fellow broadcasters. I think the letter speaks for itself, and I certainly agree with him. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dougherty's letter be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

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

CAPITAL CITIES BROADCASTING CORP.,
Providence, R.I., November 29, 1963.

To: Rhode Island Broadcasters Association.
From: Joseph P. Dougherty, president.
Date: November 26, 1963.
Subject: The tragic event.

There was no ruling from the FCC.

There was no request from any Government official, National, State, or local.

There was no directive from the NAB.

There was no suggestion from the RIBA.

Rather, there was a group of mature, responsible businessmen operating Rhode Island's radio and television stations using commonsense to make a decision to alter formats, report all the news on a noncommercial basis from shortly after the first break in the story until sign-on today.

Congratulations. You should need no further testimony to anyone from anyone.

JOE DOUGHERTY.

CONGRESS AND THE ENDLESS FRONTIER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the past few years, we have seen very

large expansion in Federal support for research and development programs; in fact we are approaching the $15-billion-a-year level of support. This is a sizable fraction of the entire Federal budget.

With this increase in Federal support has come an increase in congressional concern over how these funds are managed, and also how the Congress is to receive adequate scientific and technical advice in order to perform its proper role of authorization and appropriation.

One of the clearest and most perceptive statements about these problems and suggested solutions was made recently by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, our colleague Senator CLINTON ANDERSON. Because of its timeliness and importance, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address be printed in the RECORD at this point and recommend its consideration by all of my colleagues.

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

CONGRESS AND THE ENDLESS FRONTIER

(Remarks of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON at the 1963 Annual Conference of the Atomic Industrial Forum, Inc., Americana Hotel, New York City, November 20, 1963)

How can Government best advance science in peacetime? That was a question put to Vannevar Bush by President Roosevelt in the closing months of World War II. Writing to the President, Mr. Bush said:

"The pioneer spirit is still vigorous within this Nation. Science offers a largely unexplored hinterland for the pioneer who has the tools for his task. The rewards of such exploration both for the Nation and the individual are great. Scientific progress is one essential key to our security as a nation, to our better health, to more jobs, to a higher standard of living and to our cultural progress."

The Bush report was titled "Science, the Endless Frontier." It set out a course for the Federal Government to follow in the inauguration and support of scientific programs for the broadest public benefit.

I am not going to discuss this noon the uses and complications of atomic energy because to do so before a group such as this would be like hauling atoms to Oak Ridge. And in a few hours I am going to be participating in a panel discussion of the uses of the atom in many technical areas. But I can try, however, to contribute to the overall problem of the use of atomic science and technology by illuminating the kinds of problems and considerations which technical programs face in the Washington arena. Because of the increasing interest displayed on Capitol Hill in what has come to be called "big science," I have hope that you do not mind if I discuss the relationships between Congress and science. I can speak freely since I am not an expert in either field.

The House of Representatives has created a special committee to look into the problems posed by the rapid growth of science and the heavy financial commitment of the Federal Government to scientific and developmental enterprises. In addition, a subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee in recent weeks has been examining the relationship of science and Government. Tomorrow, the Senate Space Committee, which I serve as chairman, will conduct hearings on the impact of the national space program on education and our academic institutions. We are interested in finding out how NASA's program of graduate fellowships and research facility grants is working in relation to the total Federal activity in aid to higher education. This program represents only 1 percent of NASA's current budget, but it is an extremely important item—to the agency and to the colleges.

So there is a large measure of active congressional attention being paid to the affairs of state and science. This interest and concern are reflected by several different proposals which have been made in an attempt to improve both Government relationships with science and the effectiveness of Congress in making decisions affecting science and technology. Last March, the Senate passed S. 816 which is now pending in the House. This bill proposes the creation of a Commission of Science and Technology—a Hoover-type commission—to study ways of strengthening executive and legislative policy programs and operations in science and technology development. The Commission would review undesirable duplication, scientific manpower policies, the way in which scientific information is made available and similar problems growing out of the rapid buildup of the Government's activities in science and technology. The Commission would be made up of scientists and nonscientists. It would examine the pros and cons of a Department of Science, a proposal which has been introduced in Congress on many occasions.

Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska, has proposed the establishment of a Congressional Office of Science and Technology. The abbreviation for this advisory arm of Congress is COST—a very appropriate alphabetic designation because in my opinion, in that word, "cost," lies the basic concern of Congress.

And Congressman DADDARIO, of Connecticut, who has been presiding over the House Science and Astronautics Subcommittee's hearings into the relationship of science and Government, recommended a three-pronged program to improve Congress' ability to legislate in this area. He called for (1) strengthening of the staffs of committees which deal with problems of science and technology, (2) better equipping of the Library of Congress to gather information, and (3) the creation of ad hoc advisory committees to the appropriate congressional committees. I think the Congressman's suggestions are the most useful and I will explain why in a few minutes.

I submit that there are at least four reasons for this interest on the part of Congress.

First, there is cost consciousness. It is so familiar that it has become a cliche to recite how Government research and development expenditures have multiplied many times in recent years.

But to refresh our memories, Federal spending for research and development has multiplied a hundredfold since 1940; it exceeds 10 percent of the Federal budget, and accounts for two-thirds of what the entire Nation spends on research and development. Industry, colleges, and universities, and other nonprofit institutions account for the other third.

Another way of looking at this is from the standpoint of time and cost estimates. One of the knottiest problems in the administration of science and technology or, for that matter, the setting of policy concerning science and technology, is the fact that many budgeted costs are based on an estimate which does not hold true for any long period of time. For example, the Air Force estimated in 1960 that Project Skybolt would cost $893 million; in 1961 the estimated cost had reached $1.9 billion and by the summer of 1962—when Skybolt was scrapped—the cost estimate had climbed to $2.3 billion, and Skybolt was a year and a half behind schedule. The course of events, due either to underestimation of technological problems or overestimation of capability to achieve target dates within the dollars asked, caused the cancellation of Skybolt. Another example is the ANP project. In November 1951 one contractor estimated that it would take $188 million to deliver its nuclear powerplant for mounting an aircraft by May of 1956. By 1961, when the project was canceled, the cost of that one company had reached over $527 million, and the powerplant had never been delivered. The total cost of ANP, when it was scrapped, has exceeded a billion dollars.

Curiously, however, the money supposedly wasted on the nuclear-powered plane may yet pay valuable dividends. The positive findings of the ANP program in metallurgy and instrumentation may become the foundation for the design and development of the proposed supersonic airliner. Also, as a result of the ANP program, much technology in materials, shielding, and fuel elements has been developed which has a wide application in reactor technology of all kinds. When the Nation has a need for nuclear aircraft, the experience of ANP will certainly provide the base upon which a realistic program can be built.

Another example is the technology developed as part of the much-maligned Navajo program which was canceled after an expenditure of approximately $800 million. The guidance system developed for the Navajo program went into the Snark missile and has been used for all future generations of missiles produced since the Navajo. With modification it will continue to be the basic guidance system for missiles for years to come.

There seems to be a law of nature which, simply stated, is that knowledge, however useless at the moment of its discovery, will, at the proper moment in history, find its place in the scheme of things and make its contribution. To quote more philosophically, Newton at one time stated that if his concepts of science were better than Descartes, it is only because he stood upon the shoulders of giants—and Descartes was one of the giants.

So, when you hear about the waste in research and development, it may be only correct for that moment in history. Future use of the technology may well have been worth the expenditure.

A better way must be found to estimate the long-range costs of these programs and more accurate target dates for their completion must be determined. It is bad enough that the estimates of costs escalate to a fantastic degree, but it could be disastrous when the defense of the country may rest upon the availability of a specific system at a given time to respond to a threat. This is more important when one has made an early selection to go down one route of development rather than another and then finds that the choice was wrong.

Often overlooked in the consideration of the cost of a specific system is the cost of associated resources which must be dedicated to achievement of the goal. Support for system operational capability is often a much more expensive and complex package than is the specific project for which it is required. When the specific project is canceled, it sets off a disruptive chain reaction with serious economic implications. This leads to another critical problem. We hear much about the shortage of scientists and engineers, but I have the feeling that the problem is maldistribution and misuse of talent rather than a numerical shortage, although we are going to need more and better trained engineers and scientists over the years.

One can get concerned about this faced with the fact that often there are six or seven major contractors preparing proposals for one specific program which obviously can go to only one company. The effort that goes into the preparation of technical proposals requires large blocks of scientific and engineering talent. In some organizations,

more man-years of effort are spent in drawing proposals than in the actual performance of technical missions.

For a measure of this cost-conscious mood, perhaps "the most unkindest cut of all" was the House action reducing the National Science Foundation budget by 45 percent.

Recently, William D. Carey, Executive Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, said that "funds for research and development have come so easily in the past decade that in some quarters of the scientific community, we find a state of mind that assumes that the miracle of the loaves and fishes will go on indefinitely and that the mere assertion of a valid scientific need will suffice to turn on the financial gusher once more." So it appears that the justification for the 16th and 17th billion dollars for R. & D. will be made on different grounds than that which sufficed for the first $15 billion.

Cost consciousness, therefore, is a first reason for congressional attention to the endless frontier. Second is the belief among some Members that Congress has lost the ability to oversee effectively the vast diffusion of R. & D. activities for which it appropriates funds. As proof, take Senator BARTLETT's statement when he submitted his proposal: "At the present time," said he, "the Congress does not appreciate the importance of scientific decisions and as a result they are made, not in the Halls of Congress, but elsewhere, not by the elected Representatives but by unknown administrative officials. * * * How is a popular elected Government to control its own activities? How are elected officials to direct development of something they do not understand with implications they do not comprehend?" They are profund questions which go to the heart of our representative system.

Third, there is concern that the procedures of Congress, in some respects, may not measure up to the demands of "big science." New techniques for better obtaining information may be required so that Congress will approach parity of knowledge with the executive agencies—in other words, that Congress will have its own sources of accurate information apart from the agencies and that this source of information will enable Congress to better judge the merits in any particular research and development project.

Fourth, criticism of the space program as "moon madness" and "lunacy" gets lumped in with the criticism of heavy spending for research and development. While the space program is a large part of the scientific and technological picture, it is a long way from being a "stunt." I was somewhat amused at the way in which critics of this Nation's lunar landing mission were quick to interpret Premier Khrushchev's recent remarks as a Russian withdrawal from manned exploration of the moon. It was no such thing. We tried to say so but it finally took Khrushchev to set the critics straight.

I do, then, agree that the Congress needs various types of advice on technical matters. But it is important, first, to clarify once and for all the definition of just what scientific advice is. On examination of the content of the $15 billion being spent this year for science one will discover that only a small fraction of this figure is actually being spent for basic research. The predominant amount is being spent for hardware which is being designed and produced not by scientists but by engineers.

Let's take a minute to examine the $15 billion of Federal expenditure which too loosely gets labeled as spending for science. In reality, of the $15 billion, only $1.5 billion is for basic research, another $1.2 billion is for research and development facilities, and $12.3 billion is for developmental hardware, which is not science, but is engineering and technology with the greatest bulk spent with private industry.

The $15 billion is spent in the following manner: 67 percent through contracts with private industry, over 10 percent through grants and contracts with universities and other nonprofit institutions, and the balance by Government scientists in Federal facilities.

Most of this spending is accounted for by the revolutionary changes in defense systems which have taken place within the last decade. While the cost of defense is increasing, production line items have dwindled and the emphasis now is on fewer and more costly weapon units requiring correspondingly larger investments for research and development.

It seems to me that engineering advice is also to be included in the definition of advice. The engineers are the people who can give better estimates of cost and time than the producers of the scientific concept.

It is in the area of cost estimating of a program and the timetable required to develop and produce that Congress finds its greatest problems. I will elaborate on that point in a moment. Another important factor is that Congress needs to look on science not as a function such as agriculture or defense but simply as a factor—a factor of rapidly increasing importance—to be included in all other factors to be weighed in the solution of a variety of problems facing us.

When we look at the test ban treaty, or water pollution by synthetic detergents, or the NASA authorization bill, we see issues of public policy concerning which decisions are made not alone, or not even primarily, on the basis of technical factors but on many other factors as well—administrative, economic, political, social.

Ninety percent of the approximately $8 billion the Defense Department spends for research and development goes to produce hardware for better transport, communications, weapons, and other equipment—all of this to give the military the wherewithal to fulfill its approved missions. Knowledge of science and technology is not required for Congress to determine whether this money is being spent in consonance with assigned Defense responsibilities. The executive examines in great detail the way in which the Defense Department should operate. The detailed justification of the Defense budget to Congress reveals to the congressional committees what is hoped to be achieved with the funds. This can be measured against congressional understanding of military missions.

As an example, the Congress is fully capable of determining the role of the Air Force and the role of NASA in the total space program. This is neither a scientific nor a technical question. It weighs the broad missions of the Air Force and how best to accomplish them.

There are instances where Congress, because of its curiosity about new weapons systems, has actually pushed the services into developing new instruments of war. Witness the nuclear submarine.

I believe the kind of advice and information needed by Congress varies depending on the particular problem or situation. There are times, I think, when we need the advice of a group of the most prominent scientists we can obtain to discuss both the pros and cons of a particular question or approach to a problem, particularly where the major factor is technical in nature. For example, I believe we should have had such advice by way of education at the time of the decision of earth orbit versus lunar orbit as the best way to set up our moon program. We could have better understood the choices before us, the limitations of the alternatives and the probabilities of success and failure. On the other hand, I doubt if we could justify the full-time use of eminent scientists to review and analyze a particular agency's proposed research and development program. There might be an occasion where a panel could assist in reviewing a particular segment, such as the adequacy of the space sciences program or the basic research part of the defense R. & D. program.

Normally, however, I believe what Congress needs is the advice of a well-rounded scientific and technical "generalist," who having a scientific or engineering background is familiar with the workings of the Federal Government, and with a number of executive agency R. & D. programs, particularly with their management. Experience in coordinating the work and projects of others in terms of the overall mission or goal would be valuable. He also should be familiar with the scientific and technical community, so that he will know where to seek help when it is needed. He must have an appreciation of the values and ways of the legislative process, a feeling for public policy, and a capacity for sorting out public issues, competing values, and alternative solutions. Additionally, we need a person whose engineering background enables him to give us sound judgment on the costs of a project.

The committee structure plays an important part, naturally, in any discussion of this problem. Each committee is restricted in interest and scope of responsibility; yet many areas of congressional interest cut across many fields. For example, we cannot really review our water research and development program or our oceanographic research program, or our total basic research program, or our scientific manpower resources program, without cutting across committee responsibilities and looking at many executive department programs. Likewise, scientific and technical advice is required in many disciplines. For the Congress, or the Senate itself, to have a staff in a position to answer all of the inquiries of the various Members and committees would require a duplication of the staffs within the executive agencies. It would require people with detailed knowledge of the missions and programs of all of the executive departments. This is impractical, is too costly, and has never been the intent of Congress. Furthermore, I do not think Congress needs it.

I do not see how three or four scientists and engineers can provide the Senate, for example, with the quality and quantity of advice needed by the committees and their members. Science and technology are very general terms which we need to break down into scientific disciplines before we can analyze what kind of scientists and engineers we are talking about and whether or not they could meet our needs. How could a biologist, a chemist, and a physicist, either separately or in combination, assist the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences in determining whether to authorize funds for a deep space probe or a specific type of communications satellite system? If the physicist has a space background which enabled him to be useful to one committee then his time would presumably be taken up with that committee work and he would not be available to other committees.

Similarly, if the biologist were busy assisting the Committee on Agriculture, he would not be available to help other committees during the time when hearings were being held simultaneously by several committees. I do not see how one biologist can assist with problems of pesticides, the pollution of air, land, and water, manned spaceflight, or radioactive isotopes for cancer research. If, on the other hand, three or four experts were supposed to put us in touch with other experts, I should like to point out that this is what our permanent committee staff is already doing as the occasion demands and when it is possible to assemble these scarce professional experts. I note in one of the proposals that the Senate Com-

mittee on Rules and Administration is to determine the priority of answering requests made by Members and committees to the small group of scientists and engineers. To transfer responsibility from the proposed scientific group to our Rules and Administration Committee would not do away with the difficulties of determining priorities among congressional assignments, but instead could lead to a pattern of bottlenecks and bypassing.

Just as Congress must improve its understanding of science and technology, it is important that scientists and engineers have some appreciation of what is involved in the legislative process. This was well understood by Elihu Root when he said that "Politics is the practical exercise of the art of self-government, and somebody must attend to it if we are to have self-government; somebody must study it, and learn the art, and exercise patience and sympathy and skill to bring the multitude of opinions and wishes of self-governing people into such order that some prevailing opinion may be expressed and peaceably accepted. Otherwise, confusion will result either in dictatorship or anarchy."

Scientific advice is not something that is fixed and irrevocable. It changes with time and knowledge. The same scientific phenomena viewed from different angles pose different questions and demand different answers. The application of science may require new points of view because the frontier is changing, reaching out for new goals with new approaches. Science is too broad and it demands specialists. Men who are experts in naval reactors are not necessarily qualified to advise on reactors for space propulsion. We do not expect any single man in any discipline to be a repository of all the knowledge about his own discipline; we do not expect it in law, in medicine or any other field.

It is said that Congress, because it has maintained certain rituals for years, is a 19th century body faced with 20th century problems. I would suggest that while the precedents and practices of Congress have been maintained and are perhaps archaic in this age of science and technology, the minds of Congressmen are, in fact, products of the 20th century. There is no relationship between the rituals maintained by an organization and its mental capability. Congress could legislate as well in the 20th century if its Members still wore powdered wigs and capes instead of Ivy League clothes.

In addition to the scientific aspects and the facts assembled by engineers about a given proposal, we must ask ourselves such questions as these: What will the impact be upon our economy? What effect will it have on our foreign relations? Will it contribute to the health, education, and welfare of the Nation?

In spite of all the avenues which one may travel to get expert counsel, in the last analysis it is the collective wisdom of Congress itself which is most important. The term "scientific advice" loosely defined is an orderly organization of facts leading to a conclusion. The history of science is replete with commonsense convictions later found to be scientifically accurate. Curious men have always managed to secure for themselves skills and competent information without benefit of training in the sciences and without the calculated adoption of scientific procedures. These decisions, therefore, cannot be determined in isolation upon a completely scientific basis by disinterested officials. Such objectivity is more than we can expect from men who are creatures of their environment, and maybe more than is good for the democratic system.

I can give numerous examples from the area of atomic energy when Congress, for reasons of its own, and perhaps understandable only to the individual Members, has made momentous decisions which have withstood the challenge of history and have proven right. To cite a few:

The decision to proceed with the development of the hydrogen bomb against the advice of the General Advisory Committee;

The decision to plan a broad weapon program which required the development of large quantities of fissionable materials, even though predictions were that this country could never provide the uranium 235 and plutonium needed;

The development of the *Nautilus* and the nuclear submarine fleet, against determined opposition;

The development of a variety of power reactors.

Perhaps what I have just related will illustrate how a legislator can help shape—I hope intelligently—decisions on science and technology. The process of cross-pollination—that is, exposure to a range of problems through various committee assignments—can play a part in a Senator's decision.

So does the process of osmosis. Over a period of time, Members of Congress, through their committee assignments and awareness of the world around them, absorb some familiarity with the language and problems of the scientists and technicians. Since science is only one factor in the shaping of the good society, I would paraphrase Clemenceau that "science is too important to be left solely to the scientists."

However, I do not want to leave the impression that Congress has been infallible in its decisions on science and technology. Congress has made mistakes. In many cases, it has pushed programs too hard. But we politicians are not alone in making misjudgments. The basic theories of Newton, Galileo, Einstein, and others are now being challenged without loss of respect for these giants of science.

The aeronautical industry in 1953 completely failed to predict the space age, then only 4 years away. Prof. Simon Newcomb, a distinguished American astronomer, stated: "Human flight is not only impossible, but illogical." Newcomb published his conclusions in 1903—at the very moment the Wright brothers were about to demonstrate just how "illogical" the whole business was.

Congress is not a perfect instrument or even a near perfect instrument for making policy and laws. Certainly, I have attempted on occasion to change the procedures of Congress so that it can become a more responsible instrument of democracy. And, certainly, there is something wrong with our procedures when we find ourselves still trying to appropriate funds for the operation of Government for fiscal 1964, 5 months after the start of that fiscal year. This does not make the role of administrators any easier, and compounds the problems of managers of technical development programs.

To sum up, let me state what I think can be done to overcome the problems involved in the relationship of Congress with the "endless frontier." First, I think we need to strengthen the staffing of the committees which deal with this area.

Second, these committees should make intelligent use of ad hoc groups to give counsel on technical problems.

Third, there should be an easier flow of information between the congressional committees themselves so that Congress avoids needless duplication in repetitious hearings and overburdening of witnesses. As an example, the staff of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee this year has had a fine and continuing relationship with their counterparts in the House. This made for a more effective handling of the space authorization bill, and I think it is going to continue to pay dividends.

Fourth, the representatives of the executive agencies should improve their method of presentation to congressional committees. I do not believe that in discussing purely scientific problems there is any coloration of executive or legislative science. It is science for the Nation as a whole. There are a limited number of people available with the broad knowledge necessary to give Congress advice on purely scientific questions Although the Office of Science and Technology is an arm of the President, it would be most helpful if its staff could testify fully and adequately before congressional committees. The separation of legislative and executive powers in this regard can be carried to an extent that does damage to programs which both branches are mutually interested in.

Fifth, at the outset, the channels for gathering information through the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress should be expanded and greater use should be made of such existing organizations as the National Academy of Science, the National Science Foundation, and the National Research Council.

Furthermore, I think it might be useful in improving the lines of communication between the scientific community and Congress if Congress could receive an annual report on the state of science and technology. Each year we receive from the President a message on the state of the Union, a budget message and various other reports. The President transmits to us through the National Aeronautics and Space Council a report on the yearlong activities in space and aeronautics. Perhaps the National Academy of Sciences, through its various committees, could prepare a report by itself or in association with others such as the Office of Science and Technology. The report would briefly discuss the major programs in science and technology and would set forth what problems might be on the horizon which would require congressional attention. Separately, but more effectively, in conjunction with the National Academy, the American Association of Professional Engineers might report on the state of engineering since engineering is such a large part of Government R. & D. programs. I would like to see this proposal pursued to the mutual benefit of the scientists, engineers, and the public.

One critical essential to the effective spending of vast sums of money, the marshaling of thousands of scientific and technical skills and the construction of large installations is long-term planning. This might be called ivory towerish. Some might even label it socialistic. But without it we travel down roads, perhaps better left untraveled. Or we find that we start out in one direction and are unable to veer to another course when a change becomes prudent. Now is a very good time to begin thinking beyond Project Apollo as to what our next major objective in space should be.

If one examines in detail the capability in space being developed by this Nation, it will be readily apparent that it is a broad-based capability that will serve this Nation well for currently planned and future space programs. For example, we may conduct flybys and instrument landings on Mars to search out extraterrestrial life. Another goal might be an orbiting space platform for scientific and military research. Still another may be the establishment of exploratory bases on the moon. We should be giving very serious consideration to these and other possibilities in space in an atmosphere somewhat removed from pressures of the moment.

There are no magic ways or easy devices to solve the problem of providing Congress with adequate advice on science and technology. Any approach that some would view as ideal would still be a long way from perfection and could also produce undesirable effects upon both science and Government. As H. L. Mencken said: "An idealist is one who,

on noticing that a rose smells better than a cabbage, concludes that it will also make better soup."

You, as the doers of science, and we, in political life, have a mutual responsibility to improving the relationship of Congress and the "endless frontier." We, as concerned individuals and collectively as members of society, have a stake in this task. Each of us applying ourselves to it can do the job.

TAPE-RECORDED TELEPHONE SOLICITATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, developments in the electronic and scientific fields have brought unprecedented benefits all our lives. I hope that these developments will continue to help us live in peace and harmony with our neighbors without having to sacrifice our basic rights to solitude and privacy.

The December 1, 1963, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times contains an article about the development of an electronic sales pitch device, which I want to bring to the attention of the Senate. The article describes a method of telephoning literally hundreds of thousands of people and having a tape recording extol the glories of a product, show, book, or whatever else is being advertised in this manner. I believe that personal telephone solicitations are bad enough, but in this article I read of electronic telephone solicitations which can barge into the privacy of any home which has a telephone and rattle off their advertising message or political solicitations.

Mr. President, the manufacturers of these new devices allegedly defend their product by saying that since the messages will be tape recorded, people will be more willing to hang up if they do not choose to listen. At one time or another in our lifetimes, we all have made a mad dash for the telephone. Many times we have had to climb down ladders, come out of the bathtub, come in from working in the garden, and leave the dinner table in order to answer the telephone. Mr. President, I do not want to have to be subjected to receiving tape-recorded telephone calls from companies advertising their products. I do not think my constituents want to be subjected to them, and I do not think the rest of the Nation wants to be subjected to them, nor should the Nation be subjected to them.

If someone began showing movies on my livingroom wall from a projector across the street, I would naturally be outraged. Picture yourself sitting in the kitchen, your wife is preparing the shopping list—and then from a truck parked in front of the house a subliminal suggestion to buy a certain brand of soup or canned ham is flashed onto the wall. What an intrusion that would be, and so, too, would be an unsolicited and unwanted mechanical telephone call.

The developers further allege that if your line is busy when the device calls, it will call you back later. Such a device could soon gain the stature of a monster. If one manufacturer begins using it, others almost certainly will do so, and soon our days could be filled by trips back and forth to the telephone answering calls from these sales-pitch devices, or "phone monsters" as I term them. We would have little or no time for our personal use of the telephone. Our personal rights would be invaded, our personal lives would suffer, and many would boycott any product of a manufacturer who applied such an obnoxious sales technique in their home.

I will introduce a bill which would, if such a device is used in Illinois, prohibit the use of telecommunication lines used in interstate communications by any individual, organization, or company through the use of any electronic device employing unsolicited prerecorded messages.

Our Nation must continue to make technological advances, as it has in the past. But we must protect ourselves from abuses which may occur through the improper use of these scientific achievements. There is a right of privacy which should not be invaded. We cannot allow the worst features of George Orwell's "1984" to become a reality.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the December 1, 1963, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Dec. 1, 1963]

MASS PHONE SOLICITATIONS DEVISED

(By Dial Torgerson)

HOLLYWOOD.—You answer the phone, and a silky voice you remember from somewhere says:

"This is Gloria Glamoure and I have a grand idea for a party. Invite your friends for a dinner downtown and afterward, all of you come to see me at the Bijou, where I'm appearing in 'Practically Nothing at All,' Wednesday through Sunday. I'll be waiting."

This could happen—if a couple of bright young men succeed with their telephone advertising brainstorm.

Jeff Schottenstein and Joe Fischer have come up with a machine which can take a list of 50,000 telephone numbers, call them, tell when a voice answers, play a tape recorded message, say goodby, and hang up. Or call you back if the line is busy or if you're out.

FANTASTIC POSSIBILITIES

It's called Electro-Com, and it has some fantastic possibilities—as well as some aspects that Schottenstein and Fischer want to be very careful about.

"We're very aware of the resentment factor in telephone solicitation," said Schottenstein. "We will be very strict. We will have strict creative control over the machine, to make sure that irritating messages aren't used.

"We don't think a person should be called more than three times a month."

What if you don't want to be called? There's nothing you can do about it, anymore than you can about ordinary solicitors, except, of course, hang up.

LESS RESENTMENT

"Matter of fact," said Schottenstein, "that's one of the advantages of the machine. It's a recording, and people have no qualms about hanging up on it. The resentment factor is less than if there's a person on that phone."

The commercial uses of the device are almost literally staggering.

Schottenstein and Fischer think it could be used as the basis for a system of television ratings which could call 130,000 people while present rating concerns are calling 1,300. (The viewer's remarks would be tape recorded to be transcribed later by clerical workers.)

Or it could announce department store sales to charge-account customers, or let you know what movie is at the local theater. But in politics is where its richest fields may lie.

NOT USED COMMERCIALLY

Said Schottenstein:

"Before we perfected the automatic machine, we tried out a device where a girl dialed a number and then pressed a button, and out came the recorded message. We use it this year in 18 local political campaigns, and 11 of them won."

Only the prototype of the automated version is now operating and it hasn't yet been used commercially. Another 75 are being built, however.

NATIONALITY PITCH

Schottenstein and his associates are aware of what they call the "ethnocentric aspect" of political solicitation. In calling Chinese homes they have used Chinese pitchmen.

"We usually have someone the people know introduce the candidate, who then says a few words," Schottenstein said. "A known voice first is better."

In the same way, someone with a well-known Italian name could introduce the candidate to people with Italian names, and so on.

Schottenstein is a recent graduate of Ohio State University. His family owns soft-drink bottling franchises in Columbus. Fischer, son of a Hollywood managerial expert, went to Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and speaks five languages.

REQUIEM FOR PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in houses of worship through the land Americans have attended services in memory of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Last Monday, the Jal (N. Mex.) General Ministers' Association conducted a united memorial service at the First Methodist Church in Jal. At that service a poem written by Jenie Burke on the day after the assassination of President Kennedy was read. The poem is entitled "Requiem," and is a moving statement of the deep sense of loss felt by all Americans.

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

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

REQUIEM

How can I write
When the depth of my sorrow
Is torn with surges
Of frustration and anger—
When the tear almost shed
Looses itself in the void
The very chasm of my grief—
How can I write
What justice can be wrought
On the evil one
Who did this thing—
No power of civil society
May redress the wrong
No counter violence assuage our hurt—
The voices of powerful men
Sound small and weak
Each in a measure echoing
The thought all would speak—
To honor him is brief and pitiful
Unless we meet the challenge
of the war he fought
Against man's abuse of man
of the hope he brought
To the tired, the sick, the oppressed
of the peace he sought

For an anguished world power possessed—
How then can I write
Except that we bury him
In simple dignity befitting his estate
Among the unknown heroes
And their silent comrades of our wars
Yet in this hallowed place
Will echo through the corridors of time
The war he fought
The hope he brought
The peace he sought.

—JENIE BURKE.

PROCLAMATION BY CITY GOVERNMENT OF BIRMINGHAM, ALA., ON ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him; proclamation by the city government of Birmingham, Ala., in connection with the assassination of President Kennedy; a telegram to Mrs. John F. Kennedy; and a statement by the mayor of the city of Birmingham, dated November 22, 1963.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

Immediately upon learning of the news of President Kennedy's assassination, Hon. Albert Boutwell, mayor of Birmingham, Ala., sent a telegram to Mrs. Kennedy expressing the sorrow and sympathy of the people of the city of Birmingham. On the same day, the mayor issued a statement.

On the 23d day of November, Mayor Boutwell issued a proclamation declaring a 30-day period of mourning throughout the city of Birmingham. On November 26, at a meeting of the city council, Mayor Boutwell made a statement and offered a resolution which the city council adopted unanimously.

Mrs. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The government and the people of the city of Birmingham, Ala., enjoin our sorrow with that of America and most of the world in the tragedy that has befallen you, your children, and families. We mourn with you, and we mourn with the Nation. We pray to Almighty God that He will in His infinite compassion bless and comfort your hearts and the hearts of all who share with you in this time of grief.

ALBERT BOUTWELL,
Mayor.

STATEMENT OF THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

I sincerely believe that almost every man, woman, and child in Birmingham, regardless of how deep their personal political feelings may run, are shocked and saddened as I am by this terrible tragedy.

I speak for the city government of Birmingham—for myself, as mayor, and for President M. E. Wiggins and his fellow council members—in expressing to the President's personal and official families the depth of the sorrow and sense of tragedy that we share with them and with the people of the United States. In the name of the city government and the people it represents, I have sent a telegram of condolence to the President's wife and children, to express to them our sympathy in this time of their personal loss and personal grief.

Whatever forces may lie behind this terrible event, whatever persons may have inspired the striking down of a President of the United States, we can have no other feelings than one of sorrow and deep regret.

For the President's wife and children and the members of their families our hearts go out. We pray to Almighty God that He will, in His infinite compassion, comfort and strengthen them. And for the Nation we pray that divine providence will watch over and guide us in the troubled hours that will be the inevitable consequence of this sad day.

PROCLAMATION BY CITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Whereas the President of the United States of America has made the supreme sacrifice to which the courageous conduct of his office exposed him, as it has other great Americans and other Presidents; and,

Whereas his death, in the very prime of life, at the hands of a traitorous assassin, strikes a blow not only to our Nation but to the whole free world; and,

Whereas this city, its government and all its people, out of a deep and unalterable respect for the great office of the Presidency of the Nation, and out of sincere and human sympathy for the President's wife and his children and the members of their respective families, bow with them in sorrow; and,

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy's death in line of duty, has wiped out, for these hours of mourning and remembrance, all temporal differences of partisan feelings and united the whole free world in regretful sorrow:

Therefore, I, Albert Boutwell as mayor of Birmingham and by the privilege vested in that office, do proclaim, with the concurrence of the president of the City Council of Birmingham and such members of the council as I have been able to consult, and do declare that the 30 days, beginning November 22, 1963, and ending at sundown December 21, 1963, shall be for the city of Birmingham a period of mourning and respect, during which the flags of the United States flown upon public buildings and other official flagstaffs of the city shall be flown at half-mast; and, that the City Hall of Birmingham, and all other of its buildings, not essential to the services of public protection, shall be closed Monday, November 25, 1963, in observance of a day of prayer for the comfort of the President's family, and the blessing and guidance of Almighty God for the newly succeeding President in his administration of the affairs of our Nation.

I hereby request the effects of this proclamation to be observed by all the boards and agencies of the city, not essential to the maintaining of necessary services to the people of this city.

I further order that a copy of this proclamation be engrossed by the city clerk of the city of Birmingham, affixing upon it the great seal of the city of Birmingham and that the same shall be forwarded to Mrs. John F. Kennedy so that the bereaved family may know the sympathy and sorrow of our city in their hour of personal grief.

And, finally, I order that copies, similarly engrossed and sealed, shall be posted, together with appropriate floral wreaths upon the principal doors of the city hall of Birmingham, and there remain until sundown, November 25, 1963.

Given under my hand at Birmingham, Ala., this the 23d day of November 1963.

ALBERT BOUTWELL,
Mayor.

Attest:

JUDSON P. HODGES,
City Clerk.

STATEMENT OF THE MAYOR TO THE COUNCIL NOVEMBER 26, 1963

Mr. President and members of the council, I wish at this time to offer for your consideration a proposed joint resolution of the mayor and the council of the city of Birmingham.

There is no need to recall to anyone the tragic event of last Friday. Actions taken by your city government to express our deep and lasting sorrow and to condemn the senseless and inexpressably evil act of violence that took the life of President John F. Kennedy have already been conveyed to the late President's wife and widow and to the Nation.

The time of mourning that loss to ourselves and the Nation is not ended. Indeed, it will cast its shadow over a long time to come. But, mourning, as we still are, the undeniable reality of this hour is that a nation, reunited by tragedy, must now proceed upon its destiny under the leadership of the man the Nation chose, along with the martyred President, as its Vice President.

I, therefore, as mayor, offer the following resolution to the council for its concurrence, so that it may be presented to President Lyndon B. Johnson as a unanimous expression of our support and confidence as he proceeds in the tasks which destiny has thrust upon him.

Whereas on November 22, 1963, the cowardly act of an assassin fatally struck down John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America; and

Whereas on that same day, by virtue of his earlier election by the people as Vice President of the United States, and by the provisions of the Constitution, Lyndon Baines Johnson, after illustrious service in both Houses of the Congress and in the Vice Presidency, has now assumed the highest office and honor of Chief Executive of the Nation, and leader of the free world; and

Whereas in the performance of that office, he has earnestly and humbly evoked the support of this Nation, and the blessing and guidance of Almighty God for its successful accomplishment: Therefore be it

Resolved by the government of the city of Birmingham, on behalf of all its citizens of all races and creeds, That we do hereby declare our unstinting support in all that he may seek to do to accomplish what is good for this Nation, and to lead it in the paths of peace and prosperity; and be it further

Resolved, That we convey to the President of the United States our confidence in his leadership, and in the high ideals and principles that have characterized his public actions in the past, and predict his future directions; and be it further

Resolved, That we, as a government and a people, do join our prayers with his and with the Nation and with the prayers of free peoples everywhere, that Divine Providence may counsel him in wisdom, imbue him with unfaltering strength of mind and courage, and bless him with continuous good health against all the trials that lie before him, before us as a Nation. And finally do we pray that the God of peace and good will among men, will bless this Nation, under its new leadership, with lasting peace among the nations of the earth, and the material blessings of plenty to us and all mankind.

Judson P. Hodges, City Clerk; Albert Boutwell, Mayor; John E. Bryan, Councilman; Alan T. Drennen, Jr., Councilman; John Golden, Councilman; Don A. Hawkins, Councilman; R. E. Wiggins, President of the Council; Nina Miglionico, Councilman; Dr. Eleazer C. Overton, Councilman; George F. Seibels, Jr., Councilman; Tom W. Woods, Councilman.

TRUST LAND FOR MEMBERS OF THE ALAMO BAND OF PUERTOCITO NAVAJO INDIANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 649, S. 1931.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1931) to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 2, after the word "for", to strike out "agency, school, and"; 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 (a) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands lying within the Alamo Navajo community area, New Mexico, more particularly described in subsection (b) of this section and the improvements thereon, are hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States for the use of the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians, subject to the right of the United States to use said lands and improvements located thereon for administrative purposes.

(b) Lot 3 and the southeast quarter northwest quarter of section 6, township 2 north, range 6 west, New Mexico principal meridian, and improvements located thereon.

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1931) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DONATION OF LAND TO DEVILS LAKE SIOUX TRIBE OF FORT TOTTEN INDIAN RESERVATION, N. DAK.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 650, S. 536.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 536) to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2905.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2905) to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 2905) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 536 is indefinitely postponed.

TRANSFER OF PIEGAN UNIT OF BLACKFEET INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 651, S. 2279.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2279) to authorize the transfer of the Piegan unit of the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project, Montana, to the landowners within the unit.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, 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 Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the facilities of the Piegan unit of the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project, located in township 31 north, ranges 8 and 9 west, Montana principal meridian, including but not limited to easements, rights-of-way, canals, laterals, drains, structures of all kinds, and water rights held for the benefit of the unit, to an organization or association in form and powers satisfactory to the Secretary, representing the owners of the lands served by the unit: *Provided,* That as a condition to said conveyance, the grantee shall assume full and sole responsibility for the future care, operation, and maintenance of the unit, for which the United States shall have no further responsibility; and shall hold the United States free of all loss or liability for damages or injuries, direct or consequential, caused by the existence or operation of the unit or any of its features or structures, from and after the date of its conveyance.

SEC. 2. Upon conveyance of the Piegan unit of the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project as provided for in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to cancel all accrued operation and maintenance charges and all construction charges with respect to the said unit.

SALE OF INDIAN TIMBER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 652, S. 1565.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1565) 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.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "The trust or restrictions shall be regarded as imposed for the benefit of both the owner and his heirs, and not for the benefit of the current owner alone."; on page 3, after line 22, to strike out:

(d) For the purpose of this section, the Secretary may represent any Indian owner who is a minor, or who is non compos mentis, or whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or who cannot be located, or who fails or refuses to respond to inquiries, or whose interest does not exceed a one-sixteenth portion of the parcel under consideration.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(d) For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to represent any Indian owner (1) who is a minor, (2) who has been adjudicated non compos mentis, (3) whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or (4) who cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice of publication.

And, on page 4, line 17, after the word "windthrow", to strike out "or other causes." and insert "or other natural catastrophes."; 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 sections 7 and 8 of the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857; 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. The timber on unallotted lands of any Indian reservation may be sold in accordance with the principles of sustained yield, or in order to convert the land to a more desirable use, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, and the proceeds from such sales, after deductions for administrative expenses pursuant to the Act of February 14, 1920, as amended (25 U.S.C. 413), shall be used for the benefit of the Indians who are members of the tribe or tribes concerned in such manner as he may direct.

"SEC. 8. (a) The timber on any Indian land held under a trust or other patent containing restrictions on alienations may be sold by the owner or owners with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, and the proceeds from such sales, after deductions for administrative expenses to the extent permissible under the Act of February 14, 1920, as amended (25 U.S.C. 413), shall be paid to the owner or owners or disposed of for their benefit under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. It is the intention of Congress that a deduction for administrative expenses may be made in any case unless the deduction would violate a treaty obligation or amount to a taking of private property for public use without just compensation in violation of the fifth amendment to the Constitution. Sales of timber

under this subsection shall be based upon a consideration of the needs and best interests of the Indian owner and his heirs. The Secretary shall take into consideration, among other things, (1) the state of growth of the timber and the need for maintaining the productive capacity of the land for the benefit of the owner and his heirs, (2) the highest and best use of the land, including the advisability and practicality of devoting it to other uses for the benefit of the owner and his heirs, and (3) the present and future financial needs of the owner and his heirs.

"(b) Upon the request of the owners of a majority Indian interest in land in which any undivided interest is held under a trust or other patent containing restrictions on alienations, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell all undivided Indian trust or restricted interests in any part of the timber on such land.

"(c) Upon the request of the owner of an undivided but unrestricted interest in land in which there are trust or restricted Indian interests, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to include such unrestricted interest in a sale of the trust or restricted Indian interests in timber sold pursuant to this section, and to perform any functions required of him by the contract of sale for both the restricted and the unrestricted interests, including the collection and disbursement of payments for timber and the deduction from such payments of sums in lieu of administrative expenses.

"(d) For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to represent any Indian owner (1) who is a minor, (2) who has been adjudicated non compos mentis, (3) whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or (4) who cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice by publication.

"(e) The timber on any Indian land held under a trust or other patent containing restrictions on alienations may be sold by the Secretary of the Interior without the consent of the owners when in his judgment such action is necessary to prevent loss of values resulting from fire, insects, disease, windthrow, or other natural catastrophes.

"(f) A change from a trust or restricted status to an unrestricted status of any interest in timber that has been sold pursuant to this section shall not affect the obligations of the Secretary of the Interior under any contract of sale that is in effect at the time such change in status occurs."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 1565) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ROSEBUD SIOUX INDIAN RESERVATION, S. DAK.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 653, S. 711, which is the last measure to be considered at this time.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 711) to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "land", to insert "located in Tripp, Gregory, and Lyman Counties, South Dakota, and"; on page 2, line 9, after the word "acquired", to insert "for the tribe"; in line 13, after the word "an", to strike out "Indian" and insert "enrolled member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe"; in line 15, after the word "title", to strike out "shall" and insert "may", and after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Upon request of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, South Dakota, acting through its governing body, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to mortgage tribal interests in isolated tracts of land, in lieu of selling or exchanging them, and the proceeds of the loan secured by the mortgage must be used exclusively for the acquisition of land on the reservation within land consolidation areas approved by the Secretary of the Interior, title to the land acquired being taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon request of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, South Dakota, acting through its governing body, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to exchange or to sell, by public or by negotiated sale, the tribal interests in isolated tracts of land located in Tripp, Gregory, and Lyman Counties, South Dakota, and held by the United States in trust for the tribe: *Provided,* (1) That the Secretary of the Interior certifies that the tract is isolated in that it is so located or situated that it would be to the economic advantage of the tribe to sell or exchange the tract; (2) that the amount or exchange value received by the tribe is not less than the fair market value of the tribal trust land and is accepted by the tribe; (3) that any proceeds from the sale of land under this Act are used exclusively for the purchase of land on the reservation within land consolidation areas approved by the Secretary of the Interior; (4) that title to any land acquired for the tribe under this Act by purchase or exchange shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe; (5) that if lands in an exchange are not of equal value the difference in value may be paid in money; and (6) that if an enrolled member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe acquires the tribal trust land, title may be taken in the name of the United States in trust.

SEC. 2. Upon request of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, South Dakota, acting through its governing body, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to mortgage tribal interests in isolated tracts of land, in lieu of selling or exchanging them, and the proceeds of the loan secured by the mortgage must be used exclusively for the acquisition of land on the reservation within land consolidation areas approved by the Secretary of the Interior, title to the land acquired being taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments may be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2467.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is the House bill identical with the Senate bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair will lay the House bill before the Senate.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 2467) to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 2467) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 711 is indefinitely postponed.

ONCE AGAIN TITO HITS UNITED STATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an interesting article was published in the Sunday, December 1, New York Times. It is interesting for several reasons.

Usually the New York Times is very conscientious in its prompt reporting of news articles.

The article to which I refer carried a November 21 dateline. In other words, the article appeared 11 days after it was reported to the New York Times. The dateline is November 21, the day before President Kennedy was assassinated.

The source of the article is Yugoslavia. The article indicates that the Government-controlled Yugoslavian newspapers and periodicals have taken an increasingly sharp anti-Western and anti-United States propaganda line, and that the line was taken only a few hours, virtually, after the Senate defeated the amendment to the foreign aid bill which would have denied to Yugoslavia most-favored-nation treatment. After that action was taken to help Yugoslavia, she did what she has persistently done in the past—after the United States took friendly action toward Yugoslavia she turned around and opposed the interests of the United States. The position Yugoslavia took was particularly absurd because she criticized the United States for the recent incident on the autobahn in which the Soviet and East German troops held up American troops and prevented them from having free access to West Berlin.

The Yugoslav Government also praised Cambodia for turning down American aid, saying that this was the kind of neutralist attitude that Yugoslavia approves. This, although we have given Yugoslavia some $2 billion of aid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

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

YUGOSLAVS TURN CRITICISM ON UNITED STATES—PRESS ATTACKS POLICIES ON VIETNAM, ARMS, AND BERLIN

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, November 21.—Government-controlled Yugoslav newspapers and periodicals have taken an increasing sharp anti-Western line in the last 2 weeks, singling out the United States for criticism on several issues.

Western diplomats appeared to be at a loss to explain the motives for misrepresentations and denunciations that have been published here since President Tito returned last month from a visit to the United States.

The Yugoslav Communist criticism covers such subjects as U.S. policies in South Vietnam, Cambodia, the United Nations disarmament talks, Latin America, and Germany.

U.S. OFFICERS ACCUSED

Particularly irritating to Americans here has been the Yugoslav version of the incidents on the autobahn to Berlin in which U.S. Army convoys were held up by Soviet troops in a dispute over procedures.

Belgrade newspapers such as the party organ Borba, the large-circulation Politika and its new evening publication, Politika Ekspres, have attributed responsibility for the incidents to U.S. Army officers.

Moreover, several of these newspapers misrepresented the facts of the autobahn procedures to their readers, describing the Soviet attempts to get the soldiers to dismount and be counted as "regular inspection."

Tanyug, the Yugoslav press agency, yesterday misrepresented the nature of Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman's mission to Brazil, asserting that he had gone there to present the U.S. case against "illegal nationalization" of American companies.

Today, the latest issue of the Review of International Affairs, published in Belgrade, carried an article suggesting that the United States and other Western countries were obstructing further efforts toward disarmament at the United Nations.

INITIATIVE CREDITED TO REDS

Writing in the journal, Josip Djerdja, Deputy Chief of the Yugoslav delegation to the United Nations, asserted that all initiative for disarmament following the treaty for a partial nuclear test ban treaty had come from Communist countries.

Mr. Djerdja added that the Western Powers had not displayed the same degree of "readiness and interest" in pursuing disarmament steps as the Eastern countries.

On the question of U.S. relations with Cambodia, the Yugoslav press has slanted some reports against the United States.

Until today the anti-Western undercurrent has not been reflected in any statements by the Yugoslav Government. But this afternoon, the official spokesman of the Foreign Ministry, Dusan Blagojevic, described the Cambodian Government's decision to bar American aid as being "on the line of nonalinement and strengthening of independence." He added that such an action was "understandable and close to us."

Western observers appeared to be concerned that the increasing anti-Western tone of Yugoslav press commentaries might be a prelude to a shift in the foreign policies of the Belgrade regime.

FIGHT FOR EQUALITY IN OUTBOUND AND INBOUND OCEAN FREIGHT RATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I recently introduced two bills, S. 2328 and S. 2329, which were designed to attain greater equality in outbound and inbound ocean freight rates and thereby assist in easing our balance-of-payments difficulties.

Monday the Washington Post carried an article entitled "What To Do About Shipping Conferences" by Mr. Harvey H. Segal.

Mr. Segal quotes Adam Smith's famous observation:

> People in the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices.

The present international shipping conferences are a good example of just such arrangements on a formalized basis. Moreover, as Mr. Segal points out, the market power of these conferences "has been bolstered by the policy of the Maritime Administration which withholds subsidies from lines that do not abide by conference agreements."

Mr. Segal then points out that the conferences engage in all of the various practices common to cartels which monopolize control over international prices:

> There is a system of dual rates which provides lower rates for shippers who agree to use only conference lines for some minimum period of time. Certain conferences offer deferred rebates to loyal customers, and the Celler committee in 1958 uncovered evidence of secret rebates in times of excess capacity or overtonnage. In addition, many conferences have pooling agreements under which the total earnings on a particular route are shared among the members.

As Mr. Segal writes, the Maritime Commission has now called upon a number of the conferences to correct rate disparities. However, "while welcome, this belated action raises some serious questions about the ability of a U.S. Government agency to perform a regulatory function within the framework of the international shipping cartels."

One of the facts which has amazed me about these shipping conferences is how little is known about their ratemaking procedures. While there may be some reasons for rate differentials between outbound and inbound shipments to the United States, Mr. Segal concludes:

> It is fair to assume that they (the conferences) have magnified the differentials—it is quite likely that they have pegged certain commodity rates at levels which work to both their disadvantage and that of the public at large.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT TO DO ABOUT SHIPPING CONFERENCES

(By Harvey H. Segal)

"People in the same trade," wrote Adam Smith, "seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices." And if the good Dr. Smith had been able to observe the activities of the world steamship operators over the past century, his tart statement would have been even less circumspect.

Ever since the later 1860's—and perhaps even before—efforts have been made to regulate competition in ocean shipping through the establishment of conferences in which operators agree to play the game in a gentlemanly fashion by fixing commodity rates on various routes.

At the present time there are scores of shipping conferences or international cartels operating openly with the support of national governments. In the Shipping Act of 1916 and subsequent amendments, Congress authorized American shipowners to participate in conferences. And their power has been bolstered by the policy of the Maritime Administration which withholds subsidies from lines that do not abide by conference agreements.

The market power of the conferences is far from absolute because of competition from nonconference lines and tramp ships. But they have over the years perfected discriminatory devices in order to retain a large share of the market.

There is a system of dual rates which provides lower rates for shippers who agree to use only conference lines for some minimum period of time. Certain conferences offer deferred rebates to loyal customers, and the Celler committee in 1958 uncovered evidence of secret rebates in times of excess capacity or overtonnage. In addition, many conferences have pooling agreements under which the total earnings on a particular route are shared among the members.

Shipping conferences came back into the news when Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and his colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee revealed that the balance-of-payments problems are being aggravated by the wide disparities between inbound and outbound rates established in the shipping conferences. DOUGLAS' attack led to a shakeup in the Federal Maritime Commission, the agency charged with regulating rates, in which Adm. John Harllee replaced Thomas E. Stakem as Chairman.

The Commission has now taken its first significant step in an effort to regulate rates by calling upon 8 outbound conferences to correct the "alleged disparities" on some 45 commodities or provide a justification for their persistence. While welcome, this belated action raises some serious questions about the ability of a U.S. Government agency to perform a regulatory function within the framework of the international shipping cartels.

In the memorandum on ocean freight rates for steel products which Senator DOUGLAS released last June, there are enormous disparities between inbound and outbound rates, far greater than might be justified on economic grounds. However, subsequent testimony before the JEC indicates that ships on the outbound routes are more fully utilized than those on inbound runs, and this fact supports the presumption that some disparities between inbound and outbound rates would persist in the absence of shipping conferences.

But while surprisingly little is known about the conference ratemaking process, it is fair to assume that they have magnified the differentials. Because of higher capacity utilization, discipline in the outbound conferences is stronger, and it is quite likely that they have pegged certain commodity rates at levels which work to both their disadvantage and that of the public at large.

It has been proposed that the Maritime Commission pursue the well-established principles that guide the regulation of domestic utilities and eliminate discriminatory practices which conflict with the national interests. But this hopeful view overlooks several important factors. The rates charged by an electric power utility with an exclusive area franchise can be regulated without difficulty. But the shipping conference is a ratemaking body with an international membership of individual carriers, an organization that may be coerced but never controlled by the agency of a single national government.

Moreover, the conferences, like all international cartels, are inherently unstable.

When markets are slack and there is considerable overtonnage, discipline breaks down and individual members make "sweetheart" deals with shippers in order to fend off nonconference competition. In fact, one witness at the JEC hearings, the head of a chemical exporting company, remarked that the only factor that makes the dual-rate system tolerable is the existence of nonconference competition.

If the Maritime Commission is ever to control ocean freight rates, it will have somehow to strengthen the power of the conferences which constitute the only base upon which a regulatory structure can be built. But even if that could be accomplished, the cost would be very high. Ocean freight rates under a weak conference system are already higher than they would be in a free market; and effective regulation might mean an even higher and more rigid rate structure.

The alternative is a policy which would forbid American carriers from participating in the cartels. It might at first result in a greater instability of rates, but free markets offer a solution in an area where the traditional regulatory concepts have little chance of success.

"FOREIGN AID"—ADDRESS BY EUGENE R. BLACK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Eugene R. Black, formerly President of the World Bank and currently a director of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and a tremendously able man, recently gave a very thoughtful speech before the New York Chamber of Commerce on the subject of foreign aid. Mr. Black rarely gives public addresses at the present time. The contents of this address are so useful in connection with our upcoming consideration of the foreign aid appropriations bill, I believe that this speech should be called to the attention of Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the full text of the speech be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Black says in part:

I can and do get concerned over the fact that in the past we have been trying to spend more foreign aid than we have been able to administer effectively. We have been most reluctant to demand the conditions necessary to make aid effective in terms of economic development. We have settled for promises when we should have waited for action to justify our support. We have not developed that standard of project selection and preparation which should be the very hallmark of our work. In general we have succeeded in identifying foreign aid with large amounts of money, but not with large numbers of projects and programs which are building economic strength into the countries we are trying to help. Fortunately there has been concern in AID about these shortcomings as recent changes indicate.

I would like to suggest that we approach Congress in this direct way, and stop pretending that foreign aid is a sure cure for the political ills that plague us at the moment. Foreign aid should be presented to Congress as a means of promoting economic growth and nothing else. It should be presented in terms of projects designed to produce real wealth. It should be presented in response to actions, not promises, on the part of other countries which are seriously interested in econmic growth. It should be presented, not as a bribe for other nations to reform, but as an investment in other nations where reforms are already underway. Do this and I suggest the political benefits will come as natural byproducts.

EXHIBIT 1

FOREIGN AID

(By Eugene R. Black)

Mr. Champion, gentlemen, when I retired from the World Bank last January, I solemnly resolved that I would retire from making public speeches at the same time. For the first 40 or 50 years of my life I got along very well without making any public speeches and, on leaving the World Bank, I had hoped to return to this comfortable state of affairs. But I didn't figure on George Champion's insidious persuasiveness. He undermined my good resolutions, and he did so by appealing to the all-too-obvious need for those of us once connected with that business called foreign aid to speak out occasionally * * * to remind people that there is a problem, a very important problem, and that we have to learn to live with the problem just as surely as every new June bride has to learn to live with her mother-in-law.

The open season on foreign aid in Congress is exceptionally late and violent this year, the Appropriations Committees still have to reach their separate verdicts and the House-Senate conference, as usual, will have a job of compromising to do. In these circumstances, I do not want anything I say here to be interpreted as a lack of support for foreign aid. I believe in foreign aid. More important in the present circumstances, I think David Bell, the man charged with making the Agency for International Development work well, deserves from Congress a chance to show his mettle. Working with Mr. Bell on the Clay Committee, I was very impressed with his grasp of the complexities of his job and with the toughness of his mind.

In fact, if I could wish Mr. Bell one thing, I would wish him a clear-cut contract for at least 5 years in order that he might have a decent opportunity to put into effect some of the changes I know he wants to make. In the 15 years since the beginning of the Marshall plan we have had the ECA, the TCA, the MSA, the FOA, the ICA, and now AID. There have been 11 different foreign aid administrators, including Mr. Bell. That's an average tenure in office of less than 18 months. For a business that can't by its nature succeed in the short run, that is a formula for ineffectiveness if ever there was one.

I would also wish him some relief from his constant, and for long periods, total preoccupation with congressional reviews. Foreign aid is the only major program in the Federal budget which, in addition to the normal and necessary reviews of the Appropriations Committees, has to be authorized all over again each year in the House and Senate. In addition to that part of the foreign aid budget concerned with what I would call economic development, there is a large military aid budget which Mr. Bell must defend, yet which logically belongs in the regular military budget because after all, an important justification for giving arms and other forms of military support to foreign nations is that we thereby economize on our own military commitments and expenditures. Aid must absorb an enormous and, I think, quite unnecessary administrative overhead because it has four congressional hurdles to clear anew each year, and a bill to defend which covers an unnecessarily wide variety of subjects. Mr. Bell deserves to be relieved of some of these chores, which for so much of the year effectively prevent him from doing the job that he was hired to do.

I do hope Mr. Bell has a chance to do the job I think he can do; I do not want anything I say here to be interpreted as opposing the pending legislation, or in favor of substantial cuts in the amount requested. But I do not hesitate to say that I think the way our Government has administered foreign aid in the past has been seriously remiss in several important respects. In fact, I think it is clear now that there is a large consensus on this score in Congress, in AID itself and among interested outsiders like my colleagues on the Clay Committee.

The recent report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reflected this growing consensus in several important respects. First, the committee stressed the need to introduce more stability into the administration of foreign aid; second, the committee underscored the importance of persuading other nations, particularly former beneficiaries of the Marshall plan, to carry more of the financial burden. Finally, and I think most important, the committee made an appeal for more attention to the quality of the assistance that we give. Let me for a few minutes give my own variations on these three themes.

The Senators said that they were "unenthusiastic about aid programs * * * whose major purpose is to provide an alternative to Soviet bloc aid." Now here I think they put their fingers on one of the prime causes of instability in the administration of foseign aid in the past and of public disillusionment with foreign aid in the present. I have frequently argued that we ought to be very skeptical about crediting or debiting foreign aid for dramatic changes in the political atmosphere. It has been my experience that foreign aid has rarely gotten us anywhere in the short run. Foreign aid can be—should be—a most effective agent against communism in the long run by encouraging those policies and practices in other nations which lead to lasting economic growth. But it cannot be effective if it is turned on and off like a faucet in response to unreasonable political expectations.

I have been most interested of late to see how the Russians themselves appear to be painfully discovering the fact that foreign aid is not a very useful weapon for political skirmishes. I have over the years confidently predicted that the Soviets would find foreign aid an unrewarding business from the point of view of their political interests. Now it would seem that they are beginning to think so too.

The Soviets have a vested interest in everybody else's troubles. Buttressed by their naive belief in communism as the wave of the future, they are out to create political and economic instability as a prelude to communism. To them foreign aid is definitely a temporary business, designed to secure windfall economic and political profits.

Let's take a look at the record. No doubt some will regard Cuba as their shining success. But Russian foreign aid did not create Castro or bring him to power. Russian foreign aid only came after he was in power. The question is, "Will Russian foreign aid keep Castro in power?" This must be an embarrassing question to the Soviets; Cuba's bill which the Soviets have to pay is currently running at $1.5 million a day. Perhaps $2 billion worth of ruble aid has already gone to Cuba. Recent evidence in the newspapers suggest that the Soviets are very unhappy at this continuing drain. It would seem that the Soviets face the choice of reducing the drain by assuming ever more directly the functions of the Cuban government or of gradually backing away. Cuba, after all, is a relatively rich country, and this the Soviets know. Russian foreign aid to Cuba is almost certain to be a temporary business and so far it has clearly not been a very successful business.

What about the other countries to which the Russians have sent foreign aid in search of windfall profits? The list includes India, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Nepal, and Burma in south Asia; Syria, Iraq, and Egypt in the Middle East; Mali, Guinea, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Somalia in Africa; Cambodia and Indonesia in the Far East; and Brazil and Argentina in Latin America. These are the countries to which the Soviets have given or lent each $50 million or more which is hardly a large sum by the standards of U.S. aid, or, as a matter of fact, by World Bank standards. What about the windfall profits achieved?

In Iraq, a major recipient of Soviet aid, the Communist-backed prime minister, Kassem, lacked staying power; he was assassinated, and the Communist Party was outlawed under the succeeding regime. In Egypt, despite the Aswan Dam and considerable military assistance, the Communist Party remains outlawed—and the Egyptian government last year decided to adhere to the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the bulwark of the West's multilateral trading system. India, despite a billion dollars in Soviet aid, remains the world's largest working democracy and is clearly not aligned with the Communists.

If the *Soviets* have failed to show much in the way of windfall profits out of their foreign aid, their often obviously temporary and trouble-making interest in the business has been brought home forcibly to many countries. Burma has experienced the ill-effects of having its rice shipped to Russia and resold on the world market; Egypt has had the same experience with its cotton. Guinea, until recently exclusively dependent on Soviet bloc aid, has learned what it is to wait while promised Soviet delivery dates slip by and, in company with other countries, has experienced the illusion of the Soviet terms of aid, which are characteristically low in interest charges and high in the price of the goods shipped. Also, the goods have frequently been quite inferior, and there have been lots of difficulties with spare parts.

Our own foreign aid program has been similarly unsuccessful insofar as it has been used as an instrument for bartering against the Communists for the favor of the governments of the underdeveloped countries or for short-term political advantage in those countries. Foreign aid just is not suitable as a means of inoculating governments against communism or bringing about instant conversions from that political religion. Yet despite Mr. Bell's several references to the long-term problems to which foreign aid must be addressed, we still hear promises of economic and political windfall profits held out as arguments for increasing or maintaining the level of foreign aid. And recently these arguments have taken a new twist; we now hear urgent pleas to stop foreign aid when a coup d'etat is staged in a country we have been helping, and a less tolerant ruler replaces a more tolerant one, and I am afraid that here again we are pursuing unreasonable political expectations in the name of foreign aid.

Instead of trying to identify foreign aid with unrealistic political expectations, we ought to have been identifying it with high priority development projects—projects which are well engineered, well planned financially and which promise to produce things these countries want and need to earn their way in the world. Foreign aid in these countries ought to be identified with fiscal policies which offer some hope that local savings will flow into serious developments and not flee the country or disappear in inflation. Foreign aid ought to be identified, not with promises by countries of what they may do in the future, but with the first tangible steps towards action necessary to make economic growth a reality. Foreign aid ought to be identified with tax collection, not tax evasion; it ought to be identified with a healthy investment climate for foreign capital and not with the expropriation of foreign properties.

Here again there is a growing consensus, shared by the Senate committee and I know by Mr. Bell himself, that the major trouble with our foreign aid programs in the past has been too much concern over quantity and packaging, and too little concern over the quality of the product itself. I have said that a lot of the labels we have put on the foreign aid package in the past have been seriously misleading. I might add that I think there has been too much excitement over the quantities involved. Foreign aid has always been a stimulant to American exports; it is more directly now a stimulant than ever before. The Senate committee estimated that only 10 percent of current foreign aid expenditures represent a drain on the balance of payments. In view of this I cannot get very excited about the argument that foreign aid is a serious drain on our balance of payments.

I can and do get concerned over the fact that in the past we have been trying to spend more foreign aid than we have been able to administer effectively. We have been most reluctant to demand the conditions necessary to make aid effective in terms of economic development. We have settled for promises when we should have waited for action to justify our support. We have not developed that standard of project selection and preparation which should be the very hallmark of our work. In general we have succeeded in identifying foreign aid with large amounts of money, but not with large numbers of projects and programs which are building economic strength into the countries we are trying to help. Fortunately there has been concern in AID about these shortcomings as recent changes indicate.

Congress has tried in some cases to build into the foreign aid legislation some of the necessary conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective in terms of economic growth. There is for example the Hickenlooper amendment which would bar aid to countries which appropriate American property without prompt and adequate compensation. As a matter of fact, there is a new amendment to the Hickenlooper amendment which is being discussed now. That amendment goes even further than the original one and says that if any contracts or concessions are canceled by a foreign government, that no aid should be given to the country that canceled these contracts or concessions until adequate compensation has been paid, and paid in convertible currency. I'd like to say I am highly in favor of the Hickenlooper amendment and his new one. Congress has also opposed using foreign aid to support government-owned industries. I certainly favor this legislative limitation. In both cases the climate for private investment is at stake. Not only should we, as a matter of course, use our aid in every way possible to improve the climate for our own and other foreign private investments; we should also avoid encouraging the governments of these new nations to expand their operations into areas where other forms of finance and enterprise can be encouraged. There is no government now receiving foreign aid which does not have more now on its administrative plate than it can digest. So, to condone with or aid the acquisition of foreign industrial properties or to use aid to foster government-owned industries cannot, in my opinion, be justified in the name of promoting economic growth.

But most of the conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective cannot be legislated. As a matter of fact, attempts to do so would only compound further the already very difficult administrative problem which the AID Administrator faces. The tests of success in any foreign aid program are easy to state in generalities; is the program identified with high priority projects which are producing a higher standard of living? Is the Agency insisting on reasonable fiscal policies as a prior condition for its help? Does the program encourage reforms needed for economic growth? But there is no way that Congress, through legislation, can insure that any foreign aid program will pass these tests. In spite of the fact that whole libraries of books have been written attempting to define some fiscal policies, there is in practice no substitute for careful and mature personal judgment in deciding when fiscal conditions are ripe for aid and when they are not. Nor is there any reliable substitute for personal judgment when it comes to choosing among projects—when it comes to deciding what is of high priority and what is not. Our Congress cannot legislate reforms for other nations; they have to be negotiated. So, on all of these counts the AID Administrator's lot is not an easy one. He must adopt standards, deliberately; he must set conditions, consciously; and he must do these things without leaving the legitimate preserve of economic development and wandering into the purely political preserve.

Since the line between these two preserves is often very unclear, anybody who undertakes to administer foreign aid is, by definition, living dangerously. I have always thought that an international organization could offer certain protections which are particularly valuable in the administration of foreign aid—provided, that is, that the international organization is like the World Bank or the Monetary Fund, itself governed by financial principles and not simply an organization to allow a lot of recipient nations to divide up the contributions of a few donor nations. I think, as a matter of fact I know, it is somewhat easier for an international organization to ask for, to demand, and to receive the assurances and conditions necessary for effective aid without being accused of undue interference in the international affairs of the recipient countries or of trying to get some political advantage. I was therefore interested to see the Senate Foreign Relations Committee pick up this argument and lend its own endorsement in its recent report. I personally believe that the balance between bilateral and multilateral aid should be redressed in favor of multilateral aid. I would even make a guess that it will be redressed as time goes on. And as it becomes more evident that foreign aid can only be effective if it is identified with projects and programs that are in fact producing lasting economic wealth.

I do not look for or recommend any radical shift away from bilateral aid in favor of multilateral aid, but I do look for a gradual shift. I don't think bilateral aid can ever be completely free from the political pressures of the moment; to some extent it is bound to be wasted in efforts to put out political fires. In the long run, I think foreign aid will come to be accepted most readily where it is administered by organizations like the World Bank and the Monetary Fund, organizations whose primary objective is economic development and not to gain some political or commercial benefits.

But the problems besetting our foreign aid program are not basically institutional. Whether foreign aid is administered internationally, regionally or bilaterally, the important thing is the quality of the product—the conditions asked and the standards set.

I'd like to leave you with these three thoughts:

Some say that if the threat of communism were to disappear tomorrow, Congress would immediately cut off all foreign aid. I think this is a cynical argument. We don't need foreign aid because the Communists make it necessary. We malign the power and impact of our own heritage when we couple

foreign aid with the twists and turns of Communist policy. We give foreign aid because it is both imperative and unavoidable that we participate in the development of those countries which, largely because of their many-sided encounters with Western civilization, are desperately seeking some escape from their poverty. We have foreign aid because the achievements of our way of life in the past have made it a matter of self-respect in other nations to ameliorate their mass poverty. The presence or absence of the threat of communism in no way alters this fact. If we are to remain a great nation in the Western tradition—if we are to remain true not just to our humanitarian tradition, not just to our economic precepts which are built on the fact that prosperity flourishes only when the maximum number of people and nations share in it—if we are to remain true to our own heritage and if we are to accept the responsibilities history has thrust on us, then we will continue foreign aid.

Second, I would like to suggest that we approach Congress in this direct way, and stop pretending that foreign aid is a sure cure for the political ills that plague us at the moment. Foreign aid should be presented to Congress as a means of promoting economic growth and nothing else. It should be presented in terms of projects designed to produce real wealth. It should be presented in response to actions, not promises, on the part of other countries which are seriously interested in economic growth. It should be presented, not as a bribe for other nations to reform, but as an investment in other nations where reforms are already underway. Do this and I suggest the political benefits will come as natural byproducts. Can we not say of our own experience that it is by concentrating on economic development that we have most successfully ameliorated our own political problems? Should we not say of foreign aid that economic development is what we are after in the realistic hope that it will yield political byproducts consistent with our own security and prosperity? We've tried putting the political byproducts first; now I think we should try putting economic development first.

Finally, I agree with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that more effort and thought should be given to ways and means of internationalizing our aid effort. The challenge of development in Asia, Africa and Latin America affects all Western nations because all Western nations have contributed so much to the kind of world we live in today—a world divided increasingly by the gap in wealth between those who have practiced economic development and those who are only just now learning how. It makes political sense, but more important it makes economic sense to pool the resources and talents of the Western nations in organizations which have no other purpose than promoting development. This is the best way, I submit, to gain acceptance for the conditions which must be met before foreign aid can do its work.

The question, then, is not: Should we continue foreign aid? Of course we should and we can afford every penny which is administered effectively. The question is: How can we improve the quality of the product? Foreign aid is one business where it should be a matter of pride to produce a quality product. And if we insist on this I predict that the growing opposition to foreign aid by Congress and others will disappear as it should.

TAX CUT MAY AGGRAVATE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, our balance-of-payments problems become increasingly serious as we confront the grim possibility of being unable to meet our military commitments to the free world overseas because of the decline of our gold balance and especially because of the rise in claims against our remaining gold.

Whatever merits the tax cut may have, it may worsen our balance-of-payments situation if it does the job it is designed to do: stimulate our economy into faster expansion.

Mr. President, in today's New York Times there appeared an excellent article by Mr. M. J. Rossant entitled "Johnson and the Dollar." This article summarizes a number of the problems which confront our new President with respect to the continuing balance-of-payments deficit. As this article indicates:

> Much of the credit for the steadiness of the dollar in international financial markets is attributed to the cooperative defensive arrangements devised by the Kennedy administration. But this defense in depth, which Mr. Johnson is commited to continue, is designed to prevent a currency crisis, not to shrink the deficit in the Nation's international transactions with other countries.

The article by Mr. Rossant also refers to an excellent study that appeared in the November issue of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia's Business Review. I ask unanimous consent that this article, as well as the article by Mr. Rossant, be printed in the RECORD at the end of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Federal Reserve article examines the question of whether a stimulus in the rate of economic growth in this country will help to solve our balance-of-payments problem. Incidentally, Mr. President, I should mention at this point that there is no indication in the Federal Reserve Bank's Review of the author of this article. However, it was written by Mr. Jack C. Rothwell, who is an economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. Mr. Rothwell also wrote a longer and excellent article which recently appeared in a compendium published by the Joint Economic Committee. This compendium is entitled "The U.S. Balance of Payments—Prospectives and Policies," and Mr. Rothwell's article begins on page 119 of that compendium. Many of the conclusions in the Philadelphia Federal Reserve's Review are documented in more detail in the Joint Economic Committee publication.

Mr. Rothwell in his review article examines the past periods characterized by the substantially differing rates of economic growth and observes how our balance of payments actually behaved during these periods. He studied every cycle since 1920.

He concludes:

> In only 2 out of the 10 cycles composing the 1920–62 period (and also in only 20 percent of the postwar cycles) was our balance of payments better off in the fast growth or expansion phase than it was in the recession phase.

He also notes:

> The items composing our net private capital flow abroad, we see that all contributed to an improvement more often in recessions than in the accompanying expansion phase. The pattern is even more pronounced in the postwar cycles than in the period as a whole.
>
> Looking next at the trade picture, our net export balance shows a 50–50 pattern during the entire period, indicating no preponderance of improvement in expansions or recessions.

One general conclusion which stems from this article is:

> The most comprehensive measure of our balance-of-payments performance is a slight edge to improvements during the expansion phase. This is true both for the 1920–62 period and the 1945–62 period.
>
> Yet the margin is small. During 6 out of 10 cycles, this combination of items shows improvement as we move from slow to fast growth; during 4 out of 10 cycles, it shows deterioration. Indeed, the test for statistical significance (the daggers on the table show which items may be considered statistically significant) tells us that we can have virtually no confidence that the 60–40 pattern did not evolve simply due to chance.

The conclusion of the author, therefore, who to my knowledge has studied the subject more perhaps than anyone else is:

> One would thus be hard pressed to make a case for the growth thesis.

The author also examines the relationship between growth and the balance of payments over longer periods of time than a single business cycle. His conclusion here is:

> In general, table IV suggests that fast-growth periods are associated with deterioration in the balance of payments (increases in outflows of funds or decreases in inflows) and slow-growth periods with improvement.

Thus:

> One might conclude that the evidence presented suggests that the growth thesis may be a case of oversimplification, that the behavior of our balance of payments is extremely complex and defies simple explanation, that there is simply no clear-cut and statistically discernible tendency for an acceleration in the rate of growth to bring about an improvement in our balance of payments.

Mr. President, on the basis of this extremely informative study, as well as the even more detailed study which appeared in a Joint Economic Committee compendium, it is my conclusion that the policymakers who have supported a tax reduction on the grounds that it will aid our balance-of-payments position are stretching a point for which there is no good statistical evidence which confirms this position and there can be serious doubt that any improvement will take place. Quite the contrary, it can be reasonably expected that some deterioration in our balance of payments may be associated with tax reduction.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1963]

JOHNSON AND THE DOLLAR—NEW PRESIDENT FACES KEY DECISIONS IN NATION'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS BATTLE

(By M. J. Rossant)

The dollar stood up remarkably well in the shock of President John F. Kennedy's assassination, but President Johnson still faces some

important decisions in the battle to eliminate the chronic deficit in the Nation's balance of payments.

Much of the credit for the steadiness of the dollar in international financial markets is attributed to the cooperative defensive arrangements devised by the Kennedy administration. But this defense in depth, which Mr. Johnson is committed to continue, is designed to prevent a currency crisis, not to shrink the deficit in the Nation's international transactions with other countries.

THE ORTHODOX REMEDY

In forging its economic policies, the Kennedy administration sought to avoid the orthodox formula for a nation facing a deficit in its international balance of payments. The orthodox remedy calls for restraining the domestic economy until a payments surplus is achieved, but by resorting to a system of bilateral and multilateral currency arrangements, the administration managed to pursue a policy of domestic stimulation.

This cushioning technique paved the way for the expansion in business activity, now close to 3 years old and still going strong.

But it has done little to correct the imbalance in the payments position. The United States has bought time to get its international position back into balance, but the gap remains uncomfortably large.

GREATER EFFORT NEEDED

Mr. Johnson will have to decide whether he should reinforce the battery of weapons assembled by Mr. Kennedy to shrink the deficit. The late President had been disappointed in the slow progress being made to reduce the deficit and accepted the need for a greater effort.

In making his decision, Mr. Johnson will not want to put a brake on domestic expansion. Like Mr. Kennedy, he appears determined to promote a faster rate of economic growth.

Yet pressure for reducing the external sea of red ink is rising. A call for more effective action was made by Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president of New York's Bankers Trust Co., in a recent speech before the Industrial Conference Board.

Mr. Reierson, who had favored the Kennedy administration's approach, cited the "growing impatience of foreign central bankers and Government officials" at the persistence of large deficits.

According to Mr. Reierson's estimates, this year's deficit will be about $3 billion, or well above the $2.2 billion recorded last year and the $2.4 billion of 1961. He thinks that the administration must show "convincing evidence of sustainable progress" by new steps beyond those already in operation.

A similar call appears in the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia's Business Review. In an article in its November issue examining the relationship between growth and the balance of payments, it casts doubt on the popular thesis that stepping up the rate of domestic economic development will help to stem the outflow of gold and dollars.

Its analysis shows that the balance of payments registered an improvement in only 2 out of the 10 fast-growth periods between 1920 and 1962. The article suggests that the "growth thesis may be a case of oversimplification" because there is "no clear-cut and statistically discernible tendency for an acceleration in the rate of growth to bring about an improvement in our balance of payments."

ANOTHER APPROACH

While it is not against faster economic growth as one means of curing the deficit in the balance of payments, the Philadelphia Federal Reserve counsels that "we should not put all our eggs in this basket; we should not even commit half our eggs."

Instead, it calls for continuing to "strive for balance-of-payments equilibrium across the entire broad spectrum of public and private policy." And, echoing Mr. Reierson, it adds that "perhaps we should intensify our efforts."

An intensification in the battle to reduce the deficit would not involve any abrupt change in the tactics of strategy.

True, administration officials have stated that the demand for across-the-board tax reductions while primarily aimed at stimulating domestic growth, would also benefit the balance of payments by increasing the opportunity for profitable investment in domestic industry. But whether this is valid or not, they have not pinned their hopes on faster growth alone.

The fact is that the Kennedy administration did not rely on a single dramatic gesture to curb the deficit. It tried to plug up the leaks one by one, always being careful to keep its measures from hampering domestic growth.

Its combination of orthodox and radical steps was not intended to cure the deficit overnight. But this year, when the deficit worsened, the administration was forced to take special action.

In July the Federal Reserve Board increased its discount rate to slow down the outflow of short-term funds. This was followed by Mr. Kennedy's proposal to levy a tax on American purchases of foreign stocks and bonds, which had produced a big drain of long-term capital. In addition, the administration pledged to reduce the outflow of military expenditures.

Mr. Johnson's announced determination to maintain the Kennedy administration's policies to defend "the strength and the stability of the dollar" means that he will go along with this program. Even if he wanted to make a change, his freedom of maneuver is relatively limited.

He could attempt a faster reduction in military or economic aid, but this would not be consistent with his commitment to Mr. Kennedy's foreign policy. Nor can he hope for any swift increase in exports, for it looks as if the forthcoming Kennedy round of trade negotiations will be slowed down.

So, if urgent action is required, he may have to turn to monetary policy, the remedy suggested by Mr. Reierson. Along with many other authorities, Mr. Reierson believes that another increase in the discount rate would have a deterrent impact, actual as well as psychological, on the outflow of dollars.

Another rise in the discount rate might be considered a continuation of the Kennedy program. After all, the Treasury prepared the way for the last increase in the discount rate by publicly urging its rise.

But such a move would face opposition in some administration circles. A number of administration officials are prepared to go along with a more flexible monetary policy to help reduce the deficit, particularly if Congress approved a cut in taxes. But others are skeptical about the effectiveness of monetary policy in bringing about a reduction and fear that it might put a brake on domestic activity.

The issue also involves the independence of the Federal Reserve, which, during Mr. Kennedy's reign, managed to cooperate with the administration's economic policies.

Mr. Johnson will have to decide whether a stronger effort is needed, and work out his own relationship with the money managers. He has been spared any immediate decision by the strong showing of the dollar, but he may soon have to consider bringing up reinforcements for the payments battle.

[From the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia Business Review]

WILL GROWTH STOP THE GOLD DRAIN?

(NOTE.—Some say an increase in the rate of economic growth in this country will help solve our balance-of-payments problem and stem the outflow of gold to foreign lands. In this article we examine the reasoning behind this argument and take a look at some evidence which may help answer the question.)

Eighty-five feet below the busy streets of Manhattan lies a treasure in gold—over $13 billion cast in bricks, truncated pyramids, and thin sash-weight bars. Each bar bears the seal of its caster, some exotic Oriental gold merchant, or perhaps the mighty House of Rothschild. And each bar is carefully stacked in one of 118 steel wire cages, many of which evidence the preserve of a particular foreign government or central bank.

In recent years, long hours have been spent transferring gold bars in and out of these cages. The men putting in these hours are the physical manifestations of a problem which has plagued this Nation for over 6 years. They are employees of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and much of the metal they put into the cages marks the physical shift of gold from U.S. ownership to that of foreign nations. It is partial settlement of our balance-of-payments deficit.

The payments deficit stems from the fact that we have been paying more out to foreign nations for imports, investments, military aid, and the like than we have received from them for our exports of goods and services and from other international transactions. To make up the difference, we have paid out gold and dollars, and foreigners have accumulated our short-term I O U's in such forms as Treasury bills and commercial bank time deposits.

Of course, a nation, much like an individual, can't go on forever spending more than it receives. So we have been doing many things to try and decrease our deficit. These things range all the way from Government-sponsored programs to expand exports to a decrease in the dollar value of duty-free goods that American tourists may bring in from abroad. Yet the deficit has continued.

In recent months a relatively new balance-of-payments thesis has gained widespread acceptance: that the deficit can be relieved through an acceleration in the rate of economic growth in this Nation. In this article we examine the degree of confidence which might be accorded this thesis on the basis of experience with growth and the balance of payments.

But first, just what is the reasoning behind the growth thesis?

REASONING

The rationale behind the growth proposition concerns both the international capital and trade transactions between this country and foreign nations. It is reasoned, first of all, that more rapid economic growth in the United States will make this Nation more attractive to foreign and domestic investors—more attractive because accelerating growth will create a greater demand for capital and a rise in profits and interest rates. Greater demand for capital and higher profits and interest rates will cause both domestic and foreign investors to channel more of their funds into U.S. investments—into new plant and equipment, purchases of stocks and bonds, and into short-term investments, such as Treasury bills. The increased investment at home, it is reasoned, will mean a reduction of investment funds flowing abroad—funds that reached a $3.3 billion total last year.

It is also reasoned that accelerating economic growth would have favorable effects on our trade position. A higher growth rate, the argument goes, would increase income and demand for goods. Greater demands for goods during a period of less than full employment would increase production from present levels, thereby doing two things: (a) cutting unit costs of production, and (b) providing more profits so business could modernize plant and equipment, thus further cutting costs. This double-edged decrease in costs would help both our export

industries and our import-threatened industries to compete with foreign goods.

It is recognized that the rise in incomes created by a hike in the growth rate might mean an increase in imports and thus an increased outflow of dollars for imported goods. But the growth proposition concludes that the combination of (a) the decrease in capital flowing abroad, and (b) the better competitive position of our export and import industries will provide more than enough counterforce to make up the increased imports and still contribute to a reduction in our deficit.

This is the argument. Let us examine it in the light of experience.

TECHNIQUE OF ANALYSIS

Since the theory hinges on growth, one might go back in history, look at periods characterized by substantially differing rates of economic growth, and see how our balance of payments actually behaved. During periods of fastest growth, for example, did the rate of capital outflow really decline in response to greater demands for capital and higher profits and interest rates? And what actually happened to the trade balance?

To answer these questions, balance-of-payments flows first were examined during different phases of the business cycle. Every cycle since 1920 was analyzed to see if discernible patterns of behavior could be established for balance-of-payments items as the cycle phase shifted from fast growth to slow growth to recession. Then longer time spans were examined to see if the expected growth patterns emerged. First, then, how did the balance of payments behave over the differing growth phases of the business cycle? The answer to this question is provided in the tables which follow. But before we examine the findings, let us take a look at the structure of the tables.

THE TABLES

Column 1 of the first three tables contains several balance-of-payments items, both individual entries and selected groupings. First, we have the total of net private capital flows abroad and then the sub-items which compose these capital flows.

Next we have private capital outflows and foreign capital flowing in, and the difference between the two, both including and excluding a portion of errors and omissions. (Errors and omissions is a catchall category which includes flows of funds which have gone undetected in the process of gathering together the balance-of-payments statistics. The category is thought to be composed of a sizable portion of undetected capital flows.)

Next comes our imports and exports, our net export balance, and finally we have combined net capital flows, trade balance, and errors and omissions.

The remaining columns contain a series of ratios for each balance-of-payments item and group. The ratios tell us the percentage of business cycles in which an improvement occurred as we changed from a slower to a faster rate of growth. For example, if in 8 of the 10 cycles occurring since 1920 the capital outflow slowed down as we moved from recession to expansion, then we would put 80 percent in the expansion column and 20 percent in the recession column, indicating that capital flows contributed to an improvement in our balance of payments 80 percent of the time as we changed from recession to the faster growth phase.

The cycles in the first two tables are broken into two time periods: the period 1920–62 and the subperiod 1945–62. Of course, our balance-of-payments data were not so good during the earlier years, but the similarity of behavior during the two periods is an indication that the data may be adequate for the type of analysis employed.

Now to the findings of the analysis. What actually happened to our balance-of-payments items as we moved from slower to faster rates of growth?

RESULTS

Looking first at the net private capital flow abroad in table I, we see a different sort of picture than we might have anticipated, given the growth thesis. In only 2 out of the 10 cycles composing the 1920–62 period (and also in only 20 percent of the postwar cycles) was our balance of payments better off in the fast growth or expansion phase than it was in the recession phase.

Looking next at the items composing our net private capital flow abroad, we see that all contributed to an improvement more often in recessions than in the accompanying expansion phase. The pattern is even more pronounced in the postwar cycles than in the period as a whole.

When we add one-half of errors and omissions to the net private capital flow abroad,[1] we see a 50–50 pattern during the entire period 1920–62, indicating no preponderance of improvement in expansions or recessions. In the postwar period, however, there is still a slight edge in favor of improvements during recessions.

After calculating the difference between U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows, we once more see a 50–50 pattern during the 1920–62 period and a slight edge in favor of improvement during recessions for the postwar period.

Adding one-half of errors and omissions to the U.S. capital flow changes the pattern only slightly. In both periods we are better off 6 out of 10 recessions, and 4 out of 10 booms.

Looking next at the trade picture, our net export balance shows a 50–50 pattern during the entire period indicating no preponderance of improvements in expansions or recessions. In the postwar period, a slight edge appears during the expansion phase.

TABLE I

Balance-of-payments item	Percent of total business cycles during which item contributed to an improvement in the balance of payments [1]			
	1920–62 (10 expansions, 10 recessions)		1945–62 (5 expansions, 5 recessions)	
	Expansions	Recessions	Expansions	Recessions
1. Net private capital flows abroad	[2] 20	[2] 80	[3] 20	[3] 80
(a) Direct investments	[4] 33	[4] 67	[3] 20	[3] 80
(b) Long-term portfolio investments	[4] 37	[4] 63	40	60
(c) Short-term investments	[4] 44	[4] 56	[3] 20	[3] 80
Net private capital flows abroad plus ½ errors and omissions	50	50	40	60
2. Foreign direct and long-term portfolio investment in the United States	70	30	80	[2] 20
3. U.S. private capital flows less foreign direct and long-term investment	50	50	40	60
Above plus ½ errors and omissions	40	60	40	60
4. Exports of goods and services (excluding military transactions)	30	70	[3] 20	[3] 80
5. Imports of goods and services	60	40	60	40
6. Net export balance	50	50	60	40
7. Net export balance less difference in U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows	50	50	60	40
Above including total of errors and omissions	60	40	60	40

[1] In this and following tables balance-of-payments items from which the ratios are derived are expressed in average monthly flows of funds. An improvement during the boom phase (say in capital account) would occur if the rate of outflow of funds decreased relative to that in the preceding recession period or if an outflow of funds in the recession were replaced by an inflow. NBER reference dates were used to determine cycle periods and quarterly balance-of-payments data (yearly data in the earlier period) were interpolated to arrive at the average monthly flows of funds for each cycle.

[2] Statistically significant at 90 percent level of confidence.

[3] Statistically significant at 80 percent level of confidence.

[4] Odd number because availability of data permits comparison of fewer cycles, 9 for direct investment and short-term capital, 8 for long-term portfolio investment.

The last entry in table I combines our capital flows, net export balance, and errors and omissions. As can be seen, this most comprehensive measure of our balance-of-payments performance gives a slight edge to improvements during the expansion phase. This is true both for the 1920–62 period and the 1945–62 period.

Yet the margin is small. During 6 out of 10 cycles, this combination of items shows improvement as we move from slow to fast growth; during 4 out of 10 cycles, it shows deterioration. Indeed, the test for statistical significance (the references on the table show which items may be considered statistically significant) tells us that we can have virtually no confidence that the 60–40 pattern did not evolve simply due to chance.[2]

In summary, then, private U.S. capital tends most often to cause deterioration rather than improvement as we move from recession to expansion. But after adding in errors and omissions and foreign capital inflows, the total capital account shows little preponderance for improvement during either the expansion or recession phase. Similarly, out net export balance shows no marked tendency toward improvement in either expansions or recessions. The same thing is true when we group capital, the net export balance, and errors and omissions. One would thus be hard pressed to make a case for the growth thesis on the basis of table I.

But let us go a step further. It is quite possible that the balance of payments responds to an increase in the rate of growth only after a timelag. One might reason, for example, that (a) it takes time for increased growth to be reflected in rising profits and interest rates, (b) it takes time for investors to become aware of the increased growth, higher interest rates, and profits in

[1] No one really knows the amount of undetected capital flows counted as errors and omissions. The 50-percent figure might be considered a rule of thumb.

[2] The chi-square test was used to determine statistical significance. The hypothesis formulated was that the items contributed predominantly to neither improvement nor deterioration in our balance of payments during either phase of the cycle. A rejection of this hypothesis on the basis of the test indicated that an item did indeed contribute predominantly to improvement or deterioration. The percentage indicates the degree of confidence (i.e., 80 percent, 90 percent) with which the hypothesis was rejected. This confidence did not prove extremely high even for the items where the hypothesis was rejected.

this country and (c) time is required for the physical arrangements necessary to direct a larger volume of investment into the domestic economy.

TABLE II

Balance-of-payments item	Percent of total business cycles during which item contributed to an improvement in the balance of payments (6-month lag in balance-of-payments items)			
	1920–62 (10 expansions, 10 recessions)		1945–62 (5 expansions, 5 recessions)	
	Expansions	Recessions	Expansions	Recessions
1. Net private capital flows abroad	30	70	[1] 20	[1] 80
(a) Direct investments	30	70	[1] 20	[1] 80
(b) Long-term portfolio investments	[2] 50	50	40	60
(c) Short-term investments	[2] 56	44	60	40
Net private capital flows abroad plus ½ errors and omissions	50	50	40	60
2. Foreign direct and long-term portfolio investment in the United States	60	40	60	40
3. U.S. private capital flows less foreign direct and long-term investment	60	40	60	40
Above plus ½ errors and omissions	50	50	60	40
4. Exports of goods and services (excluding military transactions)	[3] 80	[3] 20	[1] 100	[1] 0
5. Imports of goods and services	[3] 10	[3] 90	0	100
6. Net export balance	40	60	40	[1] 60
7. Net export balance less difference in U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows	60	40	60	40
Above including total of errors and omissions	50	50	40	60

[1] Statistically significant at 80 percent level of confidence.
[2] Odd number because availability of data permits comparison of fewer cycles, 8 for long-term portfolio investment and 9 for short-term investment.
[3] Statistically significant at 90 percent level of confidence.

Table II shows the recession-expansion comparison adjusted to include a 6-month lag in the payments items. Yet despite the lag adjustment, the main groups of items show a striking similarity to those in table I.

The total U.S. private capital outflow tends to cause deterioration in the balance of payments as we move from recession to expansion but, after correcting for errors and omissions and also when coupled with foreign capital inflows, the combined capital account once more shows little preponderance for improvement during either the expansion or recession phase.[3]

Similarly, the net export balance exhibits no very significant preponderance of improvements in either phase. The same pattern holds true when we group together the combined capital, the net export balance, and errors and omissions. Thus, on the basis of table II, one would also be hard pressed to make a case for the growth hypothesis.

Yet it is still possible that a very fast rate of cyclical growth might result in a balance-of-payments pattern more in keeping with the growth hypothesis. To test this possibility, a comparison was made of the behavior of the post-World War II balance-of-payments items within the expansion phase: as the cycle moved from the trough into the very fast upward phase and then leveled off into the phase of relative stability or "bumping along the top" as it is sometimes called. What, then, happened as the cycle moved from fast growth to stability? In fact, an interesting change occurred.

As shown in table III, we have a concentration of improvements in capital flows during the fast-growth phase. Both (a) U.S. private net capital and (b) the combined U.S. outflow and foreign inflow accounts show improvement in 80 percent of the cycles during the fast-growth phase. When we include errors and omissions, however, both accounts drop down to a statistically insignificant level: growth-phase improvements during only 60 percent of the cycles.

TABLE III

Balance-of-payments item	Percent of total business-cycles during which item contributed to an improvement in the balance of payments—1945–62 (5 recessions, 5 expansions)	
	Fast-growth phase	Stability
1. Net private capital flows abroad	[1] 80	[1] 20
(a) Direct investments	60	40
(b) Long-term portfolio investments	[1] 80	[1] 20
(c) Short-term investments	60	40
Net private capital flows abroad plus ½ errors and omissions	60	40
2. Foreign direct and long-term portfolio investment in the United States	40	60
3. U.S. private capital flows less foreign direct and long-term investment	[1] 80	[1] 20
Above plus ½ errors and omissions	60	40
4. Exports of goods and services (excluding military transactions)	[1] 0	[1] 100
5. Imports of goods and services	[1] 100	[1] 0
6. Net export balance	[1] 0	[1] 100
7. Net export balance less difference in U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows	40	60
Above including total of errors and omissions	[1] 20	[1] 80

[1] Statistically significant at the 8-percent level of confidence.

The net export balance in every cycle shows deterioration in the fast-growth phase and improvement in the stability phase.

Finally, when we combine capital, the export balance, and errors and omissions, we have improvement during the fast-growth phase during only one out of five cycles. The predominance of capital account improvements during the upswing erodes under the pressure of the export balance and errors and omissions.

Thus, even though the growth hypothesis looks a little better on capital account in the fast-growth/stability comparison, by no means are we able to establish the proposition.

But so much for the cycle. Let us now look at the balance-of-payments items over over time periods.

GROWTH AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS OVER LONGER PERIODS OF TIME

Table IV shows average annual percentage changes in selected balance-of-payments items during two fast-growth periods, 1921–29 and 1948–56 and two relatively slow-growth periods, 1930–39 and 1959–62. Of course, the depression period is associated with rather extraordinary events affecting the world economy, but since the years for which we have balance-of-payments data are limited, the period is included with the obvious qualification that the period may not be representative.

In general, table IV suggests that fast-growth periods are associated with deterioration in the balance of payments (increases in outflows of funds or decreases in inflows) and slow-growth periods with improvements. The table should not be taken, however, as evidence that the reverse of the growth hypothesis is true. The observations are too few, data in the earlier period are not without question—to mention just two reservations. Rather one might say that the table does not inspire confidence in the validity of the growth thesis.

As for the individual items in table IV, percentage increases in private capital flowing abroad are greater during the fast-growth periods (though this tendency is less evident when U.S. capital outflows are coupled with foreign capital inflows). The net export balance deteriorates during the fast-growth periods and improves during the slow-growth years, as does the grouping of capital, net export balance, and errors and omissions.

CONCLUSIONS

One might be tempted to draw the conclusion from this analysis that there is a slight edge in favor of the proposition that a faster rate of growth tends to promote a worsening in the balance of payments; that imports tend to grow faster than exports during the fast-growth periods, and that businessmen tend to invest more at home—but also more abroad during expansions (e.g., "Profits look good so let's expand in Cincinnati, and while we're at it we might reconsider the subsidiary in Milan"—or—"Things look good the world over so let's stretch out for an extra 1 percent on a Canadian issue").

Yet such a conclusion is probably unwarranted. After all (and as previously mentioned) the balance-of-payments observations are relatively few; the results of all comparisons were not uniform in outcome; the data may be questioned; there is some trend in the cyclical comparisons (though from an examination of the data, this problem is considered to be minimal).

To be on firmer ground one might conclude instead that the evidence presented suggests that the growth thesis may be a case of oversimplification, that the behavior of our balance of payments is extremely complex and defies simple explanation, that there is simply no clear-cut and statistically discernible tendency for an acceleration in the rate of growth to bring about an improvement in our balance of payments.

Given this conclusion, then, what guidance might this study offer the policymaker? Perhaps the following.

[3] It should be noted, however, that short-term capital flows now show a predominance of improvements as the cycle moves from recession to expansion (the postwar period).

TABLE IV

Balance-of-payments items	Average annual percent change in selected balance-of-payments flows over periods associated with differential rates of economic growth [1] (minus signs indicate a deterioration in the balance of payments)			
	1921–29	1930–39	1948–56	1959–62
1. Net private capital flows abroad	−8.6	+11.8	−24.7	−6.1
(a) Direct investments	(2)	+11.6	−12.6	−1.0
(b) Long-term portfolio investments	(2)	−6.0	−59.7	−8.3
(c) Short-term investments	(2)	−4.4	−137.2	−14.6
Net private capital plus ½ errors and omissions	−11.5	+14.1	−86.3	−4.3
2. U.S. private capital outflows plus ½ errors and omissions less foreign direct and long-term portfolio capital inflows	−4.0	+7.4	−53.5	−15.1
3. Net export balance	−2.4	+5.8	−6.6	+54.4
4. Net export balance less combined U.S. and foreign capital flows	−5.4	+7.8	−9.6	+130.9
5. Above including 100 percent of errors and omissions	−9.2	+7.1	−9.4	+70.2

[1] Percent change over the period is calculated from an average for the first 2 years of the period to an average of the last 2. Simple annual rates of growth as measured by the industrial production index are as follows: 1921–29, 11.6 percent; 1930–39, 2.3 percent; 1948–56, 6 percent; 1959–62, 4 percent.
[2] Not available.

An increase in the rate of economic growth may help relieve our balance-of-payments deficit. Then again, it may not. Hence the wisdom which may be gained from this study is perhaps this: we should not count too heavily on growth as an equilibrating force; we should not put all our eggs in this basket; we should not even commit half our eggs. Instead, we should continue to strive for balance-of-payments equilibrium across the entire broad spectrum of public and private policy. And perhaps we should intensify our efforts.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSTON obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield without losing his right to the floor, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

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.

PROVISION OF OFFICE SPACE, SUPPLIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FRANKING PRIVILEGES FOR MRS. JACQUELINE BOUVIER KENNEDY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H.R. 9291) to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am asking that this procedure be followed after having consulted with all members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. They do not object to this procedure.

I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina will not be read, but will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all mail matter sent by post by Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, under her written autograph signature or facsimile thereof, shall be conveyed within the United States, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, free of postage during her natural life.

SEC. 2. For a period of twelve months following the enactment of this statute, the Administrator of General Services shall furnish to Mrs. Kennedy suitable office space appropriately furnished, supplied and equipped as determined by the Administrator, at such place within the United States as Mrs. Kennedy shall specify. The supplies to be furnished shall include a sufficient quantity of envelopes marked "Postage and Fees Paid" to be used for international mail. For the same period the Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, provide for an office staff for Mrs. Kennedy. Persons employed under this subsection shall be selected by Mrs. Kennedy and shall be responsible only to her for the performance of their duties. Mrs. Kennedy shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for her under this paragraph which in the aggregate shall not exceed $50,000 during such period. The rate of compensation payable to any such person shall not exceed the maximum aggregate rate of compensation payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator. Each individual appointed under this subsection to a position on the office staff of Mrs. Kennedy shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the United States Secret Service, is authorized to protect the person of Mrs. Kennedy and her minor children for such period of time following the enactment of this Act as she may request.

SEC. 4. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this Act and to pay not to exceed $5,000 toward the expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, including undertakers' charges and the expenses of transportation, the sum of $55,000 to remain available until June 30, 1965: *Provided,* That no payment shall be made from this appropriation to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services. Appropriations now or hereafter available to the United States Secret Service shall be available for the purposes of section 3 of this Act.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the amendment would change the bill in two particulars. It would extend the period to 12 months instead of 6 months, and place a limitation of $5,000 on the funeral expenses. The House bill does not contain such a limitation. It is believed that there should be a limitation placed in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer his amendment as a complete substitute for the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes; I offer it as a complete substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina, in the nature of a substitute, is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield to me, without losing his right to the floor, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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. DIRKSEN. 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. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to Mrs. J. D. Tippit, of Dallas, Texas, the sum of $10,000 as a token of the gratitude of the Nation for the service rendered by her late husband in connection with the search for the assassin of the President of the United States.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on that fateful day in Dallas when our President was struck down by the cowardly hand of an assassin, Officer J. D. Tippit, in the course of his duties as a police officer, attempted to detain Lee Harvey Oswald,

the alleged assassin of our late President. In the course of doing his duty, Officer Tippit was shot dead. Officer Tippit leaves three children: Allen, 14; Brenda, 10; and Curtis Ray, 4.

Officer Tippit was in the prime of his life as a relatively young man. He had an outstanding record of service to his community and to the city of Dallas prior to his murder on November 22, 1963.

It is my fervent hope that my amendment will be adopted as a gesture of gratitude and assistance to the family of Officer Tippet, who so ably and courageously discharged his duty on that fateful day.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator's proposed amendment is more in the nature of a claim. We are concerned in the pending bill with a payment to the widow of the late President of the United States. The present procedure is somewhat in line with paying expenses of widows of Members of the House and of the Senate.

In my opinion, this is not the time or place to adopt an amendment of the kind the Senator from Texas has offered.

When I first came to the Senate I was a member of the then Claims Committee that considered these matters. The Judiciary Committee now has a special subcommittee which considers such claims made by various people. Such a claim goes through the Claims Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, where it is discussed. Consideration is given to how much is to be paid. Some thought is given also to the age of the widow, how many children are involved, and other considerations. All these matters are taken into consideration.

I fully agree that the widow of Officer Tippit should be paid something. However, I do not believe that an amendment of the kind the Senator from Texas has offered should be added to the bill now under consideration. His amendment should be in the form of a claim, and should be referred to the Judiciary Committee, to be considered by its appropriate subcommittee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have great sympathy toward the purpose of the amendment which is being proposed by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the substance of which has also been introduced in the form of proposed legislation by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. He introduced such a measure during the past week.

I hope that, because of the peculiar and tragic circumstances affecting the particular incident involved, with which the murder of Officer Tippit is also connected, and in line with the action already taken by the House, the Senate may consider by itself the particular proposal with reference to the widow of the late President of the United States.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Texas that so far as the majority leader is concerned—and I am quite sure I speak for the minority leader, as well—we will do our utmost to see that the consideration of the proposal for compensation for Mrs. Tippit is brought before the proper committee as expeditiously as possible, and when reported to the Senate, given consideration as soon thereafter as possible.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I assure the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that I do not want to do anything untoward or improper.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I know the Senator does not. The Committee on the Judiciary handles matters of this kind. I have the utmost sympathy for the widow of Officer Tippit, as does the Senator from Texas. Having offered the amendment at this time, I am glad to know that he feels as he does. However, I think the Senator will agree with me that the alternate method is probably the best way to proceed with regard to Mrs. Tippit.

Mr. TOWER. I understand; I agree with the Senator from South Carolina and with the majority leader. I wanted to have the proposal come before the Senate, because I believe there is a moral obligation to Mrs. Tippit. I am perfectly willing to defer to the wishes of the distinguished Senator from Montana and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and to withdraw the amendment, having been given assurance that consideration will be given to my proposal at another time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I concur in the statement of the distinguished majority leader. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I give the distinguished Senator from Texas further assurance that this proposal will receive our consideration.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill now being presented by the Senator from South Carolina, pertaining to allowances for Mrs. Kennedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill before the Senate is a House bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. This is a House bill. I have just offered an amendment, which is at the desk, making certain changes.

Mr. SCOTT. I withdraw my request. If the Senator will further yield to me, I wish to say that I support the amendment. It is most fitting and proper that such a provision be included. I congratulate the Senator from South Carolina for bringing up the bill in timely fashion, and I am happy to associate myself in support of it.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. It is highly appropriate that the proposed legislation should be enacted. I am glad the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has so promptly brought the bill before the Senate, so that it may be passed promptly. There can be no doubt that the flow of mail and sympathy to the former First Lady, as well as to the widow of the murdered policeman, have created a special burden. I believe it is altogether fitting and appropriate for the Congress to approve this legislation speedily.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding to me. My only purpose in the request was to say that I am sure that if it were possible, every Member of the Senate would wish to do as was indicated a moment ago by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]—to be a cosponsor of the proposed legislation. However, this is a House bill, and the parliamentary situation makes that impossible.

I commend the Senator from South Carolina for the expeditious manner in which he has acted and for the amendment he has offered. As one citizen and one Senator, not only do I wish to be associated with the proposed legislation, but I strongly support it.

Mrs. Kennedy gave a demonstration and an example of dignity, courage, and poise that the Nation will never forget. It was an inspiration to a whole people at a time when a nation needed inspiration and reassurance.

What the Senator from South Carolina is now proposing and what the Senate is about to do will, I am sure, express the wishes of every citizen of the country—not only of the country, but of people throughout the world. Therefore, I commend the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his gracious remarks. Mrs. Kennedy was wonderful throughout the ordeal to which she was subjected. It is impossible to express her attitude in words.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for polling the entire committee last week concerning this most meritorious bill.

President Kennedy and his charming wife wrote a brilliant chapter during a brief period of American history. Their leadership was expressed not only in matters relating to political affairs but also in cultural affairs.

Mrs. Kennedy, in her role as the wife of the President, did much to restore the White House as a great American treasure. Through her search for pieces of early American furniture and objects of art, she helped to reestablish the residence of Presidents as a historic shrine.

Mrs. Kennedy's courage and bravery during the cruel days following the assassination profoundly impressed the world. She set a pattern of conduct for all Americans.

I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for bringing the bill to the floor of the Senate so promptly. It is a very small thing that we do, but the guard

force that will be provided for her and her children is one of the things that will help, in some degree, to lessen the anxiety Mrs. Kennedy might otherwise face.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is proper that the proposed amendment to include relief for Mrs. Tippit has been withdrawn, to be included in a separate bill. While I hope to see legislation passed on behalf of Mrs. Tippit, I believe it would have been inappropriate to include it in a bill which relates to the family of the late President.

Last week I introduced a bill to pay Mrs. Marie Tippit, the surviving wife of Policeman J. D. Tippit, of Dallas, the sum of $10,000. That bill is now in committee. The majority leader has assured us that hearings can be had upon that bill. The measure now under consideration is for the family of the late President, John F. Kennedy, and is for their protection and to ease the painful period of transition from probably the best known Presidential family in the history of America, to the status of private citizens. The period of time provided in this bill for that transition will be the very minimum time that will be required. More time might be needed.

I commend the able chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for the expedition with which this measure has been handled through the committee, on which I have the honor of serving, and on the floor of the Senate today. It is one of the least things we could do for a brave and courageous family of our gallant fallen leader.

In connection with the statements that have been made about the high esteem in which the family of the President was held, having been in the motorcades with the President in Texas before his assassination, I saw crowds representing a considerable portion of the population of our State. More people saw President Kennedy in the six motorcades which he led in Texas in 2 days, before his assassination, than had ever seen any other one human being who had ever visited our State before in any comparable period of time. The people everywhere gave him a tremendously enthusiastic welcome. At Houston, the largest number of people who had ever seen one person in one parade prior to that time was the crowd that had turned out to welcome Astronaut Gordon Cooper upon his return to earth. Officers who saw the crowd that came out to see President Kennedy in Houston on the 21st of November told me that the number who saw President Kennedy were much larger—from 50,000 to 100,000 more people than the crowd that turned out to welcome Gordon Cooper. The same situation was true all over the State. Everywhere the crowds were large and enthusiastic. One of the biggest, most friendly, and enthusiastic of all was the crowd at Dallas.

The Presidential motorcade at Dallas had passed through the entire city; it had passed the last high-rise building on the parade route, on the embankment that leads down to the Trinity River Valley, in the heart of the city, but in that last high-rise building, an assassin lurked in a dark corner on the fifth floor. After that building, all the high-rise buildings would have been passed.

Texas had given President Kennedy the greatest reception that it had ever given to anyone before, when this horrible tragedy, this foul deed was done.

Commendations are due the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and to the Senate leadership, for the promptness with which they have brought this bill before the Senate. I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], concerning what this family did for the President and for the Nation, and for the esteem in which the people held the President, for the way he had conducted himself in the office of the Presidency, and in all the functions that go with it.

His deeds were nobly done; his widow equally endeared herself to the American people for her charm, grace, and bravery at his side.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator from Texas for his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 9291) was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE RIVER BASIN PLANS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, House bill 8667.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM PROJECTS IN MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maine such time as she may desire.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, in response to requests that I have made in my capacity as the senior Senator from Maine and as the ranking Republican on the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Commerce Department, certain information which has been submitted to me is of interest to the people of the State of Maine. Because of this, I submit this information for the RECORD.

The Area Redevelopment Administration and the accelerated public works program have committed funds totaling $8,807,000 in Maine since the inception of these programs in 1961 and 1962. A review of the impact of these programs on eligible areas of Maine to date reveals that the Federal funds represented 56 percent of the total cost of the projects, $15,630,000. Many projects involved State, local, and private sources of financing as well as Federal funds.

Together, the ARA—as of October 31—and APW programs—as of October 1—had initiated 75 projects in the form of industrial and commercial loans, in worker training assistance, in technical assistance, and accelerated public works projects. These projects are as follows:

ARA and APW programs initiated as of Oct. 31, 1963

	Number of projects	Federal costs
Industrial and commercial loans (ARA)	9	$2,430,000
Public facility (ARA)	1	165,000
Training (ARA)	14	109,000
Technical assistance (ARA)	5	81,000
Public works (APW)	46	6,022,000

The total investment in connection with the industrial and commercial loans amounted to $3,875,000, with $1,445,000 coming from other than Federal sources. The total costs of the public facilities were $195,000 and of the public work $11,370,000. The costs of the technical assistance and training projects were entirely federally supported.

Areas in Maine which are currently eligible for ARA financial assistance and APW projects are those having substantial and persistent unemployment and include Aroostook County, Hancock County, Knox County, Lincoln County, Piscataquis County, Washington County, parts of Penobscot County, and part of York County. In addition to these areas, part of Androscoggin County has been eligible for accelerated public works but not for ARA loan or grant assistance.

A detailed review of the ARA projects indicated that the nine industrial and commercial loan projects will result in 616 direct jobs when the facilities are in normal operation. These jobs have been proven by experience to stimulate almost as many other jobs in enterprises supplying the project or in local businesses favorably affected by the new payrolls. The public facility project was approved as necessary to the expansion of 200 additional jobs in associated industrial enterprises. The 14 training jobs had 357 enrollees acquiring new skills for available jobs.

The specific ARA projects as of October 31, their location, and the approved Federal funds are:

Statewide, Maine Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries: study of shellfish, $44,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Grafton Lumber Co.: lumber processing operation, $433,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Rumery's Boat Yard, Inc., boat storage, $19,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Sanford Water District: expand water system, $165,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Twin Ridge Corp.: apple warehouse, $102,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Department of Agriculture—SCS: aerial survey of York Co., $6,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Surveys and Research Corp.: study impact of Grafton Lumber Co. project, $2,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Maine Department of Economic Development: feasibility study of plant to process marine clays, $17,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, training: nurse aid, $5,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, training: sewing machine operator, $19,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, training: sewing machine operator, $5,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, training: stenographer, $11,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, training: sewing machine operator (Aletta Manufacturing Co.), $4,000.

Aroostook County, Greater Presque Isle Development Corp.: potato plant expansion, $1,040,000.

Aroostook County, Dumond Cedar Co.: cedar fencing plant, $56,000.

Aroostook County, Pinkham Lumber Co.: bandsaw lumber mill, $650,000.

Aroostook County, training: steno (refresher), $9,000.

Aroostook County, training: blemish remover (boot and shoe), $8,000.

Aroostook County, training: cutter, machine (boot and shoe), $4,000.

Aroostook County, training: stitcher—boot and shoe, $7,000.

Aroostook County, training: hand sewer—boot and shoe, $16,000.

Aroostook County, training: heeler—machine—boot and shoe, $9,000.

Knox County, Lime Products, Inc.: expand facilities, $39,000.

Knox County, training: sewing machine operator, $4,000.

Knox County, training: sewing machine operator, $4,000.

Lincoln County, training: nurse aid, $4,000.

Piscataquis County, Squaw Mountain Corp.: ski area, $63,000.

Washington County, Eric W. Kelly Peat Moss Co.: expansion, $28,000.

Washington County, Department of Agriculture: Forest resources inventory, $12,000.

Total, $2,785,000.

The accelerated public works projects in Maine were designed to provide jobs to the unemployed in needy areas. As of October 1, the 46 Maine projects had provided 1,634 man-months of work, with an additional 5,030 man-months of work to be provided before completion of the projects. These are onsite jobs, and do not include indirect effects of these projects on other jobs and business generally.

Matching funds from State and local sources amounted to $5,348,000. These funds added to the Federal contribution accounted for the total cost of the APW projects in Maine of $11,370,000. The approved accelerated public works projects in Maine as of October 1, by location, and the Federal costs associated with each project are:

Biddeford, Webber Hospital, $400,000.

Kennebunk, municipal building, $18,000.

Old Orchard Beach, treatment plant interceptors, $27,000.

Old Orchard Beach, sewer facilities, $112,000.

Saco, sewage treatment plant, $1,114,000.

Sanford, interceptor sewer, $172,000.

Aroostook County, fish and wildlife facilities, $12,000.

Aroostook County, fish and wildlife facilities, $13,000.

Eagle Lake Town, highway improvements, $8,000.

Eagle Lake Town, highway improvements, $12,000.

Caribou, sewage treatment, $441,000.

Caribou, library, $84,000.

Limestone Town, sewer facilities, $19,000.

Madawaska, sewer facilities, $24,000.

Madawaska, water facilities, $39,000.

Madawaska, firehouse, $34,000.

Madawaska, garage, $41,000.

Mars Hill, sewage treatment, $108,000.

Mars Hill, sewer facilities, $134,000.

Hancock County, fishery buildings, water supply, roads, $121,000.

Hancock County, fish facilities, $3,000.

Hancock County, forest preservation, $20,000.

Hancock County, stream fishway, $1,000.

Hancock County, Acadia recreation facilities, $176,000.

Hancock County, forest preservation, $28,000.

Bar Harbor Town, Mount Desert Island Hospital, $37,000.

Rockland, street improvements, $144,000.

Boothbay Harbor, sewage treatment, $435,000.

Boothbay Harbor, water facilities, $12,000.

Boothbay Harbor, sewer facilities, $73,000.

Wiscasset, treatment plant interceptors, $46,000.

Wiscasset, water facilities, $33,000.

Brownville, highway improvements, $17,000.

Washington County, construct buildings, recreation facilities, $5,000.

Washington County, recreation facilities, $360,000.

Washington County, fish facilities, $5,000.

Washington County, fish and wildlife facilities, $12,000.

Washington County, forest preservation, $285,000.

Machias, Down East Hospital, $495,000.

Calais-Baring, grading drainage and paving, $342,000.

Calais-Baring, earthfill dam, $18,000.

Auburn City, sewer facilities, $87,000.

Auburn City, water facilities, $194,000.

Lewiston City, water system, $50,000.

Lewiston City, sewer facilities, $80,000.

Lewiston City, waste treatment plant. $131,000.

Total, $6,022,000.

NEW FACILITY OPENED BY MEXICAN INSTITUTE OF REHABILITATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I noted in a recent report from Mexico City in the New York Times that the Mexican Institute of Rehabilitation is opening a new facility.

I had the privilege of visiting this institute when I was in Mexico City last year, and I can testify that few efforts in which U.S. citizens are involved have such direct and immediate and favorable impact as does the work being done by our rehabilitation specialists with U.S. surplus equipment.

I am particularly pleased because of the efficiency of this program, which operates with only 13 percent of its patients paying anything, and still does not run a deficit. More than 10,000 disabled Mexicans have been put back into the work force through the work of this institute under the dedicated leadership of Romulo O'Farril, Sr.

I am particularly pleased also to note that this fine institute is going to be emulated by other Latin American countries. This is indeed the Alliance for Progress in action.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Paul P. Kennedy, published in the New York Times on November 17, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MEXICO BROADENS HELP TO CRIPPLED—REHABILITATION INSTITUTE TO OPEN DORMITORIES

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

MEXICO CITY, November 12.—The Mexican Institute of Rehabilitation, which says it is the only enterprise of its kind in the world operating with only 13 percent of its patients paying, and still not running a deficit, is opening a new facility.

It is dedicating this week dormitories for indigent men and women coming down from the mountains in need of rehabilitation. These patients have no funds to get lodging while awaiting treatment. The wardlike dormitories will house 60 men and women until they can be examined, processed and assigned to rehabilitation procedures.

None of the officials, doctors, therapists, and nurses around the institute, situated on the outskirts of the city, know how long the organization's luck is going to hold out. But for the time being at least it is serving as a model in its field for three other Latin American countries. Ten more Latin American nations have applied for advice on setting up rehabilitation procedures of their own.

GIFT FROM LOTTERY FIRST

The rehabilitation system got its start with a $1,200,000 grant from the national lottery. At that time it was under the direction of the Ministry of Health and Welfare.

In 1956 one of the country's principal publishers, Romulo O'Farril, Sr., lost a leg in a motoring accident in Europe. He underwent rehabilitation in the United States and returned to Mexico dedicated to the idea of setting up a modernized rehabilitation center in the capital. The result was the institute.

The rehabilitation system has put more than 10,000 disabled Mexicans back into the work force, where they earn about $8 million a year. This is in addition to an estimated $1,400,000 saving to the Mexican Government on dependency outlays. It is esti-

mated there are about 14 million disabled persons in all Latin America, costing the various governments about $5,600,000 daily in dependency payments.

The United States has provided a rehabilitation specialist, David Amato, and has contributed surplus equipment. The Mexican Government has spent $5,986,000 on the program and the United States $304,000.

In addition to the thousands of Mexicans going through the institute, 350 Latin American rehabilitation technicians have been trained. They have gone back to their respective countries to begin programs of their own. These technicians include the staffs of the rehabilitation institutes in El Salvador, Honduras, and Peru, all set up under Mr. Amato's direction along the lines of the Mexican Institute.

PATIENTS BEGIN IN INDUSTRIES

The institute maintains a precept that a rehabilitated person sent home to vegetate is unrehabilitated so far as society and the state are concerned. As soon as a patient is restored to activity here, he is given an adaptability test then, as a general rule, he goes to one of the six small industries set up on the institute grounds in quonset huts.

He lives off the premises but commutes to his job, punches a timeclock and works under supervision. Wages are generally higher than the going rate for such work in regular factory jobs. He continues at the job until he proves he has regained his confidence at which time the institute's personnel finds him employment on the outside.

The small industries make automobile radios, furniture, wheelchairs, foam rubber products, and limbs and braces. Some of the industries, like the radio manufacturers, work on a profitmaking basis.

The institute's net profit in 1962 was $160,000, and in 1963 it is expected to be $300,000. Of the 1,500 capacity patient load day in and day out, 87 percent pay nothing; 13 percent pay according to ability. Of the latter, about half are considered wealthy. They are charged double the normal rates.

STATEMENT BY AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON DEATH OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most moving and thoughtful statements concerning the tragic death of our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was made by the AFL-CIO Executive Council. I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the council be printed in the RECORD, together with a statement relating to President Lyndon B. Johnson and a statement entitled "Hatred in America."

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

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, NOVEMBER 26, 1963, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The incredible loss of President Kennedy has put a stunned world in mourning.

Taken from our midst in madness and violence was a young man of stature and strength, a man with a zest for life, who had gaiety and wit and wisdom beyond his years. And even more, taken from us was a leader of greatness and courage and compassion—a humanitarian whose love of his fellow man was broad beyond belief.

All who love freedom and their fellow man now mourn. Aside from his immediate family, none mourn him more than the working people of this world, the voiceless millions bowed with grief. Only a handful of them knew him personally. But to all he was their leader, their champion, their friend.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy earned their confidence, their trust, their friendship. He gave them courage and a sense of destiny. He led them toward great victories over adversity that only a man of compassion could understand.

Only last September, millions of the lowest paid of this land had reason to be thankful to President Kennedy. Through his leadership, millions finally won the protection of the minimum wage law. These and other millions, through improvements in the minimum wage law, had more money to spend. To the world's cynics, it was a raise of only 10 cents an hour. But President Kennedy knew it was milk and bread and shoes for millions of his fellow citizens, and because he knew, he fought; because he fought, millions were his beneficiaries.

He knew too the misery and hopelessness of people in depressed areas and, because he felt their suffering, workers who were once marked obsolete because of technological change, today have a new chance for gainful employment.

He brought homes within the grasp of many; deplored and detested the slums that degrade our land; sought the abolition of exploitation and suffering and misery. And those for whom he fought will be eternally grateful.

Most of all, John Kennedy understood the degradation and humiliation that millions of Americans of different race and religious belief know in too many parts of our land. A descendant of immigrants, a communicant of a religious faith that also knew persecution, President Kennedy put his heart and strength into the struggle for civil rights. More than any President since Abraham Lincoln, whose fate he shared, John Kennedy brought to America understanding of the struggle, appreciation of the plight of the victims of discrimination and segregation, determination that America must—and would—win this battle against hatred.

And never did John Kennedy lapse into the smugness of victory. No success meant relaxation to him. He knew always that there were new goals ahead, new victories needed; new enemies of mankind to be conquered.

The prosperity which marked his 1,031 days in office was only a source of partial satisfaction to him. As he told us only a week before his martyrdom, partial prosperity is not enough; there can be no satisfaction while millions go jobless.

That was typical of John Kennedy for across the whole spectrum of American life—economic and social—John F. Kennedy stood for progress. He had no low horizons. He had faith in the limitless capacity of America and of Americans. He was a realist in both foreign and domestic affairs and he faced the realities without fear.

It was that very courage which, when the Soviets challenged us with their Cuban missiles, brought the world through one of its most perilous periods. The surprised respect which that crucial event won from the Communist world, and from our allies as well, may well go down in history as a turning point in mankind's struggle for peace and freedom.

For even as we Americans thought of him as our leader, John Kennedy was much more than that. He was not only a national leader but a world leader. He had the respect of presidents, prime ministers, and kings; and somehow he had also won the faith and confidence of the world's people, in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America alike.

The evidence is not merely in the assemblage of heads of state who came here to pay their last respects. Far more moving confirmation has been found on streetcorners throughout the world, from London to Laos, where the people of every race and every nation gathered to mourn a man they knew was wholly devoted to peace, freedom, and progress everywhere on earth. The flood of messages, expressing the most poignant sorrow from trade union organizations throughout the world, which we have received, evidence this fact.

There are few men in any age—men who can combine in themselves the fresh eye of youth with the wisdom of experience; the warmth of instinct with the coldness of necessity; the scholar's grasp with the politician's astuteness—men who dare to dream great dreams and yet dare to be practical as well.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was such a man and, because he was, our sorrow is all the greater.

A week before his assassination, he spoke these words to us:

"Marshal Lyautey, the great French marshal, went out to his gardener and asked him to plant a tree. The gardener said, 'Why plant it? It won't flower for 100 years.' 'In that case,' the Marshal said, 'plant it this afternoon.'

"That is what we have to do."

That is indeed what John F. Kennedy felt this Nation had to do, and he was determined to see that it was done.

This grieving Nation is left with more than memories; it has been bequeathed a program, a practical dream, whose fulfillment will be the lasting monument to the leader who conceived it.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council speaks for workers everywhere in mourning the loss of this great and beloved man, a loss all the more terrible for the manner in which it was suffered. We extend to his widow, whose magnificent courage during these tragic days has won the admiration of all, to his children, to his parents, and to the other members of his family our most profound condolences.

To his memory, we pledge our unstinting devotion to the building of the world of which he dreamed—a world in which mankind can be free yet safe, a world in which brotherhood is fact for all men.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 26, 1963

To Lyndon B. Johnson has come the awesome responsibility of leading the United States of America and the free world. That this responsibility has come under circumstances which we know are to him, as to us all, unthinkable only multiplies the burdens that are his.

The Nation and the world are fortunate indeed to have, in President Johnson, a man of vast legislative experience, who was given extraordinary responsibilities during his service as Vice President and who acquitted himself with distinction in each of these tasks. He is deeply committed to the program of his martyred predecessor and he was clearly a partner in its design and scope.

The fulfillment of this program remains of primary importance to our own country and to the cause of freedom. America must be strong in every way—militarily, economically, socially. America must be generous, wise, and prudent. America must above all be true to its destiny.

We know President Johnson shares these objectives. We know he will prove equal to the problems and challenges which will await him.

We extend to him, in this most tragic hour in the history of our great Republic, our warm, understanding, and sympathetic support.

On behalf of millions of American workers and their families, we pledge to the new

President of the United States of America our complete backing in the dark and dangerous days that lie ahead.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON HATRED IN AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 26, 1963

The brutal assassination of President John F. Kennedy came as an overwhelming shock to the American people. Now, as the sense of shock wears off, all of our people are asking, "How? Why was such a thing possible in a civilized society?"

America and the world await an answer. Only through such an answer, complete and beyond dispute, can the American system of justice retain the confidence of the people and its good name throughout the world.

Therefore, it is wholly proper that President Johnson has mobilized the full resources of the Federal Government to uncover and make public the whole truth behind the slaying of his beloved predecessor.

But one fact is already clear. No matter what the identity or motive of the man who held the gun, hatred pulled the trigger.

Hatred—blind, bitter, savage hatred—is on the rise in America. There is the hatred of which Birmingham has become the symbol. There is the hatred exemplified by the John Birch Society and the followers of General Walker. There is the hatred of the fanatical Communists. There is no choice among them; for hatred in any form is evil.

Hatred often seeks to masquerade as a strongly held belief. But the difference is fundamental. Hatred denies the right of others to hold contrary beliefs; indeed, hatred seeks to destroy other beliefs and those who profess them.

Hatred is a clear and present threat to American society, for hatred is the antithesis of democracy. Hatred murders reason as well as men; and without reason, no free society can survive.

Let us pray that the tragedy which hatred has visited upon our land will awaken the people to this peril of their own making, and touch the hearts of those whom hatred has corrupted.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week, when President Lyndon Johnson spoke to a joint session of Congress, he spoke also to the Nation and the world. People everywhere, mournful at the tragedy which had befallen our Nation, yet anxious and eager to learn what sort of man now served as President of the United States, gained an overwhelming impression of strength and commitment. There was no question—here was a progressive spirit with deep convictions.

The impact of President Johnson's words and his manner has been measured by the editors of papers in every corner of the country. Virtually with a single voice, they have praised the message which the President delivered. One paper said:

His first Presidential message will take its place among the best of the state papers in American history. It would be hard to improve upon it by the alteration of a single sentence or a single sentiment.

I agree, as do most of the other editorials I have read. To demonstrate what must be clear to any viewer of the American scene—that there is a consensus of admiration for President Lyndon Johnson and confidence in his leadership—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of editorials relating to the speech of President Johnson and to his first days in office.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 28, 1963]

SPOKEN LIKE A PRESIDENT

The new President's words to Congress were fine words, fitting words, at times inspiring words. But as significant as what he said was the way he said it.

Lyndon Johnson was thrust suddenly into the White House, and to much of the country the new President was a stranger. The last two Presidents before him were sharply different in personality, but both were men of commanding public presence. In Congress, Mr. Johnson had a reputation for getting things done; he was master of the Senate, but his mastery, to most of the public, was veiled in mystery. His arena was the Senate cloakroom and the fastness of the majority leader's office, not the public platform, and even at the height of his power he never engaged the public imagination.

Even in his first days as President he was—as the tragic occasion demanded—the man at the edge of the stage, not at its center; the center belonged, still, to John F. Kennedy and his magnificently heroic widow.

But yesterday was Lyndon Johnson's day, and as he stood before Congress and the Nation he showed himself not a fluke of history, but a President. He had the presence of a President, and he said the things a President should have said.

His strong emphasis on civil rights was probably dictated not only by the evident need for action, but also by the doubts so many have harbored that he, as a southerner, would continue the pressure for such action. But it was vital that these doubts be laid decisively to rest. He did so eloquently, and it should now be clear that the man who, as majority leader, engineered the passage of the first major rights bill since Reconstruction, and who as Vice President vigorously championed the Negro cause, does mean to work as President to "eliminate from this Nation every trace of discrimination and oppression that is based upon race or color."

"Courage to seek peace, and * * * fortitude to risk war" were not the gifts of President Kennedy alone; these have been necessary qualities in every postwar President, and they are rooted in the resolution of the Nation at large. But it was well that President Johnson, at the start of his administration, reminded both friends and adversaries alike that these have not been lost.

It was well, because the world is anxiously watching to see what effect the change of Presidents will have on American policy. President Johnson will have his own style, but the Nation's purposes are unaltered, its commitments—as he also noted—undiminished.

The climactic events of the past week shook the Nation as it has not been shaken in this generation. And yet it has shown that it can carry on, and it will. Tragedy has drawn the Nation together, in a catharsis of grief and self-searching. From this it can, if it will, emerge stronger, more determined, more united.

It can and perhaps will, as President Johnson urged, "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." It can resolve to get on with the business of government, not wasting itself in penny-ante politicking and futile procrastination.

Capitol Hill, as Mr. Johnson somewhat nostalgically noted, was his "home" for 32 years, and as majority leader he was a Senator's Senator, the epitome of the legislative man. When he stood before Congress yesterday for the first time as President, he made it clear that a Johnson administration will respect the role of Congress as it should be respected; but also that the man who once made the Senate run expects Congress to fulfill that role.

In asking the help, with his awesome new responsibilities, of both Congress and the people, President Johnson asked what it is in the Nation's interest to give—and what he deserves to get.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 28, 1963]

A TIME FOR ACTION

President Lyndon Baines Johnson has summoned the Congress and the country to the unfaltering pursuit of those great ends to which the Nation is committed. His first Presidential message will take its place among the best of the state papers in American history. It would be hard to improve upon it by the alteration of a single sentence or a single sentiment.

What this great address said to the world is that the national objectives are not to be altered or abandoned, the national purposes are not to be forgotten or delayed, the national hopes are not to be disappointed or deferred. What it did not put into words, but what it just as clearly said, was that there is at the helm, in this crisis, the firm hand of a strong man with a steady purpose and a brave spirit. Surely, the Nation is reassured and the world is reassured.

The new President rejected the advice of those who would have had him pause, or turn aside or turn back. He spurned the counsels of political caution which might have dictated a pause in our political affairs, an interlude for reorganizing and regrouping the Government. That would have been a safe course. Even citizens who could not have admired it would have been compelled to acquiesce in it as an understandable exercise of political discretion. But the President chose the risks of a bolder and a better course.

"It is," he said, "a time for action." He called for action along the whole broad front of American purposes to which we have been committed by past promises. He asked for passage of a civil rights bill to achieve the equality "about which we have talked for a hundred years." He asked for a tax bill to buttress the national economy. He asked for education bills to "help bring the light of learning to every home and hamlet." He asked for a foreign-aid bill that will make it clear that we do not intend to "forfeit our responsibilities to this hemisphere or the world." And he asked for action on other measures long delayed in Congress, including the appropriation bills.

There is a time in the affairs of a country that calls for eulogy by words. We have lived through such a time. There is a time that calls for eulogy by action. We enter such a time. Seldom has the call to action been directed to Congress with greater clarity. The President rightly said: "Our most immediate tasks are here on this Hill." The Senators and the Congressmen can now join with the new President to help make the Government of the United States whole again—or as nearly whole as it can be made in the wake of great calamity. They can fit their actions to the words they have spoken and match their emotions by their deeds. They will be acting, in the days immediately ahead, upon a brightly illuminated stage exposed to the gaze of all mankind. None of their acts will escape the scrutiny of today or the judgment of tomorrow.

Action upon the whole broad program before them is what they owe the President

who appealed to them for help and the President who is beyond all human help; and it is what they owe themselves and what they owe their country.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 1, 1963]

LOOK NOW TO THE FUTURE

The American people have in the last 10 days lived through a harrowing experience, the reverberations of which will last long into the future. But it is that future that now must occupy our prime attention.

We cannot continue to dwell on the past; we must force ourselves to realize that, in the face of even the most brutal and villainous of crimes, the Nation's life must still go on. The destiny of a great people can never hang by a single thread.

This, of course, is far from saying that the investigation into the murder of the late President and of his alleged assassin must not be pursued in every detail, until the last vestige of doubt as to the identity of the guilty parties, their motivations, and all the circumstances surrounding these crimes has been dispelled. This must and will be done. The Presidential commission, which Mr. Johnson has just designated, was exactly what was called for to reestablish public confidence that the truth will be known and to reassert in the most unmistakable terms the American people's belief in the rule of law.

But it is no disrespect to the memory of our cruelly martyred young President, who in 3 short years made so remarkable an impact on this country and the world, to look now to the future. That is the direction in which John F. Kennedy, a man of the future, would have wanted us to look. That is the direction in which his successor has solemnly asked us to look. That is the direction in which we must look.

President Johnson set the tone in his initial message to Congress. He paid the greatest tribute possible to his predecessor when he asked the Congress to act—not talk any longer, but act—on two of the most fundamental points of the Kennedy program: civil rights and taxes. Mr. Johnson could have temporized at this juncture. He could have contented himself with praising Mr. Kennedy and deferring any call to legislative action until after the new year. That he chose not to do so is a hopeful augury.

The new President has accepted the basic Kennedy position not only in domestic but also in foreign policy. He has explicitly reaffirmed American commitment to our alliances; he has already stressed his sympathetic interest in Latin American progress; he has reiterated his belief in negotiating with the Russians while maintaining a position of military strength.

Mr. Johnson affords a striking contrast to his predecessor. He does not have the youthfulness of outlook, the intellectual interests, the philosophical bent, the profound knowledge of history and literature, the sophistication, and the subtlety of Mr. Kennedy.

He does, however, have a distinct style of his own, a completely different style and one that may well prove to be highly effective in his relationship with Congress and in the enactment of a forward-looking program. He began his political life as a New Deal Democrat from Texas, which was not necessarily the easiest thing to do; through an act of fate he has reached the height of political power as a New Frontier Democrat from Texas, not necessarily the easiest thing to be.

He is frequently spoken of as a politician's politician. We think he is a good deal more than that. He has undoubted gifts of leadership; an occupancy of the White House often brings out latent qualities of statesmanship. The country is looking to him for both; now—in the next few months—is his golden opportunity to prove them to himself, to his country, and to the world.

[From the Portland Oregonian, Nov. 28, 1963]

JOHNSON COMMITTED

President Lyndon Johnson's unequivocal commitment to the major policies of his predecessor, the assassinated John F. Kennedy, in his address to the joint congressional session Wednesday, leaves him some room for maneuvering, but not much. Any deviation from the pledges he made surely would weaken the support, both in Congress and the Nation, he asked and should receive.

The address committed him not only administratively but in the political line he will follow to obtain the Democratic nomination for another term as President in his own right. He made no concessions to the Southern racists, as, indeed, he has never done. He reminded the Nation, as well as the South, of his leadership as Senate majority leader in 1957 and 1960 directed toward enactment of civil rights legislation. In urging the earliest possible enactment of Mr. Kennedy's civil rights bill, he insisted that Congress move now toward eliminating from this Nation "every trace of discrimination and oppression based upon race or color."

Similarly, he gave no quarter to those—including powerful Southerners like Senator BYRD—who are stalling tax reduction legislation in the Senate. In effect, he called for the massed power of the people to help end congressional delay, not only on these two priority items but in other fields. Congress would do well to listen.

What President Johnson said and his measured sincerity in saying it were deeply impressive. The speech was right for the occasion—humble but forceful, restrained yet revealing strength of purpose. The Nation may be thankful that the political forces which caused John F. Kennedy to select his convention opponent, Lyndon B. Johnson, as his Vice President also brought into office as his successor a man of strength, knowledge and confidence. If his conduct in office hereafter justifies the solemn pledges he made to Congress and the people Wednesday, he will get the support he asked.

[From the Providence Journal, Nov. 28, 1963]

A STRONG HAND TAKES OVER THE REINS

A steady, strong, and sure hand holds the reins of power in the White House today, and for that simple fact, the United States can be thankful on this Thanksgiving Day.

Speaking to Congress yesterday for the first time as Chief Executive, President Lyndon B. Johnson spoke with a firmness of purpose, a humility of spirit, and a strength of character that were enormously and importantly heartening to a nation just emerging from the shock of the murder of the late John F. Kennedy.

President Johnson alined himself solidly behind the ideals and programs of the late President, and the Nation, and the world—friend and foe—know exactly where he stands and how he proposes to run the Government. Continuity of governmental power has been extended to continuity of purpose.

Mr. Johnson won the heaviest applause for his appeal for passage of a civil rights bill. "We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights," he said. "We have talked for 100 years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in books of law." His plea could not have been stronger.

Mr. Johnson pledged support of the Kennedy tax bill, and he promised an administration of "utmost thrift and frugality." The eloquence of those passages in which he spoke of the high purpose of his administration was balanced by the terse clarity of his declarations of specific intent.

But the most important plea that Mr. Johnson made was for action. "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."

With wisdom born of the experience of 32 years on Capitol Hill, the President appealed directly to Congress for its help in sharing his burden. Not only did he ask Congress to stay in session and get down to hard work; he asked for help out of the fullest respect, he said, for the "independence and integrity of the legislative branch."

It must not be overlooked that Mr. Johnson caught the mood of the Congress and the Nation with his deeply-felt call for an end "to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence." Applause shook the House Chamber when he urged a turning away from the fanatics of the far right and the far left in a rededicated brotherhood.

It was America's great tragedy to lose Mr. Kennedy in the full vigor of his life. It is America's great good fortune that Mr. Johnson already is demonstrating the qualities that could make him a great President.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Nov. 28, 1963]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH BEFORE CONGRESS

President Lyndon B. Johnson made a distinguished speech before Congress yesterday, notable for its full and vigorous endorsement of former President Kennedy's current legislative program, and his plea to Congress to enact it.

First of all, Johnson's speech gave notice to the world that the new President is quite determined to back up American interests from Vietnam to Berlin; that America must have a military strength second to none. Johnson also recognized that negotiation is welcome in an effort to maintain the peace of the world. His speech was conciliatory, but was spoken with a firmness and dignity that is to be expected of the President of our country.

President Johnson pulled out all of the stops in calling for "President Kennedy's civil rights program." Not even President Kennedy could have spoken with more force and eloquence in his plea to bring an end to second-class citizenship in our country. Since President Kennedy's civil rights program already has passed the House, this plea to former fellow Senators should be effective.

The same thing applies to the tax cut bill. The House has passed it, and it now is stalled in the Senate. It will be nearly impossible for Senator BYRD to smother it in his committee in the face of this plea from the new President himself.

The timing of the message also will help out. Congress plans to recess on December 14, so that its Members can return home for the holidays. Considering the present mood of the country, it is possible that many Members of each house now will feel compelled to go along in order to support the new President. When the legislative jam breaks on these two big pieces of legislation, the chances are that it will carry along with it much other legislation.

It will be a good test of the confidence that Congress has in the new President. His speech echoed with skill in recognizing the independence of Congress, but at the same time asking for results.

[From the Morning Sentinel, Nov. 28, 1963]

A STRONG SPEECH

President Johnson's first major speech since he took over the reins of Government was eloquent in its simplicity and its directness.

He left no doubt where he stands on the major problems and the major issues of the day and he left no doubt that he will use his considerable talents to persuade the Congress to support these stands.

That he will follow the broad outlines of President Kennedy's foreign and domestic policies there can now be no question.

And while he pleaded for the help of both the Congress and the people of the Nation in carrying on the crushing tasks of the Presidency, he left no doubt that he has grasped the wheel of the ship of state with a firm and positive hand.

His accents were those of Texas in contrast with the accents of Boston the Congress has heard from its President the past 3 years, but the words were familiar.

On the great central domestic issue facing the country, civil rights, he forthrightly called for early enactment of the civil rights program for which his predecessor fought. Nor was it lip service. One recalls that President Johnson pushed through Congress as majority leader the first civil rights bill since Reconstruction days. He means to work with equal vigor for another. There can be no question of that.

The United States will continue to work for peace, ready to grasp the hand of all who seek freedom and justice. But it will continue to work for that peace by maintaining the strength to enforce it.

President Johnson's reception from his colleagues was warm as would be expected for one who has spent almost all of his adult life in one or the other of the two branches of Congress.

Whether he will be able to translate this warmth into support for the legislation he wants remains to be seen. One can believe that he will spend fully of his tremendous energy in an effort to accomplish it.

[From the Kansas City Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

THE NEW PRESIDENT: WORDS THAT THE WORLD NEEDED TO HEAR

Lyndon B. Johnson passed his first test as President of the United States. He passed it magnificently.

His words were words that Congress, the Nation, and the world needed to hear. Certainly all were waiting to hear, and we have no doubt of the profound effect. There was, here, a reassuring simplicity, a depth of sincerity. There was that call to national unity that must be made again and again. He found, in the tragic event that had thrust him into this awesome office, the lesson that should mean so much to all Americans.

In this fashion, he paid eloquent tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy. But henceforth the tribute is to be in action, not in words. "Let us continue," President Johnson said, and in so saying he moved onto the stage of history as a world leader.

READY TO LEAD: GETTING ON WITH THE JOB

Congress could not have missed the full significance of this return of a colleague, now wearing a different robe. This is a man the lawmakers know and a man who knows the lawmakers. Together, he told the assembled legislators, we have work to do, and let us be about it.

In stating the challenge, President Johnson displayed a fine understanding of the meaning of our constitutional Government. He spoke pointedly of the integrity and independence of the legislative branch of Government. He expressed his confidence in Congress and, considering the virtual stalemate that had existed on Capitol Hill, it was a necessary boost to legislative morale. At the same time, Lyndon Johnson left no doubt about his conception of the Presidency as the office of a leader.

We did not, however, detect any tone of rebuke. Instead, there was an impressive recital of the work to be done. In this case, it was firm but gentle prodding. Lyndon Johnson, however, understands the nature and the problems of Congress perhaps better than any other man. It is an understanding that he will put to use time and time again in the months ahead. Yet in his onetime post on Capitol Hill, he obviously acquired a deep understanding of the nature of the executive. He left no doubt that gentle words today may be stronger tomorrow.

On civil rights, for example, he stated the case so well in but a phrase. "We have talked long enough," he said.

On the tax bill, he used the strong Kennedy argument that this lessening of the burden of taxes is so essential to the Nation's future, to the creation of an atmosphere of incentive.

On matters of fiscal and monetary policy, he stated his determination to protect the dollar, a determination that no President, in this global economy of today, can state too often. "The Government will set an example of prudence and economy," he stated. Let us all hope that this will prove to be so.

Such specifics are essential, of course, and if no timetable was established, it was a proper and necessary bit of executive strategy. But beyond the specifics, we suggest, is the picture of this new Chief Executive of ours.

It is the picture of a man strong in his determination, a man of action capable of saying so very much in but a few phrases. The experience of years in government was apparent, yesterday, and this experience will be a strong asset of the new Johnson administration. It is also the picture of a President that in words and methods—though certainly not in philosophy—contrasts with the lingering picture of John F. Kennedy.

In the historic moment of a former Senator returning to familiar surroundings, the world had its first real view of Lyndon B. Johnson in his great new role. It was a reassuring view that ought to dispel any uneasiness that might have existed. This Nation needs to show that it is capable of decisive action, President Johnson said. In a few minutes before his former colleagues, he clearly demonstrated that he is capable of decisive leadership.

ON STRAIGHT COURSE—PEACE AND STRENGTH

The President has now set forth the basic philosophy which will guide his administration in the direction of our foreign policy. That philosophy should occasion no surprise, either at home or abroad. It had been confidently predicted in advance and, at several points, specifically foreshadowed by statements Mr. Johnson had already made, since assuming office. Nevertheless, it immensely serves the national interest to have this summing up, so magnificently sincere in tone and so straightforward in content.

Where our international affairs were concerned, the stress of the message was focused on a vigorous rededication to all the policies and programs in force under President Kennedy. The new Chief Executive eloquently paraphrased his predecessor's injunction to begin at once upon the multitudinous tasks confronting the Nation, by calling for a continuation of those efforts without interruption.

In language that could bear no misunderstanding, President Johnson declared that we would keep our commitments throughout the world. He promised that we would remain both unceasing in our search for peace and unafraid in our confrontation of those who would destroy that peace or impose their will on others. At one and the same time he thus moved to reassure our friends and warn our enemies against underestimating the strength of our determination.

In particular, the President pledged us to an undeviating support of the United Nations, to the meticulous discharge of the obligations we owe our allies, to the reinforcement of our existent programs of assistance in Africa and Asia and to our duty under the relatively new Alliance for Progress with Latin America.

Of special significance, in this respect, were some remarks which he seemed to interpolate in his prepared speech. These embodied a frank recognition that the executive branch, even though charged with primary responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy, must have cooperation from both Houses of the Congress. Mr. Johnson not only appealed for that cooperation, in general, but urged directly that the Presidential authority not be frustrated by legislative attempts to restrict flexibility of action within an overall policy framework.

Finally, the President called the attention of his former colleagues to the immense impact of our racial policies at home on the influence which we exert in world affairs. Coming from such a source, it is greatly to be hoped that the Congress will pay heed and act in accordance.

AND TOGETHER: FOR AN END TO HATRED

The President reserved to the end of his address a most stirring appeal for national unity, in the wake of the terrible tragedy that has engulfed us. He called upon all his fellow Americans for an end to the preaching of hatred and violence. He begged them to turn away from the fanaticism of the extreme right and left, alike, and to eschew the counsels of bitterness, bigotry and lawlessness which "pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream."

Using President Kennedy's martyrdom as his text in these closing passages, he required of us a new sense of fellowship that will make us one people and reestablish the spirit of brotherhood "from sea to shining sea." It was a fitting climax to a great address. And the tremendous applause with which it was greeted demonstrated how sorely the American conscience is troubled; how deeply we stand in need of rededication to the ideals of our forefathers.

No one could hear—or read—what our new President said yesterday, without a sense of solace, without a determination to strive for the goals he so impressively, yet with such personal humility, set before the Nation.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FIRST REPORT

Lyndon B. Johnson's address yesterday gave a foretaste of what the President's countrymen and America's friends and foes abroad can expect in the months ahead.

His words conveyed a sense of strength and resolve; in his person he displayed a sureness and a confidence in his new role that should make all Americans, regardless of party, proud of a system that can so change personal leaders without faltering.

As one watched Mr. Johnson on the TV screen, one was reminded that here was a man who actively had contested the late President Kennedy for the Democratic nomination for the office in 1960. Here was a man who wanted to be President, who believed in his ability to handle the job and who took the Vice Presidency when asked to do so by Mr. Kennedy.

Although Mr. Johnson has pledged to carry on in carbon copy of Mr. Kennedy, no man can be a duplicate of another. Mr. Johnson's speech in large part might well have been delivered on an earlier and happier day by Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson was undoubtedly helped in preparing it by Mr. Kennedy's staff writers. But as time goes on, the Presidency inevitably must reflect the Johnson approach rather than the Kennedy approach.

Mr. Johnson is a practical man who seeks the best but settles for the possible.

In his references yesterday to the two most important pieces of unfinished legislation Mr. Kennedy had demanded, Mr. Johnson called for the earliest possible action on the civil rights and tax cut bills.

Thus Mr. Johnson put himself squarely behind the two bills but he did not demand immediate passage.

The issues involved in both these pieces of legislation have not been changed by Presi-

dent Kennedy's death. In this time of mourning and during which Mr. Johnson has much to do, it would be far better for Congress to do only what is necessary for the Government to function.

In connection with the tax cut bill, it must be noted with commendation that Mr. Johnson promised the Government will set an example of prudence and economy. As we said with reference to the tax cut bill earlier, there will be no harm in delaying action on it until Congress sees the President's budget next year. This argument is bolstered, we believe, by Mr. Johnson's welcome personal pledge that Government expenses will be administered with frugality.

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, Nov. 28, 1963]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON: "LET US CONTINUE"

President Johnson's first address to Congress struck a precisely proper and moving note. One could have no doubt about the depth of his feeling when he said, "All I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today."

And one could feel with equal impact his sincerity when he declared, "Let all the world know, and none misunderstand, that I rededicate this Government" to the "unswerving" continuation of the policies set forth by President Kennedy. Recalling his late chief's words on inauguration day almost 3 years ago—"Let us begin"—he added his own imperative, "let us continue."

It may be hopefully significant not only of the mood of Congress but of the Nation that Mr. Johnson was most fervently and lengthily applauded after two stirring sentences in his appeal for greater tolerance among Americans for each other:

"Let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence." And * * *

"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."

If this mood truly prevails in Congress, and if Congress senses that it is running overwhelmingly strong and deep among the people, President Johnson may indeed win substantial legislative victories, especially in that one, extremely emotional issue on which he placed so much stress, the civil rights bill.

Many Congressmen of both parties have already felt considerable kinship with Mr. Johnson as "one of ours"—i.e., because of his 32 years of service in the House and Senate. His forthright expression of respect for the independence and integrity of the legislative branch in his message yesterday should help cement this new-found legislative-executive friendship.

At the same time, the new President made it specifically clear that he would not look lightly on any attempt at "erasing executive flexibility in the conduct of foreign affairs." He intends, it may be inferred, to be a positive leader, albeit a friendly one.

One almost dares hope that in this atmosphere of mutual friendly respect, or respectful friendliness, the new President and Congress may surprise us all with their legislative accomplishments in the next 6 months.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Nov. 28, 1963]

JOHNSON'S STRONG BEGINNING

It is a tribute to John F. Kennedy that his successor has called upon Congress and the Nation to push forward with renewed vigor the Kennedy administration program.

It is a mark of the stature of Lyndon B. Johnson that he should place above all else the enactment of the Kennedy civil rights bill. From the lips of a Texan and a southerner these words bear all the more import for every American:

"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 the books of law."

And President Johnson eloquently pledged himself—and asked others to join his pledge—to the Kennedy goals:

"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."

President Johnson did not ignore the needs of our alliances or the threat of our enemies. We will keep our commitments from Berlin to South Vietnam. We will remain a good and reliable friend to those who seek peace and freedom. We will remain a formidable foe to those who seek to break the peace or curb freedom: "Those who test our courage will find it strong, and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable." The sentence is worthy of John F. Kennedy.

And President Johnson dealt with hard domestic matters, too. He called for immediate passage of the tax cut bill as a means of insuring the continuation of a strong economy. His was a pledge for action now and a call for help—"I cannot bear this burden alone." And he called movingly for an end to hate and evil and violence, which have smeared too many black blots on our Nation in recent months.

This was a good beginning. It came after a series of talks with leading allies. It brought out again the side of President Johnson that many people have overlooked—his dedication since early New Deal days to a progressive philosophy.

His asking or his promising will not turn Congress into an efficient and effective body or the Nation into a brotherhood of dedicated men. Feet will still drag. Imagination will still escape many. Even hate will continue to eat at the hearts of some.

But most people will hear the call and give to the new President their heartfelt support in his time of need and trial—and the Nation's time of need and trial. Lyndon Johnson is now the leader. He brings great strengths to his task. He deserves good will and time to prove himself.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Nov. 28, 1963]

THE NEW PRESIDENT SPEAKS

If proof were needed that the Presidency of the United States is in strong hands, it was demonstrated on Wednesday in Lyndon B. Johnson's first address to the Congress since his succesion to that high office.

He spoke solemnly, unsmilingly, to a somber Senate and House, still numbed by the tragic ordeals of the past 5 days. His speech was low-keyed, in keeping with the occasion.

But it was forceful and direct, and it reflected the strength of the speaker's convictions and his determination to take hold of the burdens thrust upon him to the best of his abiltiy.

He made it clear where the Government stands; he left no doubts in anyone's mind as to the course that he will follow. His position, his policies, his commitments will be those of the murdered John F. Kennedy: where his predecessor said on his inauguration: "Let us make a beginning," President Johnson says to the American people: "Let us continue."

Many persons have been anxiously awaiting the position the new President would take on the two controversial issues that are leftovers from the Kennedy administration, civil rights and tax reduction; and the bills concerning each that are among the unfinished business of the present Congress.

Mr. Johnson made it clear what he wants done: both the civil rights legislation and the bill calling for income-tax reduction should be enacted into law quickly.

"No memorial oration could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory," he told Congress, "than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought." And again: "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."

On world affairs, the President was equally explicit. The United States will maintain military strength second to none in the world and will, at the same time, be unceasing in the search for peace. This Nation will keep its commitments "from South Vietnam to West Berlin." It will support the United Nations and keep its alliances strong.

And he flung this challenge to the foes of America and of freedom: "Those who test our courage will find it strong. Those who seek our friendship will find it honorable."

Lyndon Johnson came before Congress with a heavy heart, just as he had sorrowfully taken the oath of office as President minutes after John F. Kennedy died from an assassin's bullet. He appeared to make the deepest impression upon his hearers when he called earnestly for "an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence" in the land.

A humble and patriotic American, suddenly loaded down with awesome responsibilities, Lyndon Johnson asked Congress for its help in the days ahead. He should receive that help—and that of all Americans.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Nov. 18, 1963]

THE NATION'S TEMPO

Lyndon B. Johnson had two choices yesterday in his first Presidential address to the Congress. He could have said all the proper things, and then have called in effect for a time of pause, while the country and he gathered and organized themselves for the work ahead—or he could have said what he did say. Actually, with Mr. Johnson's temperament and his understanding of what the Presidency is, he had no alternative but to try to pick the spirit and energies of the country up, and set us in motion again. That effort he performed superbly.

The theme of the address, sounded over and over, was action. "No words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America," the President said. He said that now the ideas and ideals of John F. Kennedy "must and will be transplanted into effective action." He said: "It is our duty * * * to do away with uncertainty and to show that we are capable of decisive action * * * that we can and will act and act now." He said: "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."

All this was addressed in general to the country, and some of it specifically to the Congress, in a bold combination of flattery, cajolery, and demand. "Let us meet in action," he said to the Congress. He set no time limits for action on specific legislation, but when he declared that "the need is now" he was serving notice that he does not foresee a state of do-nothingness through the rest of this year, if he can prevent it. Politically, Mr. Johnson was casting his lot on the side of movement and speed: rightly and, we trust events will prove, shrewdly.

The President's list of things to do was revealing in contents and in order of priority. In the roll of "American dreams * * * vitalized" by Mr. Kennedy he named space exploration, international partnership, the

Peace Corps, education for youth, care for the elderly, and cure for the mentally ill, but he placed above all, as the highest purpose and the first legislative imperative, a Federal civil rights law. After yesterday, no one can doubt where Lyndon Johnson stands on the issue of civil rights.

No one can doubt either where he stands generally in fiscal philosophy, or immediately on tax reductions; nor, in world affairs, can anyone doubt his determination to keep the Nation strong, or his dedication to peace. Our foreign friends and opponents alike may contemplate the key foreign policy portion of the address:

"In this age 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."

For us in this country, at this moment, the speech's most memorable passage, the passage not to forget, was:

"The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and respect one another. So 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."

Those are not the words or the accents of politics or of any section or any State, South or North. They are the words and the accents of a President of the United States, setting the tone and tempo for the time ahead.

[From the Park Region Echo, Alexandria, Minn., Nov. 28, 1963]

THE NEW PRESIDENT

There is so much to be said about the tragic weekend one scarcely knows where to begin.

Perhaps it would be best to take up the consideration in reverse order—last things first, for at the moment we are still moved by President Lyndon Johnson's truly magnificent address to the Congress Wednesday noon.

We would be less than candid if we did not admit at the outset that Lyndon Johnson was not our favorite for the Vice Presidency. Indeed, Mr. Johnson has never stood at or even near the top of our list of favorite public officials.

But whatever reservations we may have had about the man's outlook (not his ability, for we have always admired that) were largely erased by Wednesday's speech.

We do not know who writes Mr. Johnson's speeches. We do know the speech writer is a gifted one if Wednesday's production was an example.

Mr. Johnson is not an orator of the caliber of Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Stevenson, but Wednesday he did as well, if not better, than at any time we've ever heard him.

He spoke sincerely, directly, simply—and movingly.

There was a poignancy in his opening remark about the late President being "the greatest leader of our time" that clutched at one's heartstrings, for at this moment, if not before, the listener suddenly realized how very much the new President loved and admired Mr. Kennedy.

There was poignancy, too, in his moving appeal for the support of the Congress and of all Americans in helping him shoulder "the awesome burden of the Presidency." The catch in his voice at this moment gave lie to any suspicion that Lyndon Johnson is an arrogant man.

But for us, listening, the most gripping moment in the entire speech occurred when the new President began reciting the creed of his belief in the programs of the New Frontier and his determination to see them through.

The spectacle of this tall Texan standing before both Houses of the Congress and appealing for all he is worth for the passage of President Kennedy's civil rights bill as "a living memorial" to the late President will live forever in our memory of a week so full of so many memories which will never be forgotten.

If ever there was any doubt that Lyndon Johnson represents all of the people of the United States, it should have been destroyed in that moment.

For those who know him well, his stand on civil rights comes as no surprise, despite his Texas origin.

The distinguished journalist William S. White said it just the other night. "Lyndon Johnson is a man without intolerance."

He led the fight for civil rights legislation in the Congress in 1957 and again in 1961. He chaired the President's committee on equal employment opportunities. The Negro community respects Johnson and appears to have great faith that he will follow in the footsteps of a President they now believe was the greatest since Abraham Lincoln.

The new President impressed us, too, in his earnest appeal for passage of President Kennedy's tax cut legislation and in his firm pledge of continued and "unswerving support of the United Nations."

Mr. Johnson is considered by many to be more conservative than was Mr. Kennedy. This is not true, and before long the Nation will discover it.

The President is conservative in that he is a practical politician who believes in compromise when compromise is necessary, who believes in being prudent and who knows the world cannot be changed overnight.

But if he is prudent, he is also consistently progressive, and in some respects, notably in fiscal matters, he probably is more liberal than his predecessor.

Mr. Johnson, for instance, not only gives full support to Mr. Kennedy's tax cut proposal, but would also, it is reported, accompany the tax cut with an increase in spending to further prime the economy and forestall a recession.

It is said, for instance, that he favors more spending for foreign aid, continued high level spending for defense programs, renewed emphasis on welfare programs (he is deeply committed to medical care for the aged under social security), supports the Peace Corps with enthusiasm, and backs public works spending whenever and wherever needed.

But he is not a Keynesian as such, for that role is traditionally usurped by intellectuals and the new President is not an intellectual. He is a practical "doer" who believes not in spending for spending's sake, but in spending for greater returns. He is, after all, a banker, along with being a rancher and a public servant.

And so the stage is set. President Johnson moves into the White House as a prudent progressive, deeply committed to Mr. Kennedy's program, determined to bring it to fruition not only as a memorial to a man he loved but also because he believes in the rightness of the program.

The man is different. The style is different. The operation will be different. The net result, we fervently hope, will be the same.

Of this every American can be absolutely certain:

We have just witnessed the assassination and the burial of a truly great patriot. But we have also just seen assume the highest office of the land another great patriot.

"I am," he once said of himself, "a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat—in that order."

—J.C.O.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 29, 1963]

A STRONG START

The strength and self-confidence President Johnson has exhibited in his first grim days in office have helped to ease the paralysis that seemed to freeze the world after President Kennedy's assassination. His performance lent added solemnity to his Thanksgiving promise last night that he would strive for "a new American greatness, a new day when peace is more secure, when justice is more universal, when freedom is more strong in every home of all mankind."

Through his talks with world statesmen come to mourn his slain predecessor, his statements and his initial address to Congress, he has won applause in all parts of the free world and cautious approval even in Moscow. A measure of the uncertainty that originally existed on both sides of the Iron Curtain has been wiped away by the vigor of his pledges of uninterrupted forward movement in the fulfillment of our commitments for the defense of freedom and the pursuit of peace.

Congress responded in cordial fashion to the first message from its old friend and former leader, but Mr. Johnson is too experienced in the ways of Congress to mistake the warmth of his reception for an assurance that the long stalemate on Capitol Hill is about to end. However, at least one of his urgent calls has already had an affirmative response—his plea for preserving executive flexibility in foreign affairs.

Proposed restrictions on the sale of wheat to Soviet Russia have been rejected—restrictions that both President Kennedy and President Johnson opposed as infringing on executive prerogative. Shackles put on executive authority in the foreign aid bills also have been removed. The President may now continue to aid Communist-ruled countries at his discretion if he deems this vital to the security of the United States and the independence of the recipient countries, in particular Poland and Yugoslavia. But many restrictions remain to hamper our policy in dealing with Argentina, which has annulled American oil contracts, with Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, and especially with Cuba.

Securing adequate appropriations for foreign aid remains a formidable task in the coming days. So does the need for speedy action on civil rights, taxes, and other priority issues. The best that seems to be in store for this session is a House vote on the civil rights bill. Turning his ideas into effective action is the challenge that faces President Johnson. The momentum of his first week must not be allowed to turn into deadlock and delay on measures that have already been studied to death.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Nov. 29, 1963]

AS JOHNSON SETS FORWARD COURSE

With Thanksgiving Day over—a day in which President Johnson not only addressed a message of inspiration to the Nation but continued diligently to get a firm grip on the pressing duties and problems confronting him—the course he is setting for the country now is assuming definitive direction.

In the new President's solemn words of the past 2 days—to the American people Thursday night and to Congress Wednesday after-

noon—the one deep impression that surpasses all others is Mr. Johnson's great sincerity of purpose and steadfast resolve: Not merely to guide the Nation safely through this period of tragedy and crisis but to get the country quickly into forward motion again.

As President Johnson said succinctly Thursday night: "Our thrust is forward."

This is evident in both domestic and foreign affairs.

President Johnson's strong bid for action on civil rights and a tax cut, in his message to Congress, may have jolted some Senators and Representatives out of their lethargy. Unfortunately, however, resistance from diehard southerners on the matter of civil rights is not likely to melt away. The standpatters will remain stubborn to the bitter end. An all-out, no-holds-barred battle will be essential to enact the kind of civil rights legislation this country urgently needs.

Mr. Johnson's conversations on Thanksgiving Day with several high administration officials—most notably Secretary of State Rusk and Central Intelligence Agency Director McCone—underscore the President's grim and reassuring determination to keep the country continuously on the alert in the international arena. Any foreign power that might believe this is an opportune time to test America's defenses at home or abroad would be well advised to abandon any such notion.

The sea is stormy, and the clouds are overcast, but the hand at the helm is steady.

[From Wall Street Journal, Nov. 29, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT'S FIRST WEEK

It is now 1 week since President Johnson assumed office, and even in so short a span, so clouded in tragedy, he has done much to command respect and encourage confidence. People have been impressed as much, perhaps, by the President's demeanor as by his words and acts.

There has been thoughtfulness for everyone; for the late President's family, the Government employees high and low, the Members of Congress, the Governors of the States, the visiting heads of foreign nations. And, not least, thoughtfulness for the American people whom he has sought to address when possible, even with a special Thanksgiving talk last evening.

There has been calmness in the midst of exhausting turbulence, so that the machinery of Government slowed but did not falter. An ease of manner, as in his meetings with the foreign dignitaries in the most difficult of circumstances. An instinct for the right thing, as when he did in fact confer with those dignitaries despite protocol advice to the contrary.

And much more, all of it suggesting a President compassionate and capable, certainly one who is in charge. His words, general though they have understandably been so far, have buttressed that impression.

During this week President Johnson has pledged support, as was expected, for President Kennedy's foreign and domestic policies, with particular stress on the tax-reduction and civil-rights bills. On these and other matters, he asked Congress to act speedily but wisely.

What is notable, however, is that he has not tried to rush Congress to specific dates of action or make urgent new demands upon it. That is an indication of a man who is not likely to be stampeded but will give due thought to courses of action—an excellent thing in a President, especially in times of continuing international trouble.

Such restraint, in turn, is an important element of national confidence. In this connection, Mr. Johnson has sought to foster confidence in the many millions concerned with the Nation's business. He has expressed in down-to-earth language, his belief in free enterprise, a belief shared by most Americans. Nor is this anything new for Mr. Johnson; he has said much the same before and plainly believes it.

The President, moreover, has emphasized the need to control the Federal budget and eliminate waste from Federal spending. He has promised to demand the utmost thrift and frugality in Washington, to insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent, and that it set an example of prudence and economy.

Though few would call Mr. Johnson a fiscal conservative, few consider him anti-business either. He has a strong economy going for him, and the business community has already given him a strong expression of confidence. This, we think, but reflects the feeling of most Americans.

None of us can yet say what kind of President Lyndon Johnson will eventually make, or what further trials may be in store for all of us. But at least this week has shown a man of ability and resolve. The Nation today is thankful that out of high tragedy can come high promise for the future.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 27, 1963]

PROFESSIONAL TOUCH

It has been but 5 days since Lyndon Baines Johnson became the 36th President of the United States. They have been crowded days, heavily charged with emotion. But the new President has moved swiftly, efficiently and confidently. That sure professional touch which was the Johnson hallmark as Senate majority leader has been very much in evidence.

Discussions have been held with world leaders who came to Washington for the funeral of John F. Kennedy. They have been assured that we will honor our obligations. Arrangements are being made for future meetings with men of international stature, the objectives being understanding and working arrangements as essential underpinnings of peace.

At home, the vital machinery of government has been kept turning. The daily paper work is being done. The new President has conferred with congressional representatives, with leaders of the political opposition, and has appealed to the people for support.

In short, all that could be done has been done. No one is more aware than Lyndon Johnson of the trials and frustrations which lie ahead. But he has assumed the executive command and he will cope with them to the best of his ability as they arise—all of this within the framework of the American constitutional processes.

There was more, much more, than rhetoric in the observation by William Gladstone in 1878 that "* * * the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

And it helps when the man who steps in to carry on has a brain and purpose of his own.

TRIBUTE TO THE NEWS MEDIA FOR GREAT PUBLIC SERVICE PERFORMED IN COVERAGE OF THE NEWS OF NOVEMBER 22–NOVEMBER 25

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I had hoped last week to pay appropriate tribute to the news media of the Nation for the outstanding public service performed in the coverage of the news in the period November 22–November 25, in connection with the tragic death of President Kennedy.

When the history of our times is written and the tragic events of the November 22–November 25 period are chronicled, I am certain that there will be a particularly glowing page for the superb coverage by America's media of information.

Probably not in our lifetimes has the profession of journalism in all its forms so well demonstrated such uniform excellence in news gathering, news interpretation, and news dissemination.

Even the great combat journalism of World War II and the Korean war seem to have been surpassed, for here were stories—not merely of violence and tragic death, but of the most profound and varied human, patriotic, and social content—breaking within our very midst, and altering the very nature of our times.

A supreme tragedy was covered with supreme distinction by all forms of journalism.

Some may have noted flaws or imperfections here or there. But I believe that, on the whole, the readers of our country's newspapers and magazines, the listeners to radio stations, and the viewers of television stations feel profoundly indebted to the men and women of the fourth estate.

By means of the various media—particularly television, because of its scope and immediacy, every adult American and every American child old enough to understand became personally involved in those almost unbelievable events. He or she was not a distant spectator, but felt himself or herself to be only a few feet away from that tragic street opposite the Texas School Book Depository, from the elevator in the Dallas city jail, or from St. Matthew's Cathedral or Arlington National Cemetery. Never before had our people been so continuously near the leaders of this Nation, or on Monday, the leaders of so many other nations.

Each of the respective media—newspapers, radio, television, magazines—played its optimal role. Each made sacrifices in ways peculiar to its particular nature in canceling other commitments, in reassigning personnel, in working around the clock, in altering publication schedules, not only in communicating to the American people the hard news of what had happened, but also in estimating why it had happened and what its ultimate meaning might be.

One can view the performance of American journalism of those 4 days from many varied standpoints.

Some who are interested in the techniques of journalism were understandably awed by the speed, the accuracy, and the precision with which the media covered the events. They represented techniques from the most classic days of personal daring and enterpise, in the tradition of Richard Harding Davis, to the newest classic days of 1963 public-service television at its best.

What may to some laymen appeared to have been as effortless, actually involved, behind the scenes, incredibly complex and difficult teamwork. I cite the complex teletype circuits and the intricate arrangements for pool TV coverage from every possible position as but two examples.

Some who are interested in the financial phases may view those 4 days from the standpoint of the staggering costs

which the media willing bore—including radio and TV cancellation, for example, of their total regular commercial programing.

Some who view the events from the standpoint of the spirited competition between the media will analyze this or that "beat" by some wire service or daily, will recall how electronic journalism—TV—made news history in its breathtakingly swift coverage of unforeseen events as they transpired, and/or within minutes thereafter by videotape.

Meanwhile, still photography wrote some of its own finest chapters.

I doubt, for example, that anyone in this Chamber or anyone else in this Nation can ever forget the portrait of little John Kennedy, Jr., aged 3, bravely saluting his departed father, the President of the United States, from the steps of St. Matthew's Cathedral.

The coverage of those 4 days provided not only a lasting chronicle for history, but also a catalyst for meeting the problems and needs of the future.

Few Americans need ever be convinced again of the heights which public service television can perform, and few Americans can fail to ponder an old problem which has emerged in new forms—namely, the basic right of the people to be informed, in relation to the basic duty of law-enforcement officers to maintain security.

The great editorial pages, newspaper columns, and editorial cartoons of the land have focused attention on still other soul-searching issues posed by those 4 days—issues of the battle against extremism, the battle for the rule of law, and the battle for continuity in the Republic. What the newspaper and magazine articles and editorials may lack in speed—by hours or days—they make up in a depth which probes to the very fiber of the challenges of our times.

So, Mr. President, to the men and women of the Fourth Estate, I say a heartfelt "well done."

I offer these comments, not in a pro forma manner, but as a sincere expression of gratitude by one Senator, one citizen, one father, one American, to those who covered history so well. These ladies and gentlemen helped us to see, to hear, and to feel the tragedy of a gallant leader who was mercilessly cut down in the springtime of his life. They showed us tragedy, but they have helped us triumph over it.

America will never again be quite the same, nor will journalism.

We have sadly sustained an irreplaceable loss.

But from it, as the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy would wish, we have grown as a people.

For this, we owe very much to American journalism.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE RIVER BASIN PLANS

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. SIMPSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What time is yielded to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Wyoming desires to submit an amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the agreement which has been entered into, time is available for debate on amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; 1 hour—equally divided—is available on each amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So the Senator from Wyoming will now be able to proceed in the time available in connection with his amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 334, and ask that it be stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, it is proposed to strike out lines 15 through 22, as follows:

> 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.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, my amendment would deny authorization of the Knowles Dam and Reservoir project in western Montana. Earlier this year the Senate considered another form of the bill. At that time I objected to the authorization of the Burns Creek project. This bill (H.R. 8667) now comes to us without the Burns Creek project. This was a wise deletion. But the bill still includes a request for an authorization of a project which is as bad as, if not worse than, the omitted project.

The Knowles project will cost from $247 to $306 million. It will flood 59,000 acres of land including 9,000 acres of irrigated cropland and 20,000 acres of Indian reservation land. It will generate 256,000 kilowatts of power at a cost of $1,066 to $1,195 per kilowatt of installed capacity, making it the most extravagant project in the Columbia River Basin.

The only purpose for the Knowles project is commercial power production by the Federal Government. The project has little or no reclamation benefits. In fact, less than 4 percent of the cost has been allocated to reclamation, about 1 percent to recreation, and 95 percent has been allocated to power production.

If we really follow the lead of the new great leadership of President Johnson and want a dollar's worth of value for a dollar spent, this is a good place to eliminate some of the fat.

The bill would authorize first, the construction of the Knowles Dam and Reservoir by the Corps of Engineers; second, the operation and maintenance of the project by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and, third, the appropriation of $50 million for its partial accomplishment.

The committee report does not indicate why the project is to be turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation after construction by the Corps of Engineers, but presumably it is on the basis of the statements of the Secretary of the Interior that Knowles should be constructed and operated by his agency. The project as proposed by the Corps of Engineers is for electric power, flood control and recreation purposes. There are no irrigation facilities planned or irrigation benefits claimed. In fact, the project would flood out more than 9,000 acres of presently irrigated land. This would be reclamation in reverse.

The Knowles Dam and Reservoir would be located on the Flathead River in Lake and Sanders Counties, Mont., 2.17 miles upstream from its confluence with the Clark Fork River and 5 miles above the town of Paradise. The reservoir would have a usable storage capacity for flood control and power of 3,080,000 acre-feet. The project would require the acquisition of over 59,000 acres of land, much of which is Indian property. The initial power installation would consist of four 64,000-kilowatt units with a total capacity of 256,000 kilowatts. Senate Report No. 648 of the Public Works Committee states that the total cost of the project would be $247 million. Annual charges are estimated at $9,549,000 and annual benefits at $12,205,000, consisting of $11,681,000—95.7 percent—for power, $466,000—3.8 percent—for flood control, and $58,000—0.5 percent—for recreation. However, it is apparent from information developed subsequent to the submission of the Corps of Engineers' report that costs will be considerably higher than the $247 million estimate with corresponding increases in annual costs.

The Knowles project has been rejected for authorization by the House on three different occasions during the past 2 years. It has been presented to the Congress by the Corps of Engineers as a flood control and power project. The Secretary of the Interior says that it should be constructed and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Senate Public Works Committee straddles the issue by proposing construction by the Corps of Engineers and operation and maintenance by the Bureau of Reclamation. The confusion, indecision, and lack of clarity as to the real purpose of this project is further compounded by the deceptive authorization for appropriation being limited to $50 million for partial accomplishment of the project, evidently on the premise that no one knows what kind of creature will actually be produced at birth, since the power project cannot, admittedly, be justified economically.

Claims have been made that Knowles is needed for irrigation. I believe that soundly conceived reclamation projects are of inestimable value to the contin-

ued economic development of this country. I have and will vigorously support such projects at every opportunity. But Knowles has not been presented as, nor is it by any stretch of the imagination, a reclamation project. There is nothing in the supporting material to show that it will contribute in any way, either directly or indirectly, to economical irrigation development. Furthermore, Knowles would divert water from potential irrigation projects and would adversely affect existing irrigation projects.

As indicated earlier, the cost estimates stated in Senate Report No. 648 are far from adequate. Railroad relocation costs are reported to be deficient by $33 million. Interest during construction will amount to more than $27.5 million. These increases alone will bring the total investment cost well over $300 million. These changes, together with necessary adjustments in interest and amortization cost estimates to conform with realistic figures, will bring annual costs to $15.5 million and cost per kilowatt-hour to 9 mills. The agencies have stated that the Bonneville Power Administration will market the power at its postage stamp rates. In 1962, these averaged 2.36 mills per kilowatt-hour. For Knowles power production this would bring in annual revenues of $4.1 million. The annual deficit would reach the staggering sum of $11.5 million. The Bonneville Power Administration, which has been losing $15 to $18 million annually, no longer has any surplus to cover increasing annual deficits. If Knowles is authorized, either Bonneville Power Administration's rates will have to be further increased, over and above that required to cover current annual deficits, or the taxpayers will have to pick up the check. Neither step is necessary.

Presently pending before the Federal Power Commission are applications to license two hydroelectric projects known as Buffalo Rapids No. 2 and 4, which will develop 240,000 kilowatts of installed capacity as compared to the 256,000 kilowatts of installed capacity which the Knowles project would produce. This would permit construction of hydroelectric facilities at those sites at absolutely no cost to the Nation's taxpayers. In terms of money the Knowles project will cost seven times more than the Buffalo Rapids projects, but will produce only 1¼ more kilowatt-hours than the Buffalo Rapids sites. This only serves to show the expensive cost of the power production from the Knowles project.

Furthermore, the Knowles project destroys 60,000 acres of land, over 600 buildings, displaces nearly 1,300 people, and over 300 miles of railroad, highway, and utility lines—as against the Buffalo Rapids private development only requiring some 8,000 acres, 3 buildings, 12 people, and 15 miles of highway and utility line replacement.

Mr. President, we must give some consideration to the impact which Knowles—as a large uneconomical monument to government inefficiency—would have upon the area involved. The resulting catastrophic damage to local tax base of the construction of such an uneconomical project as Knowles is very vividly brought out by the case of Lake County, Mont., where a large portion of the 60,000 acres and improvements thereon would be taken from the tax rolls by the large reservoir created by the Knowles Dam. Fifty-five percent of the land area of Lake County is now exempt from taxation by reason of being either Federal or State lands. The county depends upon the property tax as the principal source of its tax revenues for the purpose of carrying on its governmental functions, including law enforcement, public welfare, general county administration, support of elementary and secondary schools, and support of irrigation districts which are of great economic importance to the development of Lake County. The total taxable valuation of this county is $10,871,095. The construction of Knowles Dam would remove from the tax rolls $1,009,830 of that taxable valuation. This would represent an annual direct tax loss to the county of approximately $206,000. One school district alone would lose $74,325 in tax revenues. Lake County is unalterably opposed to the construction of this project.

When I was Governor of the State of Wyoming, I became acutely aware of the financial problems associated with the maintaining of our county and local governments. Most tax revenue sources have been preempted by either the Federal or State Governments leaving only the property tax as a means for counties and local governments to sustain themselves. The loss of a quarter of a million dollars in tax revenue to counties in Western States is a most serious problem. Knowles Dam could well bankrupt Lake County. The $206,000 loss in taxes by reason of the Knowles Dam must be absorbed by the remaining tax base in the county.

Such an additional burden placed upon other lands and improvements and personal property in the county, in order to finance the necessary county services, could well be too much for the remaining lands to profitably handle.

The county of Sanders is in a similar situation. It would lose nearly $900,000 in taxable valuation. Sanders County is unalterably opposed to the construction of this project.

But there is another part of this story. The private development of two damsites owned by the Flathead Indians, to which I referred a few moments ago, would take no tax base from Lake and Sanders Counties.

Instead, private development would bring approximately $242,000 in additional taxes to Lake County alone.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Last year, in the Senate hearings, the Indians, through their counsel, appeared and testified that, in their opinion, if the Indians should build the dam the dam would be tax exempt, since it would be Federal trust property. Therefore, whether the Federal Government builds the dam or the Kootenai Flathead Tribe builds the dam, there will not be a tax return to Lake County.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the Indians themselves, if the project goes through as a Federal project, are asking for $116 million, which I have not added into the additional cost of the project.

Mr. METCALF. I wished to point out to the Senator from Wyoming that, while he is correct in his analysis about what would happen if the Montana Power Co. were to build the dam—and there would be a tax benefit to Lake and Sanders Counties—the tax benefit would not accrue if the Indian tribe built the dam. It was the opinion of the tribal attorney, as it is my opinion, that as Indian trust property it would be tax exempt. That was brought out in the hearings before the Senate committee last year.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the Senator saying that the Indians would not receive any revenue from private enterprise, if the Montana Power Co. took the land?

Mr. METCALF. No. I am saying that no tax benefit would accrue to the counties whether the tribe built the dam or the Federal Government built the dam. If either should do so, there would not be a tax benefit to the counties.

Of course, if the Federal Government takes the land, there will be a negotiated settlement, as there was at Yellowtail, as there was at Oregon, and as there have been at other Indian dams. That situation will be the same if the Montana Power Co. builds the dam or the Indians build it.

I was merely making the point that it would not make any difference whether the tribe built the dam or the Federal Government built it; there would not be any tax benefit, by way of property tax, to the counties.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the Senator insisting that the great installation by the Montana Power Co. would not be taxable on the county tax rolls?

Mr. METCALF. No. The Montana Power Co. installation would be taxable. If the tribe built the dam, it would not be taxable.

Mr. SIMPSON. I see. I understand the Senator's position.

Private development would add $2,353,644 to the taxable valuation of Sanders County.

Additionally the Federal Government, while experiencing a revenue loss of approximately $11 million a year by construction of Knowles, would receive approximately $1 million per year in tax revenues from the private project construction. It seems utter folly to be serious about a project which would have such a devastating effect upon an area, when sensible, economical, taxpaying alternatives are available.

My good friend, Hugo Aronson, the former Governor of Montana, has estimated that the area flooded by the Knowles project will take from the economy of western Montana over $2,700,000 annually. Over a 50-year period that

will amount to a loss of nearly $150 million to the economy of the State of Montana. During this same period private development of this particular stretch of the river would bring to Federal, State, and local tax units over $138 million. This does not take into consideration the fact that this project would lose to the Federal Government nearly $700 million in a 50-year period.

That is the overall period in the proposed legislation. The choice is here and now—and it is clear. We can vote to lose a billion dollars of taxpayers' money upon this outlandish project, or we can vote to bring into the various Government tax agencies $138 million and save the economy of western Montana from such a tragic impact as the loss of $150 million.

The rejection of Knowles and the construction of the alternative Buffalo Rapids No. 2 and 4 would turn loss to the Federal Government into profit at a time when our fiscal stability is being seriously questioned; at a time when our President has said we should get a dollar's value out of every dollar spent; at a time when we are being asked to raise our debt limit to $315 billion. At such a time we should take the opportunity to turn $11 million Federal loss into a $1 million Federal gain. The rejection of Knowles will do just that.

No, Mr. President, Knowles is not needed. It will be a backbreaking burden to everyone—the State, the region and the Nation. That is why the Governor of the State of Montana opposed the project. That is why the Montana State Water Conservation Board opposed the project.

Let us face it, the only reason for the pressure to authorize the Knowles project is because it will produce some very uneconomic, high-cost public power in an area where statements of public officials indicate there is no shortage—either in peaking capacity or in energy.

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

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

Mr. METCALF. In the House hearings on the bill recently the president of the Montana Power Co., Mr. Jack Covette, testified that there is a power shortage in Montana, and that power is needed in Montana. He testified that if the Federal Power Commission would grant them a license to build the dam, the Montana Power Co. would go to work right away, because there is a market for power.

I believe we are all agreed that, insofar as this area of western Montana is concerned, there is a need for additional power, and that the need will grow in the future.

Mr. SIMPSON. If the Senator will bear with me, I did not state in my text that it was said there was no lack of power.

Mr. METCALF. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. SIMPSON. I placed it upon another basis.

Mr. METCALF. In the Pacific Northwest at the present time, as we have heard in the debate on other bills—such as the intertie bill—there is a surplus of power, and especially a surplus of interruptible power, but not a surplus of prime power.

We are all agreed—from the president of the Montana Power Co. to the private utilities, the heads of the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Northwest Power Pool—that there is a shortage of power in Montana, and that the shortage will grow.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am sure that is correct. If that had not been the case, the Montana Power Co. would not have made application to the Federal Power Commission for the two sites involved.

Mr. METCALF. That is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON. It is a good example of a growing problem emphasized by the National Reclamation Association, that is, that the Bureau of Reclamation is getting far afield and is doing a disservice to irrigation by concentrating its efforts on public power development rather than reclamation. Mr. President, much has been said about the special relationship the United States bears to the Indians of America. We have made great promises to protect their rights under various treaties negotiated between the U.S. Government and their forebears. But we have utterly failed to live up to these solemn obligations and promises. The action of the Senate Public Works Committee in recommending authorization of the Knowles project and thereby disregarding the treaty rights of the Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation is but another example of complete disregard for our moral, if not legal responsibility to live up to commitments made under treaties negotiated by the Executive and ratified by the U.S. Senate. Both major political parties of the United States have consistently promised the American Indians that their treaty rights would not be violated without their consent.

The late President Kennedy wrote in the 1960 campaign:

> There would be no change in treaty or other contractual relationships without the consent of the tribes concerned—Indians have heard fine words and promises long enough. They are right in asking for deeds.

The 1960 platform of the Democratic Party said:

> We recognize the unique legal and moral responsibility of the Federal Government for Indians in restitution for the injustice that has sometimes been done them—free consent of the Indian tribes concerned shall be required before the Federal Government makes any change in any Federal-Indian treaty or other contractual relationship.

Now, when the test comes to perform our promises and to respect the Indians' wishes, I find no voices raised in indignation at the complete and unexcusable disregard for our noble commitments made to this great minority group.

Justice Hugo Black, in a recent dissenting opinion involving Indian lands in New York—*FPC* v. *Tuscarora Indian Nation*, 80 S.C. 543—said:

> Great nations, like great men, should keep their word.

Are we no longer a great nation? Can we no longer be expected to keep our word?

The Flathead Indians have clearly and repeatedly protested the violation of their treaty through the building of the Knowles project because it will flood out two or three tribal damsites which are highly valuable, inundate a large and irreplaceable area of tribal grazing lands, and do much other damage to the economic and social well-being of these people.

Now is the time for deeds, not words. We have an opportunity to show our good faith by rejecting this project.

But this is not our only backsliding. We say that we will make payment to the Flatheads to compensate them for their lost treaty rights.

The Corps of Army Engineers has said that the Flathead Indians can be expected to be compensated either in the form of assignment of annual power or rentals, or by income derivable from negotiated lump sum payment in an amount equivalent to the net benefits which they would derive from their own development of the alternative sites—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 16, 1963, page 17036.

The Indians have placed that sum at $115 million. The corps then says:

> But we shouldn't consider this amount of money in the analysis of project feasibility.

Why not? It all comes out of the American taxpayer's pocket.

No; we are told to "sweep it under the rug" as a "social obligation" of the Congress in protecting the rights and welfare of the Indians.

Mr. President, these Indian payments would make Knowles, not a $247 million project, but, rather, a $372 million project. I want to protect the rights and welfare of the Indians—I also want to protect the rights and welfare of all other citizens of the United States. In this instance this can be done only by the rejection of this gold-plated monstrosity and allowing the Indians to promote their economic development in their own way.

I urge my colleagues to reject this unnecessary, wasteful, and harmful project, and to get on with the important business of the Senate. This body should no longer stand in the way of providing the urgent emergency appropriation authorization essential to the continuation of Corps of Engineers river and harbor and flood control projects now under construction.

In closing, I submit to my colleagues this thought: I realize that public power advocates are trying to get this and other projects, such as Burns Creek, on the agenda, to be constructed at great expense to the U.S. Government; but there are private power companies at this time ready, willing, and able, with ample money, to underwrite these projects, put the property on the tax rolls, furnish the respective communities the needed services.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana such time as he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am, of course, opposed to the amendment of

the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

In his major natural resources speech of the 1960 campaign for the Presidency, the one dam with respect to which the late President Kennedy specifically committed himself was Knowles Dam. Speaking at Billings, Mont., on September 22, 1960, President Kennedy said:

> We will not stand by and permit our resources to be wasted or taken for partial development for the benefit of special interests. We will not stand by, for example, and permit another Hells Canyon blunder in the Clark Fork Basin. I think the next President of the United States must support early authorization of the multipurpose project in the Paradise-Knowles area.

In his February 23, 1961, message to Congress on natural resources, President Kennedy said:

> The full development of the power and other water resource potentials of the Columbia Basin is a vision that must be fulfilled.
>
> I have requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, working with appropriate department and agency heads, to schedule a progressive, orderly program of starting new projects to meet accumulated demands.

On April 10, 1962, President Kennedy recommended construction of Knowles Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Knowles Dam has been consistently recommended by the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior.

Knowles Dam has been three times approved in committees of the Senate. It was advocated by my distinguished predecessor, the late Senator Murray, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the recommendation being that it be built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

As the Senator from Wyoming points out, there is very little reclamation involved in this dam. Therefore, it seems more appropriate that the project be built by the Corps of Engineers. It seems more appropriate that it should have been referred to the Public Works Subcommittee. In the previous Congress it was recommended by the Public Works Subcommittee, and passed the Senate. Already this year a bill containing the Knowles Dam project was included in a bill considered by the Public Works Subcommittee, and passed this body.

I wish to make a correction. The Senator from Wyoming has said the project has been rejected three times in the House. It has never come before the House on a vote. Last year, in the previous Congress, Knowles Dam and other public power and new public works projects were contained in the omnibus public works bill. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] has told the story of what happened in that Congress. The Senate recommended the authorization of those projects. The bill went over to the House. The House suggested that it had never held any hearings on the projects, but that it would hold early hearings this year. Therefore, these projects were taken out in conference. The House itself, and the committees of the House, never had an opportunity to vote on it. This year the House held hearings on all these projects. It has not yet reported a bill. A bill has not been received. Hearings have been held.

When an authorization bill for the river basins came to the Senate, these projects were added. That bill—H.R. 6016—was passed shortly after the end of the fiscal year, and it was sent to the House. The House has not chosen to send the bill to conference. The House, instead, repassed the authorization bill for river basins, not considering the other projects, and sent it back to the Senate. The bill was amended by the elimination of Burns Creek and other projects which the Senator from Wyoming discussed.

So the House never considered this project. It has never been rejected by the House.

I shall not burden the RECORD at this time by talking about the feasibility of the project. The Corps of Engineers is a highly respected organization so far as the Senate is concerned. The Corps of Engineers has repeatedly determined that this project is feasible.

The Senator from Wyoming has raised many objections to the project. Most of them are objections that were raised in a pamphlet issued by the Montana Power Co. in an attack on me.

It seems that at sometime during his career a Senator from Montana must face the opposition of the Montana Power Co. Senator Walsh, in his memoirs, discusses a time when he had to oppose the operations of the Montana Power Co. Senator Wheeler, in his book "Yankee From the West," discusses the construction of Fort Peck Dam and how he had to oppose the Montana Power Co. My immediate predecessor, Senator Murray, in his desire to develop the resources of Montana, had to fight the Montana Power Co. Of course, our distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, had to oppose the company when Hungry Horse Dam was constructed.

But I had the unique distinction of being opposed by the Montana Power Co. in a report to the stockholders of September 30 of last year, because of my activity in support of this project. The Montana Power Co. sent out its annual statement of income, which consists of six columns, one column of which is devoted to income, and the other five columns of which are an attack on the junior Senator from Montana.

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

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want the Senator from Montana to know, as I am sure he does, that I had never seen such an attack, and that I would never join with the Montana Power Co. in an attack on the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I have discussed this question with the Senator before. I know he does not join in the attack.

I know that his amendment is based upon a deep feeling that the Knowles Dam in western Montana is not a proper project. I wish to point out where some of these arguments originated and where the record has come from. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that this material be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The Montana Power Co. and subsidiaries—Consolidated statement of income

	9 months ended Sept. 30, 1962	
	This year	Increase over last year
Operating revenues	$41,577,834	$4,152,707
Operating revenue deductions:		
Operating expense, excluding taxes	10,973,337	1,054,088
Taxes, Federal income	8,922,600	1,331,400
Taxes, other	5,000,561	515,893
Provision for deferred taxes on income:		
Accelerated amortization	454,050	0
Liberalized depreciation	417,375	59,625
Depreciation and depletion	3,139,805	46,704
Total, operating revenue deductions	28,907,728	3,007,710
Net operating revenues	12,670,106	$1,144,997
Other income (net)	[1] 90,889	[1] 85,581
Gross income	12,579,217	1,059,416
Income deductions:		
Interest on mortgage bonds	1,491,866	0
Interest on debentures	394,875	[1] 2,511
Other interest and deductions	98,223	30,288
Interest charged to construction, credit	144,246	121,520
Total, income deductions	1,840,718	[1] 93,743
Net income	10,738,499	1,153,159
Dividends applicable to preferred stock	907,151	0
Net income available for common stock	9,831,348	1,153,159
Earnings per share of common stock	1.29	.14

[1] A decrease.

NOTE.—Sept. 30, 1962, on 7,607,766 shares; Sept. 30, 1961, on 7,578,386 shares.

LETTER TO STOCKHOLDERS ON INTERIM EARNINGS STATEMENT, SEPTEMBER 30, 1962

DEAR STOCKHOLDER: Knowles Dam is dead for this year. In the concluding hours of the 87th Congress, Senate and House conferees agreed on an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill which eliminated the proposed Federal Knowles project from consideration.

The decision of the Congress not to authorize the Knowles project represents a significant victory for the thousands of Montana residents who made their opposition to the project known in letters, telegrams, resolutions, and personal appearances before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee, which held hearings on Knowles. It also indicates that Members of Congress are growing increasingly aware of the fiscal danger represented by such wasteful, uneconomic projects as Knowles.

During your company's opposition to the Knowles project, Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana, made many false, misleading, and irrelevant charges against us in an effort to draw attention away from the demonstrated economic waste of the project.

While it would be impossible in this space to answer all of the unfounded attacks on your company, I thought I should report to you the facts related to some of the more glaring misstatements released by the Senator.

Several of the Metcalf newsletters charged that it would be necessary to draw down Flathead Lake at least 30 feet lower than it now is being drawn in order to achieve the power production your company plans from the two Buffalo Rapids hydroelectric developments which would be flooded by the Knowles Reservoir.

The natural low-water elevation of Flathead Lake is and always has been approximately 2,883 feet above sea level. The channel bottom at the outlet of the lake is only a few feet below this 2,883-foot elevation, and this controls the low-water elevation of Flathead Lake at approximately 2,883 feet so that it is a physical impossibility for your company, or anyone else, to draw the lake 30 feet below its normal low-water level. These are reasons why the Federal Power Commission, in the license granted your company for its Kerr project, limited the regulation of Flathead Lake to a 10-foot drawdown between 2,883 and 2,893 feet. Senator METCALF is familiar with the Kerr license provision.

Senator METCALF also has charged that your company has the highest average rate of return of any major utility in the Nation. The Senator knows this is not true. The October 1962 issue of the highly respected Bear, Stearns & Co. analysis of electric utility common stocks shows that 13 fine utilities throughout the Nation have returns on total capitalization that are approximately the same or higher than your company's. Among these companies are such well-known utilities as Central Illinois Electric & Gas Co., El Paso Electric Co., Florida Power & Light Co., Nevada Power Co., and Texas Utilities Co.

The rate of return figures used by Senator METCALF are wrong because they do not include approximately $21 million of plant account which the Montana Public Service Commission, after exhaustive study and inquiry, has included in the company's rate base. The Montana Commission in 1958, after a full public hearing, granted us an electric rate increase which allowed us to earn a return of 5.33 percent on the fair value of our electric properties.

Senator METCALF's newsletters have repeatedly attacked the rates of your company and have compared them with rates charged by utilities and municipal systems in the Pacific Northwest that obtain much or all of their power from Bonneville Power Administration. These attacks failed to call attention to the fact that BPA pays no taxes and pays an interest rate far below the cost of money to the Government itself. They also failed to mention that BPA lost $41 million in the 4 years between 1957 and 1961, that its loss in fiscal 1961 was $14 million and that its 1962 loss has been estimated at $15 million. These losses, of course, must be absorbed by the Nation's taxpayers.

Senator METCALF's attacks on our rates ignored the fact that natural gas rates in Montana are from 53 percent to 63 percent below gas rates in other areas of the Pacific Northwest. Analysis of reports issued by the Federal Power Commission and the American Gas Association demonstrates that a typical Montana Power customer using 500 kilowatt-hours of electricity and 15,000 cubic feet of natural gas per month can heat and light his home and operate his household appliances at a cost ranging from $4.56 to $12.56 less per month than a comparable customer in four major Pacific Northwest communities. The following table shows the monthly energy bills on this comparable basis:

Total monthly energy bill

The Montana Power Co	$21.88
Tacoma, Wash	34.44
Seattle, Wash	34.09
Portland, Oreg	26.98
Spokane, Wash	26.44

A Federal Power Commission report for 1962 which analyzes the electric bills in 374 U.S. communities shows that industrial power rates of your company are among the lowest 7 percent in the Nation and that commercial electric rates of your company are among the lowest 22 percent. The study includes communities served by publicly owned as well as investor-owned utilities.

Senator METCALF also has charged that 10 large brokerage houses in the East and Middle West hold about the same amount of stock in the company as do stockholders in Montana. The Senator knows that these brokerage houses do not own the stock themselves but that in all cases they are nominees for very large numbers of individual stockholders or for mutual funds and pension funds which are owned by hundreds of thousands of investors.

We do not share Senator METCALF's contempt for the holdings of our Montana stockholders. We are proud and gratified that approximately 12,000 Montanans own stock in the company and that these Montana shareholders who have faith in the future of the State and the company include many small investors who own from 10 to 100 shares each.

On the reverse side of this letter, you will find a preliminary statement of income for the first three quarters of 1962.

The quarterly dividend of 28 cents per share on the outstanding common stock has been declared payable October 27 to stockholders of record at the close of business October 8. Quarterly dividends of $1.50 per share on the $6 preferred stock and $1.05 per share on the $4.20 preferred stock are payable November 1 to holders of record October 12.

Your dividend check is enclosed.

Sincerely,

J. E. CORETTE,
President and General Manager.

OCTOBER 24, 1962.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, without attempting to answer all the questions raised by the Senator from Wyoming, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I had prepared in answer to the various objections which have been raised to the Knowles project be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

KNOWLES DAM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on August 19, comment was made in the other body—it appears on pages 15349–15353 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—about Knowles Dam, which the Senate has twice approved. The statements made in the House regarding Knowles Dam are, in summary, 36 points, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

"SUMMARY OF STATEMENTS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF AUGUST 19, 1963 (PP. 15349–15353) ON THE KNOWLES PROJECT

"1. The project will take 20,000 acres of valuable Indian land and flood two and possibly three damsites owned by the Indians.

"2. It is proposed in face of strong Indian opposition and violation of their treaty rights.

"3. Indians state that treaty guarantees them the right to refuse giving their land to the Knowles project.

"4. Treaty recognizes rights of Indians to development of the powersites, and Congress has on numerous occasions and by section 10(e) of Federal Power Act required approval of Indians before tribal lands may be used for power development.

"5. Democratic Party promised no change in Federal-Indian treaty without consent of Indian tribes concerned.

"6. Inconsistent position of Secretary of Interior as between its Bureau of Reclamation to build the dam and its Bureau of Indian Affairs which acts as trustee in the best interest of his wards, the Indians. They have indicated construction of Knowles not in their best interests; that they wish to develop their own properties.

"7. Secretary of Interior's position that, inasmuch as Indians want development it is up to Congress to determine which is best development, completely misses the point that Buffalo 2 and 4 would develop their properties, provide annual income, and would not flood 20,000 acres of their land.

"8. Knowles would not provide greater benefits to Indians than would development of their own resources or renting their resources.

"9. Assignment from Knowles of 1.1 billion kilowatts to Indians (equivalent to Buffalo 2 and 4 production) deducted from Knowles revenues would make benefit-cost ratio 0.42 (50-year life, 2⅝ percent).

"10. Project should not be recommended in light of strenuous opposition of Indians.

"11. Project is of most questionable feasibility and should not be authorized.

"12. This project is not multipurpose. Over 95 percent of benefits are power. Congress should not authorize purely power projects under the guise of multipurpose.

"13. Project actually loses $12 million annually, equal to $700 million in 50 years, over $1 billion in 100 years. This is so because corps evaluates power benefits at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour and it will be sold at a net revenue of 1.29 mills per kilowatt-hour.

"14. Standards should be set by Congress so that projects would not be feasible on a benefit-cost ratio when they actually lose $700 million to $1 billion.

"15. Taking of 20,000 acres of Indian land will have very serious effect on economy and development of Indians.

"16. Cost of payment to Indians not considered in benefit-cost ratio. Cost of acquisition of Indian lands is not considered. If cost considered, including cost of powersites which they could develop or lease, project would not be justified.

"17. Indians are receiving $238,000 annually from Kerr Dam. Considering Indians here have two sites, payment would be far beyond the $30 million involved on Kinzua Dam.

"18. Knowles would be highest cost per killowatt-hour of any electricity in United States.

"19. It is not for flood control, not for irrigation, purely for power.

"20. Revenues from power sales will be $2,232,000; flood control benefits $447,000; recreation $58,000—total $2,733,000. That is the revenue. Costs are $13,739,000. Loss which taxpayers must pay is $11,002,000.

"21. We are taking from the Indians 19,000 acres and their only chance for a livelihood.

"22. Presentation of project has gone around proper committee of Congress and Secretary of Interior has passed his responsibility over to the Corps of Engineers.

"23. We may also be violating the treaty with Canada whereby there can be no storage projects on this river without the consent of the Canadian Government.

"24. Cost estimated at $272,964,000 (with interest/construction) but NP witness testified that railroad relocations understated by $32,970,000.

"25. The project would flood 59,000 acres including 9,000 acres of irrigated lands.

"26. It would cost from $1,066 to $1,195 per kilowatt installed capacity, making it most extravagant project in Columbia Basin.

"27. Flood control objective can be met by Canadian Storage Treaty and by other projects in basin with higher B/C ratios so it is not needed for flood control.

"28. Current B/C ratio unrealistic because (1) power benefits based on steam-electric plant cost rather than revenues; (2) because interest rate of 2⅝ percent way too low; (3) because no compensation included for Indians, and (4) because 100-year life not justified inasmuch as nuclear power will make the plant obsolete before then.

"29. If 4-percent rate used and revenues project would produce, loss would be $10 to $11 million per year.

"30. It would flood out Buffalo 2 and 4 which would result in savings to the Federal Government, taxes to Federal, State, and local governments and compensation to the Indians.

"31. Buffalo Rapids would have 240,000 kilowatt capacity, almost the same as Knowles, and it would produce tax revenues of $2,772,000 annually.

"32. Buffalo would cost $175 per kilowatt—Knowles 7 times this.

"33. Because Knowles would operate at a loss, it would not provide any irrigation assistance anywhere.

"34. It would destroy the bison range.

"35. It would flood out feeding grounds, nesting areas for pheasants, winter range for deer and elk, and destroy fine game fishing.

"36. It would disrupt economy, peoples, buildings, etc."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I asked the Corps of Engineers to comment on 33 of those points, excepting those numbered 5, 6, and 7, which involve the Democratic Party and the Secretary of Interior. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the corps' excellent statement.

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

"STATEMENT ON THE KNOWLES PROJECT

"The Knowles project was recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his review report on the Columbia River and tributaries in the interest of flood control, power generation, recreation, and other related water uses. With 3,080,000 acre-feet of usable storage for flood control, it was proposed as one of the key elements in the major water plan for control of lower Columbia River floods. Subsequent to the initial recommendation of the project by the division engineer, negotiations with Canada concerning the Columbia River Treaty had proceeded to the point that the potential contribution which Canadian storage including Libby, might make toward the flood control and power requirements of the U.S. portion of the Columbia Basin had to be assessed. The Knowles project, along with all other projects previously recommended, was reevaluated in a system with Canadian storage, with their justification tested on the basis of meeting the flood control objectives, the power requirements, and the other water resources needs that would not be served by Canadian storage. Complete control of lower Columbia River floods will not be achieved by Canadian storage and additional projects will still be required in the United States. The Knowles project's flood control potential is less in a system with Canadian storage because the flood control requirements are less. However, as the only remaining storage above the confluence of the Snake River economically justifiable at this time and acceptable or feasible from the viewpoint of recreation and fish and wildlife interests, its 3,080,000 acre-feet of usable storage constitute a significant resource. Its development will not be solely in the interest of power. It will still be effective in contributing to complete control of lower Columbia River floods and will as well reduce flood damages sustained in the local basin area.

"The Corps of Engineers flood control objective is to control a flood of 1894 magnitude to 600,000 cubic feet per second at The Dalles. In addition to Canadian storage and Libby, an additional 7.6 million acre-feet properly located in the basin will be required to meet the objective. Of all the projects analyzed in connection with the flood control objective, Knowles is the only project remaining that is located above the Snake River in the Columbia River Basin in the United States that can be developed to provide the needed flood control regulation. Alternative plans considered included: (1) Paradise project, which is not economically feasible when added after Canadian storage; (2) Smoky Range, dropped from consideration at the request of the Secretary of the Interior because of adverse effect on Glacier National Park, (3) Ninemile Prairie, located on the Blackfoot River, and Enaville, located on the Coeur d'Alene River were both found to be uneconomical when considered after Canadian storage.

"In summarizing, there are no other projects having a higher benefit-to-cost ratio located above the Snake River that are feasible for early consideration. Moreover, the value of storage for other uses such as domestic and industrial water supply, water quality control and fish and wildlife and recreation in subsequent years can be expected to become much more important and will considerably enhance total project benefits over the useful life of the project.

"The Knowles project, with its 3,080,000 acre-feet of storage and development of 234 feet of head, will in the system with Canadian storage add some 517,000 kilowatts of salable firm power (at 71-percent load factor) to the Northwest system resources. A block of power of this magnitude will be required to meet regional loads by 1972–73. Justification for supplying power by development of the Knowles project is based essentially on findings that the costs are less and will be less than costs of development of any available alternative sources of supply. In other words, the project is economically justified and constitutes a logical and supportable development for meeting regional power needs. This in no way is intended to imply that the production cost per kilowatt-hour is as cheap as some previous projects built in the Northwest 20 to 30 years ago. We hardly expect to find any resource development or other productive values to be attained at those historical unit costs. What is shown by the justification analysis is that it is a good project for construction now, and is competitive costwise with alternative sources of power presently available. The Pacific Northwest has been fortunate, compared to some other sections of the country, in having vast hydroelectric power resource that could furnish low-cost energy. This is particularly true because of the dearth of cheap energy fuels in the region compared to other areas more amply endowed with such resources. The Northwest is fortunate still to have the hydroelectric power potential of the Knowles project, for the power produced at Knowles constitutes a cheaper source of energy than that now or in the future available in many other parts of the country.

"The Columbia River power system today is 100-percent hydro but the time is approaching when all economical hydro will have been developed and thermal plants will be required to meet the continued load growth demands. Costs of alternative sources which will constitute the only remaining source of energy for the region are the yardstick used, the measure of benefits, to determine whether Knowles or any other hydro project now being considered for development is justified. This alternative cost value in the Pacific Northwest is approximately equivalent to non-Federal publicly financed steamplants. Development of this benefit value by the Federal Power Commission and its application as a feasibility test, that is, as a measure of benefits, is in accordance with the accepted and usual standards for evaluation of hydroelectric resource projects and is clearly set forth in Senate Document 97, 87th Congress.

"Senate Document 97 standards also prescribe the policies and procedures for evaluating project costs, including the interest rate to be used, the treatment to be accorded taxes and other matters. The Knowles evaluation conforms to Senate Document 97 requirements in all aspects of the cost analysis including utilization of the interest rate as prescribed. It is a rate determined by the Bureau of the Budget and used by all agencies in analysis of water resource development projects.

"We find numerous statements being made that the Knowles project will lose millions of dollars annually because revenues, measured by the present BPA system rate, are not equal to benefits and because the interest rate used in the project analysis is too low. This represents a completely erroneous and misleading view of the relationship of justification analysis and financial feasibility analysis.

"In all power systems throughout the country, system rates reflect the average or composite of costs of all its energy-producing plants. The marketing of power from the Knowles project will be no different in this respect when it is added to the Columbia River Power System. The Bonneville Power Administration which markets and distributes power from all Federal projects in the Columbia River system establishes a composite rate which reflects the varying production and transmission costs of all the components. The present Federal system comprises 12 operating hydroelectric projects. The unit cost of providing energy at the individual projects varies from about seven-tenths mills per kilowatt-hour at Grand Coulee, which was built some 25 years ago, up to about 5 mills per kilowatt-hour at Lookout Point in Oregon. For marketing and revenue purposes, however, the entire system must be treated as a unit. It would be prohibitively complex, inefficient, and expensive to tailor each customer's rate to reflect the cost of energy used on the assumption that it was generated at one particular project. The BPA wholesale rates are established on a system basis, so that the total power revenues will pay the total system expenses. The rate so established will understandably exceed the unit cost of production at a number of the projects in the system and will be lower than the cost at others. The power to be generated at Knowles and downstream therefrom will be absorbed into the BPA system and marketed at established system rates. The production expenses will be offset in their entirety by revenue credits equal to the costs. By law, the BPA rates must be set so that total system power revenues will repay all system power costs, including marketing, metering, transmission, etc.

"The allegations, therefore, that the Knowles project will lose $12 million annually, $11 million annually, or any other amount is without foundation. With a system rate established and adjusted as necessary from time to time to insure that total costs of all projects in the system are covered, no project loses any money annually. Computation of a loss can be imputed only on the assumption that Knowles power would be sold independently of the Columbia River power system but at that system's present rate. To the contrary, Knowles will be incorporated in the Columbia River system, its power output will be sold at the then prevailing system rates and it will receive whatever share of system revenues are required to fully pay off the project costs allocated to power over the repayment period established by Congress.

"Once the reimbursement requirements of power have been discharged revenues assignable to the project will be available for irrigation assistance or such other use as the Congress of the United States deems fitting and proper. The standards used in evaluating Knowles project justification and its financial feasibility are the sound and approved policies and procedures applicable to all water resource development projects as set forth in Senate Document No. 97 and followed by all water resource development agencies.

"Although the cost of power from Knowles, when considered after Canadian storage and Libby, will be higher than the other hydro projects recommended in the Columbia River Review Report, it is a fully justified and feasible project, both economically and financially, and supportable as a logical addition to the regional power resources at this time. Therefore we should not be misled by statements that this is a high cost project, compared to others, or the most extravagant project in the Columbia Basin, particularly when the figures cited to establish this misconception are based on a comparison of total project costs per kilowatt of installed capacity. For instance we have had statements made time and time again that Knowles power would cost from $1,066 to $1,195 per kilowatt of installed capacity or that it would cost seven times as much per kilowatt of installed capacity as the alternative Buffalo Rapids development.

"Such analyses completely disregard the large expenditures included in the cost estimates for other uses such as flood control, recreation and storage for downstream power generation. The cost estimate for Knowles also provided for foundation and skeleton stuctures so that future power generating units which will double that plant capacity can be installed cheaply and readily. Such analyses also give no consideration to the power produced. For example, if Buffalo Rapids were in existence today it could produce only 1,297 million kilowatt-hours of net salable energy annually. On the other hand, if Knowles were in existence today it could produce 8,348 million kilowatt-hours annually, or nearly 6½ times as much salable energy to system resources. In the modified major water plan with Canadian storage, Knowles would produce 2,015 million kilowatt-hours of energy annually whereas Buffalo Rapids would produce only about one-half this amount.

"We have frequently heard the statement, as a further argument against Knowles, that nuclear power will make the project obsolete before its useful life is expired. This of course is not an argument against Knowles alone, but against the development of any additional hydroprojects anywhere. Nuclear powerplants will not make hydroplants obsolete but will increase their value. The remaining economical hydrosites are being rapidly depleted as powerloads increase, and in a few years the only possible source of additional electric energy will be conventional steam or nuclear. Whether conventional steam plants or nuclear plants are developed, both will operate in the base of the load while hydro will be designated to carry the peaks. This is the most economical method to operate a large system. Good examples of the forthcoming role of hydroplants can be found in the East where the utilities for constructing pumped-storage hydroplants for peaking. Under no instances has it ever been expressed by experts in the electric utility field that nuclear energy will make hydroplants obsolete.

"The construction of Knowles entails substantial relocations, principally railroads and highways. Disruption to the local economy and relocation of individuals and their homes and towns are not excessive compared to other projects of comparable size which have been developed throughout the country at great benefit to the Nation. The project will flood 59,000 acres of land, of which 9,000 acres are under irrigation. Approximately 1,300 people will be displaced and 527 buildings destroyed. Lands and buildings would be purchased and the project cost estimate includes these purchases appraised at fair market value as is customary in all projects of this type. Many of the persons displaced would relocate in the general area and they will be served by relocated railroads, highways, and utilities comparable in service ability and utility to the present facilities. New industrial and business development resulting from the project can be expected to have a favorable long-term effect, offsetting any initial adverse impact from lost taxes. Availability of water from the reservoir for additional irrigation, either through pumping or by gravity diversion from the pool, would offset lost income from cultivated and irrigated land flooded by the project. The Bureau of Reclamation has testified that there are 21,000 acres of land adjacent to the reservoir that could be reached by pumping and further has pointed out that pumping energy from the project also would be available for irrigation pumping at other more remote areas.

"Extensive railroad relocations will be required by construction of the Knowles project. Estimated relocation costs were reanalyzed by the Corps of Engineers after portions of the proposed plans were questioned by the railroad and these further studies confirmed their earlier findings as to proposed relocation routes. When the project cost estimate was updated in 1961, increased allowances were made both for highway and railroad relocations. Railroad relocation costs included in the Corps of Engineers 1961 project cost estimate amount to $91,395,000 direct, and the total, direct and indirect, is $100,535,000. The Northern Pacific Railroad witness indicated railroad relocation requirements would be $116,056,000, although this amount, according to his testimony, included $8,801,000 more than actually considered necessary by the railroad company. This additional amount was included because the Corps of Engineers estimate for relocating the branch line exceeded that of the railroad company by that amount. It is apparent that the difference in estimates by the Engineers and the railway company is not of great magnitude, and certainly not approaching the cited figure of $32,970,000.

"The Knowles project would not destroy the National Bison Range and the Fish and Wildlife Service has testified to this effect and I quote: 'Although a part of the scenic and esthetic value of the National Bison Range would be destroyed, suitable replacement of lands and facilities is considered feasible.' The project would inundate 1,990 acres of the range and make another 1,460 acres unusable through railroad relocation and fencing. Lands suitable for replacement adjoining the east side of the range are proposed for acquisition by the Service and the project cost estimate includes funds for acquisition of approximately 5,000 acres of replacement lands.

"Other lands proposed for acquisition and provided for in the cost estimate will replace upland game range and nesting areas for waterfowl that will be inundated by the project. Corrective measures for protection of the fishery resource, consisting of chemical treatment of the river and tributaries above the damsite, developments to replace lost spawning areas, hatchery facilities and restocking of the reservoir are included as a part of the proposed project plan.

"In presenting the plan for the Knowles project, the Corps of Engineers recognized the special consideration warranted the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation by reason of inundation of two powersites on their reservation. Based on precedent in similar cases the Engineers suggested that the question of just compensation be determined by the Congress of the United States. The Knowles project was recommended because it was found to provide the most complete resource development justifiable and in this respect was superior to alternative run-of-river projects at the Buffalo 2 and 4 sites proposed for development by the Indians and by the Montana Power Co. It never was contemplated, however, that an equitable settlement would not be made to the Indians for their compensable rights.

"We have a number of precedents where Indian lands required for water resource developments have included powersites comprising special and significant value to the Indians over and above the mere land values. In such cases the water resource development prospects have included in the cost estimate payment for the fair market value of the lands, but compensation for powersite values has always been a matter of negotiation, following project authorization, between Congress and the Indian tribes involved. Such compensation, moreover, has traditionally been a special cost not considered chargeable to the water resource project. This is consistent with and parallel to other programs and expenditures of the U.S. Government on behalf of the Indians which are incurred because of the special trustee-ward relationship between the U.S. Government and the Indians. Such expenditures are made to benefit or to protect and promote Indian welfare because our Government has recognized that we have a special obligation in this respect and such expenditures are nonreimbursable, justified by these obligations and benefits.

"Most water resource development projects are recommended after evaluation and consideration of a number of alternatives, with selection of that project or projects which represents the optimum development of the resource. In many cases, the alternatives considered are in the same reach of the river as the selected project and are inundated by the selected project. No payments are made for inundation of these other sites and no charge is made against the project for values of alternative sites inundated. The fact that we do make payment to the Indians for their powersites is only because of their special rights and the special relationship between the Government and the Indians and in nowise indicates that such payments should be charged against the water resource project. Normally, the Federal Government, in the exercise of eminent domain, would institute condemnation proceedings in the local U.S. district court and the court would determine the amount due the Indians as 'just compensation,' as provided in the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

"If the Federal Government's action progresses to the point that it constitutes an actual or constructive taking of Indian lands, the Indians could proceed against the Government in the U.S. Court of Claims. However, in this event, the measure of damages would be the same as under normal condemnation proceedings; i.e., 'just compensation' as provided in the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

"Also, as indicated in House Document No. 403, 87th Congress, 2d session, volume I, 'Columbia River and Tributaries.' Under the heading 'Special Considerations' on page 178, there is a discussion of 'equitable settlement' for powersites. If such a settlement can be negotiated, it would not be necessary for the Federal Government to institute condemnation proceedings or for the Indians to proceed in the Court of Claims.

"It has been alleged that the Knowles project should not be built because of Indian opposition, because of violation of their treaty rights and because development of alternative powersites would provide greater benefits to the Indians. In this regard article VI of the Constitution provides three things which are the supreme law of the land:

"1. 'This Constitution, and

"2. 'the laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and

"3. 'all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; * * *.'

"The Constitution does not provide for situations where there is conflict between two or all three of these elements. However, the Federal court has said 'A treaty with the Indians cannot rise above the power of Congress to legislate' (161 F. Supp. 376) (Jan. 11, 1957). (This was a condemnation action brought by the Federal Government against the Seneca Nation of Indians in connection with the Allegheny (Kinzua) Dam and Reservoir project.) The above is quoted from the opinion of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of New York, dated January 11, 1957. The Seneca Nation moved, in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, to stay the district court's order of possession. The circuit court of appeals, without a written opinion, rejected the plea of the Seneca Nation.

"As a corollary, the court also held in January 11, 1957, opinion referred to above that: 'The Secretary of the Army has the power to take Indian lands for flood control purposes, provided Congress has authorized the project, and

" 'Congress had authorized construction of the project, not only with the presumed knowledge but with actual knowledge of history of the lands within the Indian reservation and particularly as to the so-called Pickering Treaty of 1794, and the proclamation by Congress of such treaty with the Six Nations on January 21, 1795.'

"Another related action was an injunction proceeding in 1958 filed by the Seneca Nation to enjoin the Federal Government from constructing the Allegheny Reservoir project. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia held, in a decision rendered on March 24, 1958 (162 F. Supp. 580), that:

" 'The construction of the project is authorized by law.

" 'The action of the Government was lawful.

" 'The Seneca Nation was not entitled to an injunction or any other relief in the action.

" 'The complaint should be dismissed.'

"The Seneca Nation appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which held, in a decision in November 1958 (262 F. 2d 27), that the Seneca Nation was not entitled to the injunction notwithstanding the proposed flooding would infringe Indian rights acquired by the treaty in 1794, where Congress showed by legislative history a clear and specific intention to authorize the taking of the Indian lands by eminent domain despite the treaty, as it was authorized to do. The U.S. Supreme Court in June of 1959 refused to grant a writ of certiorari (360 U.S. 909).

"Congress has the responsibility not only of promoting and protecting the rights and welfare of the Indians, it has the responsibility in this particular instance of promoting the optimum resource development plan for the national benefit. In past cases this twofold responsibility has been discharged, not by endorsing a less than optimum development but by recommending the best project, in terms of regional and national goals, and in addition, making just and equitable settlement to the Indians for their special treaty entitlements. This can be done again in the case of Knowles and the benefits to the Indians, either in the form of assignment of annual power or rentals, or by income derivable from a negotiated lump sum payment, can be expected to be fully equivalent to the net benefits which they would derive from their own development of the alternative sites.

"There has been a statement made to the effect that the Hellgate Treaty is the same type of treaty and should merit the same concern and treatment as is presently being given the test ban treaty. It is unalterably clear that there is a basic difference between the two treaties. The test ban treaty is with other sovereign nations, not subject to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America, laws of the Congress of the United States of America or action of the courts of the United States of America. The Hellgate Treaty is with the Flathead Tribe who are subject to the provisions of the Constitution, the laws, and the courts of the United States of America.

"It has been suggested, as a further argument against Knowles, that construction of the project may be a violation of the treaty with Canada on the grounds that no storage projects can be built in the Clark Fork watershed without the consent of the Canadian Government. The treaty contains no such proviso. Perhaps the reference is with respect to the stipulation in the treaty which prohibits diversions except for consumptive uses (and other than those specifically provided for in the treaty) which might alter the flow of any water as it crosses the boundary within the Columbia River Basin. The treaty in no way limits or restricts the development of storage where no diversion is involved and Knowles, of course, involves no diversion."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, one of the witnesses before the House Public Works Committee this year was Archer S. Taylor of Missoula, Mont. He is a supporter of Knowles Dam. Some Senators are acquainted with his brother, Walter Taylor, who currently is engaged, under the auspices of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends (Quakers), in working with the Senecas, in connection with Kinzua Dam. Both Archer and Walter Taylor are known as fair and knowledgeable supporters of Indian rights.

Archer Taylor has given me permission to have printed in the RECORD his testimony this year before the House Public Works Committee and a letter to his brother, Walter. Both documents deal with the Indian-rights aspect of the Knowles controversy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these two documents printed at this point in the RECORD. I commend them to those who desire a clearer understanding of the Indian-rights question in connection with Knowles Dam and the degree to which a well-intended organization, from which some Senators have heard, was misled by its reliance on data furnished by the Montana Power Co.

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

"STATEMENT OF ARCHER S. TAYLOR, MISSOULA, MONT., TO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 4, 1963

"Mr. Chairman, my name is Archer S. Taylor, and I live at Missoula, Mont. I am a professional engineer, practicing as a consultant in the field of radio and television. I was one of the original organizers and the first secretary-treasurer of the Committee for Paradise Dam. My wife is today the treasurer of the committee. I am strongly committed in favor of the authorization and construction of the Knowles Dam, or if subsequent studies should indicate feasibility, the larger Paradise Dam.

"However, I am not here today to present testimony on the merits of the project itself, but rather to discuss the matter of Indian rights involved in the Knowles project. My brother, Walter Taylor, is currently engaged under the auspices of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends (Quakers) in working with the Senecas in western New York in their adjustment to the Kinzua Dam. Some of you may have met him as he tried in vain to prevent the taking of Seneca lands by condemnation without consent. I am here today to support the rights of Indians with respect to our obligations under treaties made in the early years of our history.

"There has been considerable testimony and editorial opinion expressed by various persons and groups opposing the authorization of Knowles Dam because of alleged violation of Indian treaty rights. I am not a lawyer, and cannot argue the legal question of whether the mere authorization would constitute violation in itself as contrasted with actually taking land without treaty negotiations.

"However, I am ashamed, as an American citizen, of the cavalier treatment we newcomers to this continent have given the native population who inhabited this beautiful country long before our ancestors even knew it existed. And I am every bit as concerned as the Indian Rights Association or the Christian Century or the other church groups that further violations of our sacred promises be prevented.

"But even so sacred an obligation as the treaty rights of the Indians must be supported and defended by truth, or at least man's best effort to arrive at the truth. The rights of Indians are not effectively nor worthily supported by arguments in opposition to the Knowles Dam which are demonstrably false, or based on misinformation, or partisan political propaganda of vested commercial interests. This is my deep concern; and it is with considerable discomfort to myself, and to all of my friends who have been active on the Committee for Paradise Dam, that we find ourselves in disagreement with the leaders of the Confederated Tribes of the Flathead Indians. It appears to us, and to some members of the tribes who are not represented in the tribal leadership, that the tribal leaders have been somehow lead by the utility company into an alliance which will once again demonstrate the perfidy of the white man in his commercial dealings with the Indian.

"The arguments used by the Indian Rights Association and its supporters against the Knowles Dam are not arguments in defense of Indian treaty rights, but are the partisan, vested interest arguments of the Montana Power Co.

"They say: 'Actual cost of Knowles would exceed benefits' if the Indians are compensated for damsites. This argument claims a benefit-cost ratio of 1.08 to 1, but ignores the fact that the latest official figure on the benefit-cost ratio is 1.2 to 1 if constructed after Libby Dam, and 2.31 to 1 if constructed before Libby Dam. It is based on an appraisal figure for damsite value which far exceeds the revenues which the Indians might actually obtain for their power, if they themselves built the dams, since it is based on the cost of steam generation. The extent of these distortions has been thoroughly presented by Senator METCALF and by numerous witnesses in the various hearings concerning the water-use project, and I will not enlarge on them here.

"I would submit that the Indian Rights Association is not itself qualified to make a judgment as to the correctness of the official figures presented on benefit-cost ratios. I would further submit, that whether or not the dam is economically sound has precisely nothing to do with Indian rights. The only proper question is whether or not the 'authorization' in this bill constitutes in itself a violation of the treaty rights—not whether the project is sound.

"They say: 'The bison range would be destroyed, or severely damaged' by the flooding of Knowles Dam. The record shows, without contradiction, that only a small fraction of the bison range acreage would be flooded. The official position of those charged by law with administering the bison range is that adequate replacement for the lost acreage is available and will be obtained. There are technical arguments in which unofficial

supporters of the bison range contend that the loss of headquarters pasture would be irreplaceable. This has been studied by the National Wildlife Service, and their testimony is otherwise.

"In any event, the Indian Rights Association is not competent as experts on bison grazing, etc. Furthermore, the question as to what happens to the bison range is immaterial to the central question of Indian rights. As a matter of fact, the official resolution of the tribes opposing the Knowles Dam states that the bison range itself was built on Indian lands without the consent of the Indians. The only proper question is whether or not the authorization of Knowles Dam constitutes a violation of Indian rights, not whether or how much the bison range will be, or should be affected by the dam.

"They claim that: 'Knowles is not the best plan for full development.' This argument is based on studies by private engineers. No matter what the controversy, of course, it will always be possible to find expert opinion to support both sides. Furthermore, when unofficial evidence is being considered as valid on one point, it must also be considered on other points. Thus, the Committee for Paradise Dam several years ago engaged a private engineer who testified that the railroad relocation costs of the Corps of Engineers were grossly overstated. Since railroad relocation is the largest part of the cost of the Knowles Dam, it is apparent that this private engineering study has as great a bearing on the benefit-cost ratio as the Indians' 'private engineering' studies have on appraisal of full development. The official agency, charged by law with responsibility to the Congress and to the people of the United States with determining these matters, appears to disagree with the Indians' engineers on this matter. In any event, the Indian Rights Association does not claim competence in the matter of conservation or full development of water resources, and relies merely on hearsay in making the claim that Knowles is not the best plan for full development. And again the question of full development is not relevant to the central question of whether or not the Indians' treaty rights are being violated by the mere passage of the authorization bill.

"They say: 'Knowles would hurt recreational areas.' This argument is based on three points: (1) the drawdown and 'mudflats'; (2) the injury to the bison range; and (3) a vague reference to the maintenance of wildlife habitat. The drawdown and mudflat argument is an emotional one, which suggests ignorance of the facts that maximum drawdown is a rare occurrence in multipurpose dams, that the full pool period will coincide with the summer-fall recreational period, and that most of the pool shoreline is steep sided with only the Moiese Valley area being subjected to significant mudflat formation. The implication is that the bison range may be of value to Indians for hunting or fishing, but it must be obvious that it is closed to such activities at all times. In order to control overgrazing, the herds are thinned each year by range personnel, but hunting is never permitted to Indians or others. It is further made clear by testimony in the several hearings on the Knowles Dam that the alternate proposal of the Indians for Ninemile Prairie and Smoky Range would have vastly more impact on wildlife conservation and on wildlife interests generally than would Knowles. The two small dams which the Indians say they want to build would produce two small lakes, little wider than the river channel itself, in almost treeless areas where access roads are almost nonexistent. It is difficult to see how this could offer recreational attraction superior to the wooded shoreline on the south side of the Knowles pool, along which U.S. Highway 10–A would be built, and which is also on the reservation.

"In any event, the Indian Rights Association has made no study of recreation in the area, and does not claim any special competence in the field of recreational uses of lands. This question is also immaterial to the central question of whether the authorization of Knowles is a violation of Indian rights.

"5. The questions as to the taking of Indian lands, valuable for grazing, for power, or for recreation, and the claim by the Indian Rights Association that the authorization of Knowles Dam would cripple the Indian economy in violation of President Kennedy's pledge to develop Indian resources, simply assume that the Knowles Dam would be built by condemnation without adequate compensation to the Indians and without their consent.

"I am here today to do what I think the Indian Rights Association has failed to do. I fully support the authorization of the Knowles Dam. I think the Indians are wrong in their judgment that the passage of the authorization bill is tantamount to the confiscation of their lands and values without consent.

"But, I think that all of us in the United States may well hang our heads in shame at the repeated instances of improper and unjust intrusion on Indian rights. I believe that once authorized to do so, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF, of our State of Montana, will sincerely undertake, as they have promised, to arrive at a mutually acceptable modification of the Indian treaty terms which will permit the Knowles Dam to be built. Obviously, such treaty amendments cannot be arrived at agreeably without including compensating payments in money, or in power, or other things of value for the power damsites on the tribal lands, nor without arrangements to replace or compensate for the loss of the grazing lands, nor without arrangements to relocate equitably those Indians who would be moved from their present homes.

"I think the Indians have some cause for distrust, and some cause for fearing that our promises to them may not always be honored. I realize that it is impractical to include such promises in the line item of an omnibus public works bill, but I would hope, and urge, that in the legislative history of this project it be made abundantly clear that the Knowles Dam will be built only after negotiating an agreement with the Indians, on terms which make it possible for them to realize the full benefit of the development of the power and water resource which is within their reservation.

"Others who have, or will, testify in this hearing will have shown the distortions of fact, the misrepresentations, and the apparent abuse of the truth which have constituted the bulk of the argument by the private power utility and their agents (some unwitting) against the Knowles project. Neither these arguments, nor in fact the supporting arguments of the Committee for Knowles Dam, have any bearing on the question of a violation of Indian treaty rights.

"It is my own opinion that the Knowles Dam actually constitutes the best guarantee the Indians have of receiving value for their power damsites. They know they have had to take the Montana Power Co. to court to compel payment of additional rent for the third generator installed at Kerr Dam on the reservation. Their attorney, Mr. Cragun, testified in the Senate hearings that 'it is legally impossible for (the Indians) to get as good a deal from Montana Power Co. as they could get from building the dams themselves.' What remains, then, is to determine, by negotiation, whether compensation can be given to the Indians equivalent to what they could get by building the dams themselves. This authorization bill will have to be passed before serious commitments on this matter can be made.

"It is worth noting that in 1957 Senator Jim Murray, of Montana, together with then Congressman LEE METCALF sponsored a bill to provide for the construction of Paradise Dam which included a requirement that the Secretary of the Interior negotiate a contract with the Confederated Tribes providing for the payment of just compensation, on the basis that the owners of any property shall be at least as well off economically after the transaction as before. At that time, the tribal council supported the Montana Power Co.'s proposal to build the small dams, and opposed the Paradise bill.

"In any case, it would appear that the power resource which the Indians would have without the full development of Knowles might be insufficient to attract commercial users except Montana Power Co. It would indeed be ironic to find the Indians resisting both the Knowles development and the Montana Power Co. development, only to find themselves captive producers of power with only Montana Power Co. as a customer. Under the Knowles development, this would not happen, if the treaty negotiations are properly handled. Under Knowles, the Indians could be virtually guaranteed returns on their damsite values.

"None of us can truly, in our hearts, criticize the Indians for not trusting our word, nor could we expect them to weaken their leverage for subsequent negotiation by making premature concessions. It is nevertheless disturbing, and disheartening, to me that their position as represented both by their tribal leaders and by private agencies such as Indian Rights Association has been to pick up blindly the vested interest arguments on the public merits or lack of merit of the project itself. They seem to have overlooked, or minimized, to a large extent that history has provided ample cause for them to fear that Congress and the administration may speak with "forked tongues" as have many Congresses and administrations in the past.

"I have no doubt but that the Knowles Dam can be built without infringing on Indian rights. I have every confidence that an equitable agreement can be achieved by this Congress, with men like our Montana Representative ARNOLD OLSEN, Senator MANSFIELD and Senator METCALF working through and with the Kennedy administration, which has pledged itself to the protection of the Indian land base and to no changes in treaty relationships without the consent of the tribes concerned.

"Thank you for this opportunity to be heard."

"MISSOULA, MONT.,
"April 29, 1963.

"WALTER TAYLOR,
"Salamanca, N.Y.

"DEAR WALT: I saw Lawrence Lindley in Philadelphia Friday. It was a short visit but long enough for me to get pretty well to the meat of the problem, as I think he would agree. At that time, I had not yet received your letter of April 24, containing Harry Burks' correspondence.

"Frankly, I am much relieved that Harry's attitude was as objective as it seemed to be in his letters. I am encouraged to think that had he lived, he would have taken what I would consider to be a more tenable position than the Indian Rights Association has taken, no matter how far he dug into the conflicting points of view. So much for your first point. Later in this letter I will outline what I mean by 'tenable position.' I do not mean, necessarily, one which either agrees with me, or even supports the present bill.

"On your second point, I can fully agree that Indian internal politics are as complex as non-Indian politics—with right and wrong

aspects to both the official and the unofficial position. It is not quite true, however, to charge that the Flathead-Kootenai organization is 'nonreservation' Indians. I suspect that it may be weighted with such, but it does include a substantial participation of reservation Indians in opposition to the official governing body of the tribes. In this connection, I would merely like to point out that Lawrence Lindley leans heavily on unofficial testimony as to availability of replacement grazing lands, impact on the National Bison Range, impact on recreational values, etc., paying no attention at all to the official position of U.S. Government agencies which make contrary judgments. It appears to me to be inconsistent to contend that we must consider only the views of official tribal leaders on the one hand, but reject official views of U.S. agencies on the other.

"On your third point: The Indian Rights Association has picked up the earlier corps figure of 1.08:1 for benefit-cost ratio, notwithstanding that the revised figure presented in the 1962 Senate hearings was 1.2 to 1. The revision was based on using a 100-year life rather than a 50-year life. I do not believe the Indian Rights Association claims or has competence to judge the merits of this situation. Furthermore if we are going to take into account additional factors, such as the special negotiated compensation to the Indians, then we must also consider that the costs of railroad relocation, which were roughly half the total cost of the project, are probably significantly inflated. The corps never made any independent study of this, but merely accepted the figures presented by the railroad itself—and when you realize that the railroad has interlocking directorates with the Montana Power Co., you can appreciate that their figures may well be inflated. The Indians rely on independent engineering counsel to set a value on their power sites; the committee for Knowles Dam engaged an independent engineering firm several years ago to analyze the railroad relocation costs. If the findings of one are worthy of consideration, the findings of the other are equally worthy. The conclusion of such an analysis including both Indian compensation and true railroad costs would probably be a standoff: little or no change in benefit/cost ratios.

"Two years ago, there were extensive hearings in the Senate at which a considerable effort was made by conservationists to get revision of the benefit-cost evaluation formulas to include such things as water pollution abatement and a number of other side benefits. If such revised formulas were to be used, the ratio at Knowles would be considerably enhanced. This is an area where you and I are in complete agreement: The formulas and methods used by the Corps of Engineers are most unrealistic. I am certain, though, this is, of course, not impartial evidence, that revised analysis of costs and benefits would still show Knowles to be a most worthwhile project.

"To show how elusive a matter benefit/cost ratios really are, consider the following. Another dam has been authorized, and appropriations made for it: The Libby Dam on the Kootenai River, which is also in the Columbia basin. The flooding from this dam would cross into Canada, and so requires treaty negotiations and agreements, just as the Knowles requires negotiations with the Indians. For several years, now, the Provincial Government of British Columbia has blocked ratification of the necessary treaty, and there is no clear indication as to whether the new Pearson government will expedite this or not. But if Knowles should be built before Libby, the benefit/cost of Knowles is much greater than the figures used earlier in my letter. Thus, Mr. Holum testified, pages 312–313:

"'In either event, annual benefits exceed annual costs. The resultant benefit-cost ratios become 1.68 if Knowles is first added, and 1.08 under the extremely conservative assumption that it might be last added. (First and last refer to before or after Canadian storage in Libby Dam.) The above figures are based on an assumed economic life of 50 years. Again, may I say this is a most conservative figure.

"'If the economic life of 100 years is used, which is in accord with current criteria, the benefit-cost ratios would be increased substantially.'

"On page 121 in the hearing record, table 3, line J, and page 122, table 4, line L, Mr. Bloch, the engineer hired by the tribes to present testimony on the value of their damsites and on alternate proposals, has tables showing benefit/cost ratios.

"With Candian storage, he shows 1.20; without Canadian storage, 2.31. The references indicate these are the Corps of Engineers figures in its June 1958 updated report, based on 100-year amortization. They do not include compensation for power damsites to the Indians. Without Canadian storage, if we add Mr. Bloch's own estimate of the value of the Indians' power, $4.65 million annually, we find that the benefit/cost ratio is still 1.57:1. On the 50-year basis without Canadian storage but after paying for Indian power, the ratio is 1.14:1.

"Now, to get to the 'nut' of our disagreement with the Indian Rights Association. I told Lawrence Lindley that I would agree wholeheartedly that if Knowles Dam were to be built without negotiating a settlement with the Flathead Indians, this would be a violation of Indian rights and their treaty. I most emphatically do not agree that the passage of the line item authorization of Knowles Dam in the omnibus public works bill is in itself any such violation. I specifically asked Lawrence Lindley if he would be willing to modify his statement along some such lines as: Unless compensation by negotiation with the tribes is provided, the taking of Indian lands for construction of Knowles Dam would be a violation of Indian rights. He would not consent to the qualification—contending that the mere authorization was in itself a violation.

"The plain fact is that there is no legal way for the U.S. Government to undertake negotiations with the Indians, or anyone else for that matter—railroad, white man, or Indian—until congressional authorization has been made.

"Several years ago, 1958, there was a Paradise bill (now modified to Knowles) written and introduced by Senator Murray, of Montana, which did spell out in general terms the requirement that negotiations be undertaken with the Indians. Mark this: the Indians—in particular Walter McDonald, then tribal council president—opposed this bill. If Lawrence Lindley's position is consistent, I would believe that he would have had to support the bill at that time—had it been called to his attention. At that time, the Indians favored construction of the two small dams by Montana Power Co. The bill was never reported out of committee—to nobody's surprise.

"One further point which you have missed completely in your letter to me of April 24. As far as I can tell, and I am deeply involved in the proponent efforts for Knowles Dam, there is no proponent of Knowles, and no agency of Government which disagrees with the Indian Rights Association on two points:

"(1) The taking of land for Knowles Dam must be by negotiation and not by condemnation.

"(2) The Indians must be provided with compensation in the form of income or income producing assets replacing the potential value of their powersites.

"Lawrence Lindley showed me a letter from the Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, confirming this general approach, though admittedly cautious not to concede specifics prior to the proper opening of negotiations.

"Senator Metcalf and Senator Mansfield, and before them Senator Murray, have stoutly insisted on these principles from the very beginning.

"The leaders of the citizen's group supporting the Knowles proposal are, without exception, liberals (as Harry Burks found out) who by nature and inclination support these principles.

"The Corps of Engineers in its call to hearing in 1958 in Missoula officially stated that the Indians' rights would have to be given full consideration.

"There is considerable testimony in the 1962 hearing record in which Senator METCALF makes quite clear his position on this matter. This record becomes part of the 'legislative history' of the Knowles bill, and is a very important legal protection against violation of this 'intent' by subsequent actions.

"Lawrence Lindley quotes Mr. Cragun as saying that the Indians had a change of heart between the 1958 hearings and the 1962 hearings. Whereas formerly they were merely looking for 'the best deal for the Indians,' they now (after mature consideration) totally oppose Knowles in favor of building the two run-of-river dams themselves. I would quote the following from the hearing record:

"(Rather than copying the quotes, see pp. 3, 10, and 11 of Rae Logan's letter to the Christian Century.)

"Lawrence Lindley contended to me that he felt that this testimony was somehow or other improperly adduced from Morigeau. But Morigeau said the same thing twice; Cragun confirmed the recognition of Indian rights by the senatorial sponsors of the Knowles authorization; and then there is this, from page 74 of the hearing record:

"'Senator COOPER. How long have you been a member (of the tribal council)?

"'Mr. MCDONALD. I am starting my 21st year.

"'Senator COOPER. You say that in this period in which this project has been under consideration, that the appropriate U.S. agency—what is it, the Bureau of Indian Affairs?

"'Senator METCALF. Yes.

"'Senator COOPER. (continuing). Has not discussed with the council your interest in this land?

"'Mr. MCDONALD. Only to the extent that the possibility of Knowles and the Paradise Dam would be built, not to the extent of valuation.

"'Senator METCALF. May I interject here.

"'As I understand it, Federal agencies would not negotiate with anybody until a dam project is authorized and an appropriation were made, because there is no power to negotiate either with the Indians or with private individuals. However, may I also interject that in the 10 years that I have been in Congress, I have talked to Mr. McDonald and Mr. Morigeau; Senator MANSFIELD has talked to them. We have talked about Knowles and this project.

"'We have assured them that if it were authorized, that their interests under the treaty would be protected.

"'We have discussed various payments.

"'Mr. McDonald testified at Missoula in the Corps of Engineers hearings as the chairman of the tribal council that he and his council did not care what dam was built. (NOTE.—I understand from Lindley's letter that it is Cragun's position that they have changed their stand on this in favor of building their own power dams.) All they wanted was the best deal for the Indians, and of course that is what the Senate of the United States wants too: to treat the Indians in the best way, so he is not being exactly accurate with the committee, when he says there have

not been any negotiations. (NOTE.—Morigeau reaffirmed this position on p. 79 of the testimony.) There have been discussions and so forth with him, but there could be no formal negotiation, as I think Mr. Holum will testify tomorrow, until there is authority for the Federal Government to go in and develop this project, and that would have to be an authorization. I say that because over the 10 years I have been in Congress, I have been very much concerned with the interests of the Indians and the Indian people in my State, and I deeply resent this statement that we are trying to set aside treaties, and that any of the congressional delegation is not very much concerned with, and interested in, protecting and leaning over backward to protect the rights of the Indians, as we have done at Yellowtail Dam over in the other area. And Mr. McDonald knows that; he knows about those conversations, that is why I asked him to come forward and testify.

" 'Senator COOPER. I am sure of that. This is again a field in which I have no knowledge, and I am sure all of us agree with our chairman that he is concerned about this, as is Senator MANSFIELD and Members of the House. But I do assume, then, that in the hearings that were held, council representatives did appear at the Corps of Engineers hearings?

" 'Senator METCALF. Yes, at everyone of the hearings, as far as I recall, members appeared; Mr. McDonald appeared and testified.

" 'He appeared at Missoula; is that not right, Walt? (Walter McDonald.)

" 'Mr. MCDONALD. Yes.

" 'Senator METCALF, I appreciate what you have said, that that was not quite accurate as to negotiations. It is true, Senator METCALF and I talked this over for many years, you might say, and he always did state that our treaty would be protected.

" 'But I was a litle bit farfetched there perhaps in saying that, and I was thinking of negotiation in other terms and I appreciate that, Senator.'

"Later, Mr. Holum, Assistant Secretary for Water and Power Development, Department of Interior testified (p. 311 of the record) in part as follows:

" 'Provision should be made to compensate adequately the Indian tribes for their flooded lands and all other interests that may be involved. It should be noted that the question of compensation respecting the property and rights of the Indians, and the special relationship of the United States to the Indian people, will require most careful consideration."

"In conclusion, on this point then, it seems to me that Lawrence Lindley has a very weak, if not untenable, case when he contends that the authorization of Knowles Dam in itself constitutes a violation of Indian rights. The record is replete with assurances, promises, intentions to undertake negotiations with Indians when authorized to do so. There is no evidence to the contrary. There is precedent for this procedure right in Montana in the Yellowtail Dam. Agricultural value of the lands taken here was $47,000. Montana Senators sponsored legislation based on a negotiated agreement with Crows, for a $5 million payment. The bill passed. President Eisenhower vetoed it. After further negotiation with the Crows, Senator METCALF then sponsored a bill for $2.5 million, with an express provision authorizing the Crow Indians to sue the U.S. Government in Federal court for an additional $2.5 million. This bill passed, and was signed by Eisenhower, notwithstanding some contention that the Indians ought to be paid only land values. The Crows have filed suit for the balance, and the outcome is not yet determined.

"Now, I want to move on to another area which disturbs me tremendously. In Lawrence Lindley's letter of January 2, 1963, to Harry, second page, he says: 'I think you will find that there is considerable partisan politics mixed in with this Knowles Dam situation. This, to me, is unfortunate.'

"He is absolutely right. But what disturbs me is that the Indian Rights Association has not taken the trouble to separate out the partisan political arguments. It has picked up a most partisan and distorted set of arguments for opposing Knowles, which at best are only one side of some very complex matters—and I might add a very partisan side of the story. It has not supported or defended its basic contention that the mere authorization is a violation of rights. Here are specific examples:

"1. The map used on the brochure you sent me is exactly the map used in what I consider to be a scurrilous brochure of the Montana Power Co., copy of which is enclosed.

"Now, this would not be quite so serious, except that the map is a gross exaggeration of the size of the Knowles Lake. I am enclosing another quite partisan anti-Knowles brochure which shows the lake more nearly in its true size, though even this one is larger than the fact, simply because the problem of drawing the lake to true scale is a little difficult—it is hardly the width of a visible line in some places.

"I don't know whether the map itself causes any crucial misunderstandings, but it certainly does make it look like much more of a flooding problem than it really is. And it puts Indian Rights Association squarely in a partisan camp—a corporate vested interest camp where it ought not to be.

"2. Two or three times the Montana Power Co.'s. brochure claims the national bison range would be destroyed. Indian Rights Association backs away slightly from this position and says that it would be 'severely damaged.' The facts are that not more than about 10 percent of the area of the range would be flooded, and the only part of this 10 percent that is of bison grazing value is the headquarters area and display pasture. An additional 7 percent or so may be made inaccessible to the bison by a new railroad line with no satisfactory way yet proposed to get the buffalo across the tracks. But even so, 83 percent of the acreage for grazing, wintering, etc., of bison, elk, deer, birds, etc., remains. Furthermore, the Corps proposal, and the Fish and Wildlife proposal, both contemplate adding acreage to the bison range—in fact they will add 4,500 acres to replace loss of 3,450 acres. There are some unanswered questions as to where a new headquarters might be located and where a new exhibition pasture might be found. The fact of the matter is that the present headquarters and pasture are most inaccessible to the touring public, and it would be my hope that they might be relocated closer to the highways.

"The argument that the range would be destroyed is supported by a number of groups who oppose Knowles for other, and often partisan political reasons. The argument that the range can be accommodated comes from the official agencies responsible. If we are going to accept the arguments of unofficial groups on this matter, then we must also give credence to 'splinter Indian groups' who favor Knowles and oppose their official leaders. In any case, Indian Rights Association is not competent to make a judgment on this.

"3. On the grazing lands, I do not have an authoritative answer. I do know that evidence has been submitted that 35 Indians use these lands—this evidence is, I believe, from the Indians themselves in the hearing. I understand that replacement grazing lands are available, and will be offered in treaty negotiations. I believe that in the House hearings held in June there will be testimony from the Reclamation Bureau as to the quality of the substitute lands compared with the inundated lands. It is very easy to say 'There are no substitute lands available to the Indians,' but it is much more difficult to prove this statement. I believe that the facts will subsequently show that there are substitute lands, so that the only true statements that can be made would have to relate to comparisons. Then, you will no doubt get into such esoteric problems as to how many acres of bottom land are equivalent to how many acres of higher land, etc., and whether compensation can be on the basis of providing for, or paying for, winter feed by other means than bottom land grazing. Again, Indian Rights Association is not competent to make a judgment on this technical agricultural matter.

"4. The argument about 'crippling Indian economy' is based on the initial assumption that the Knowles Dam will be built without providing the Indians income commensurate with that which they could derive from the two small dams. Since Lawrence Lindley and I could not agreeably rephrase the original premise, I suppose this argument flows naturally from what I initially objected to. It is nevertheless an insulting implication that we who favor Knowles Dam are unconcerned about the Indian economy.

"5. I have already demonstrated that the benefit-cost ratio argument is at least very tricky. It simply is not true to categorically state that cost will exceed benefits if Indians are compensated. The statement that the ratio is 1.08:1 is a misrepresentation of the facts, and puts the Indian Rights Association directly into the partisan politics which Lawrence Lindley abhors.

"6. For every private engineer who can be found to state that Knowles is not the best 'full development' plan, there can be found other private engineers to disagree. The plain fact is that the Indian Rights Association is not competent to make this judgment. The private engineers are not responsible for making a recommendation based on having to support it and, what is more, do not have to actually produce results based on it.

"Specifically, the alternate Indian proposal would provide only about three-fourths of the storage of Knowles. The Corps of Engineers has a goal for storage in order to protect the entire Columbia Basin against disastrous floods like the 1948 one which killed 30 to 40 people. This goal is not even satisfied by Knowles and Libby combined. Furthermore, the alternates proposed by the Indians would have many times as much impact on wildlife, and I have never heard anyone say otherwise. So, the Indians, in Lindley's brochure, complain about damage to the bison range, and loss of that game preserve, but turn around and propose as an alternate two dams which would much more seriously injure wildlife and game. One of the Indian alternate dams, Smoky Range, would seriously damage the recreational value of Glacier National Park—much more seriously than Knowles would damage the bison range, by anyone's testimony.

"This, then, leaves the argument in this position: If the Indians can be agreeably compensated with income equivalent to the income they can reasonably anticipate from their own dams, which proposal should be considered? From the storage, recreational and wildlife points of view there is no argument: Knowles is superior on all counts, and there is no countertestimony. On power, the two proposals appear to be about equivalent, though there may be a more complex transmission problem, and possibly a more complex operational and control problem with the alternates than with Knowles.

"So, even this point boils down again to the same basic argument: does the omnibus public works bill authorizing Knowles Dam preclude, or even jeopardize the adequate compensation of the Indians for their full value.

"7. Another pet argument of the partisan political opponents of Knowles which IRA has picked up is the mudflats. This is an emotional issue which stirs the imagination to all kinds of horrors. It is largely false, and based on ignorance of the area to be flooded, with which I am intimately familiar.

"The facts are as follows: First, the 80-foot drawdown is the absolute limit of potential drawdown. Perhaps the pool would have been drawn down like that to prevent the 1948 flood, but in 15 years since (I have been here since 1947) there has not been a recurrence of this extreme situation. This 80-foot drawdown is not an every year occurrence—but rather a rare extreme situation, which I would suppose would not happen more than once in 25 years, though I do not have official estimates on the frequency of occurrence predicted on the basis of past experience. This is available, however. I do not know what the average drawdown will be, but suspect it will not exceed 10 to 20 feet.

"Secondly, the Columbia River is different from most U.S. rivers in that flood crest occurs in June, with runoff starting in May or April. If the storage in the dam is to be useful, it will have to be holding its 3 million acre-feet of water during the flood crest on uncontrolled rivers. The point being, that by the time the recreation season starts actively, the pool will be filled and mudflats will be gone. Dropping the pool level will not take place until January or so, to a predicted level based on anticipated runoff determined by snow water studies which are made throughout the basin every winter. This is the practice on Flathead Lake with which we are all familiar in this area, and which has not damaged recreational property values.

"Thirdly, the pool area, for the most part, is steep sided, as a reference to the USGS topographic maps will show. The area on the east side of the pool between Moiese and the Buffalo Rapids No. 4 damsite, is a gently sloping, clay soil, and will indeed be mudflats whenever there is any drawdown. This is but a small portion of the pool area or the shoreline.

"The south shore of the lake, from Ravalli to Knowles, is largely wooded, and steep sided. Except for a few areas, it will not be mudflat even at low water in the winter and early spring. It is on Indian reservation, and in my opinion constitutes the prime recreational area. This area has no recreational value of any significance now, so that what recreational value will exist will be created by the Knowles Reservoir, and will be on the Indian reservation. Now, I do not know how much of this land has already passed to non-Indians, or is out of tribal control. This is a matter of record, however, and some research will produce the facts. But I know that much of it is still under tribal control.

"There is almost no recreational value to the two Buffalo Rapids Dams proposed by the Indians. For one thing, there are no trees in the area at all. A lone cottonwood, perhaps here and there. The canyons are very steep sided, the lake will be little wider than the present stream. One has to actually see this to appreciate the truth of what I say. I simply do not see how there could be much recreational use made of these two small pools, other than perhaps boat fishing. But this will be merely pennies compared with the land value enhancement that comes from the realistic possibilities of summer cottages, homes, motels, etc., that will be available along the south shore of the Knowles pool. Furthermore, U.S. Highway 10-A will be built along the south shore of the pool providing ready access to the lake. If it is built—at least in part—far enough up from the lake to provide some privacy to summer homes, there will be some terrific land values created here by the lake. The pools the Indians would create would be in areas in which there are now no roads. We have tried to get in there to make an on-the-spot count of homes in the pool area, but could not. Roads can be built, but there is simply no attraction there in the hot summer to bring people so far off the beaten track.

"Well, there is the whole ball of wax. I thought I could answer your letter with a two-pager—but I missed by a few hundred percent.

"The Indian Rights Association is, of course, perfectly entitled to disagree with me, or Senator METCALF, or anyone else. I consider their statement that 'the proposed Knowles Dam—would violate rights' to be a false statement unless it is qualified by an 'if' or an 'unless' clause. However, I suppose that they may properly quote the tribal council on this score. (Their pamphlet does not quote, however.)

"But, when Indian Rights Association supports its thesis with partisan political arguments, which are demonstrably either false or misleading, or misrepresentative of the facts, without at the same time presenting the other side, then I am greatly hurt, disturbed, and a little sick at heart to think that Indian rights are not being defended on more logical and sound bases.

"My alternate suggestion—which I only had a chance to hint at when I met with Lawrence Lindley—would be along these lines:

"1. Put out a brochure with an honest map of the lake.

"2. Make the statement which they seem to feel is necessary to make, that Knowles would violate Indian rights.

"3. Support this statement with an acknowledgment that there have been numerous 'promises, assurance, etc.' of negotiation, but no concrete dollar or kilowatt-hour figures, no specifics on other matters. Then cite the sad and sordid record of the past—and I can only assume because I do not know that there is a record of taking Indian treaty land by condemnation and without adequate compensation. Cite the record of the U.S. Government to make us all ashamed of ourselves: the Indian irrigation project which was undertaken on Indian lands without Indian consent (Flathead); the national bison range itself was apparently established without Indian consent (yet now they oppose Knowles by referring to the severe damage or destruction of the bison range); the Homestead Act which opened reservation lands to white ownership; the establishment of wildlife refuges without Indian consent at Ninepipe and Kicking Horse.

"But to try to support Indian rights by taking one side of a partisan political argument, after starting from at best a misleading premise, is to me unconscionable, and does Indian rights as represented by the association almost irreparable harm.

"I think the Indians have put themselves in a bad spot by working so closely with Montana Power Co., when, as Mr. Cragun testified in the hearings, they cannot possibly get as good a deal from Montana Power Co. as from building their own dams. I think there is a very real possibility that if they are left to their own to develop the two low dams, they will find themselves prisoners of Montana Power Co. in the end. And as between friendly Senators and a friendly Kennedy administration, as compared with the unscrupulous Montana Power Co. I do not have much trouble choosing where the Indians' best interest lies.

"But notwithstanding, I agree that the Indians themselves have a right to be wrong—just like the rest of us.

"I do not agree that the Indian Rights Association has a right, or can even be condoned, in the kind of propagandizing political partnership which is evidenced by the pamphlet against Knowles. Furthermore, I find I shall in the future hold as suspect other positions of the association because they have not acted responsibly in this case.

"May I repeat—that I do not mean they have to agree with me to be responsible. I have suggested an approach which would oppose the Knowles Dam—even oppose the authorization bill which I want to see passed in the worst way. But oppose it on the real grounds of Indian rights—even go to the extent of documenting and dramatizing the reason for failure to trust and rely on the assurance of LEE METCALF, the Kennedy administration, the good will of the citizens' committee for Knowles Dam, and the cautious indications of official agencies.

"What I object to is the effort to oppose Knowles on its merits—bison range, mud flats, benefit-cost ratio, 'full development plains,' etc. The Indian Rights Association is not qualified to make judgments on these matters, but is eminently qualified to state the case for Indian rights. All of its statements on the other issues are merely repeating partisan arguments about which they have no way of knowing the truth.

"I hope the above gives you a clearer picture of this situation, and my concern about the Indian Rights Association's position. I really think you and I and Lawrence Lindley are not very far apart on our basic concern with Indian rights.

"As I said when I saw you, I stayed out of the Kinzua matter because I did not understand it. I have participated in legal proceedings enough to have learned quite a bit about evidence, hearsay, opinion, expert opinion, etc. I have learned how much easier it is to make flat statements when you are not fully responsible for the project, and are not subject to cross-examination. I do not know what are the merits of Arthur Morgan's alternate for Kinzua—it may have been very good. If, however, it was like Mr. Bloch's alternate for Knowles, it would be but an incomplete and unsatisfactory answer. I simply have no knowledge, and did not want to inject myself into the case without adequate knowledge. As to Senator METCALF's lack of support for your case on Kinzua, I find that Senators are very sensitive to public works in their own State—they do not care to have projects in their State taken up by out-of-State Senators—either for or against—as they properly feel they have more knowledge and more at stake than out-of-State Senators would have. It would have been unwise, and probably unsuccessful from your point of view, and METCALF attempted to go over Senators JAVITS' and KEATING's heads on the matter. I have had some notion that there may have been some vested interest complications in the matter, so that it became much more complicated than merely a matter of Indian rights.

"I am enclosing some materials, and sending copy of this letter to Lawrence Lindley. I do hope you will read carefully both my letter and Rae Logan's. I do not expect, nor ask, that you take a position—for much the same reasons that I did not take a position on Kinzua.

"I do hope that you can understand and appreciate my position, my disappointment that such a respected organization as Indian Rights Association should handle this matter with such little understanding of the real issues involved, and the complexity of the many, many issues not directly involving Indian rights, and my hope and concern that Quakers, as represented by Ray Wilson, Ed Sanders, and AFSC, take a more sound position without becoming parties in the spreading of the Montana Power Co. false gospel.

"As surely as I understand the operation of Montana Power Co., I know that they will do

all in their power to take away, dissipate, or steal for themselves the damsite values which the Flathead Indians are so concerned about. It is my opinion, which you and Lawrence Lindley are of course at liberty to disagree with, because only time can prove it, that the Knowles Dam is the very best protection the Flatheads have for their powersite values. They will derive more from negotiated compensation than they can ever derive from Montana Power Co., and I have no confidence that they can beat Montana Power Co. by building the dams themselves. (After all Montana Power Co. beat the U.S. Government at Canyon Ferry—a public dam, but Montana Power Co. got the right in the Eisenhower administration (partnership, you know) to build the transmission lines. So the only customer the Federal power generators at Canyon Ferry can have are Montana Power Co.)

"Next time I write, I will try to avoid this subject, and get to more personal matters.

"Sincerely,

"ARCHER TAYLOR."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, portions of points No. 6 and No. 7 in the summary which I have inserted in the RECORD allude to the desire of the tribes to develop their own properties. As I reported to the Senate last week, the Flathead Indians have retreated from their statements to both the Senate and House Public Works Committees, to the effect that they planned to finance and construct Buffalo Rapids No. 2 and No. 4. The official representative and former chairman of the tribe is now soliciting throughout the Northwest editorial endorsement, of an arrangement under which the Flathead Tribe would develop these dams in cooperation with the Montana Power Co., instead of on its own. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my comments on the new position of the Flathead Indians, the August 30 memorandum to Northwest newspaper publishers from Walter W. McDonald and the August 25 editorial, in the Wyoming State Tribune, entitled "The United States Is Breaking a Treaty, Too."

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

"[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 12, 1963]

"THE CAT IS OUT OF THE BAG

"Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of Members of both the Senate and House of Representatives a significant development concerning authorization of Knowles Dam.

"The Knowles Dam project, on the Flathead River in western Montana, was one of the projects added by the Senate to the omnibus bill, which has now been returned to the House of Representatives.

"During the hearings on this project before the Senate Committee on Public Works last year, it became clear that there could be three possible developments. One possibility could be the Knowles storage project, which I favor. Another could be construction of two run-of-the-river dams, at Buffalo Rapids sites 2 and 4, by the Montana Power Co. The third possibility could be construction of the two run-of-the-river dams at the Buffalo Rapids sites by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, which have applied to the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit, as has the Montana Power Co.

"At the hearing, the desire of the tribes to construct the dams was emphasized by John Cragun, counsel for the tribes, in these words:

" 'It is legally impossible for (the tribes) to get as good a deal from Montana Power Co. as they could get from building the dams themselves. There would be a sharing of benefits with Montana Power Co. which would cut in half the exploitable value of those sites to the tribes. Those sites are so valuable in comparison with any other sites, probably, in the whole United States that the matter of the tribe's financing and building them presents no problem, and they could get the entire value from them, which they could not do if Montana Power Co. builds them. The tribes have definitely instructed me to oppose the Montana Power Co. application with every means at our hands. We have done considerable engineering work in preparation for that.'

"Mr. President, the Flathead tribes took a similar position at the hearings on Knowles conducted by the House Public Works Committee this year.

"The prepared statement of Walter W. McDonald, official delegate and former chairman of the Flathead Tribal Council, refers to the tribes 'own development of the Buffalo Rapids sites.'

"The prepared statement of Counsel Cragun concludes that the tribes 'wish to rely on their own applications before the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit to build their own damsites.'

"Additionally, Mr. Cragun placed in the hearing record a resolution of the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, adopted August 18, 1962, and signed by its president, the same Walter McDonald who appeared as a witness for tribal development of the sites. The resolution states that 'the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes intend to develop these damsites and have filed an application for preliminary permit on these sites with the Federal Power Commission.'

"Mr. President, I am aware that many of my colleagues, in both the Senate and House, have had the impression, as I have until now, that three developments were possible—the Federal Knowles Dam, construction of Buffalo Rapids 2 and 4 by the Montana Power Co., or construction of Buffalo Rapids 2 and 4 by the Confederated Flathead and Salish Tribes.

"It now appears that the alternatives have been reduced to two, that a deal has been made between the Montana Power Co., and the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes.

"I have been privileged to receive a copy of the memorandum which is being distributed to editors in the Northwest by Mr. Walter McDonald. This memorandum is written in his capacity as president of the Northwest Affiliated Indian Tribes. It accompanies an editorial from the Wyoming State Tribune. The Tribune, discussing the run-of-the-river alternatives to Knowles, reveals that the Flathead Indians 'plan this development in connection with the Montana Power Co.'

"Mr. McDonald, in sending this editorial to newspaper editors, asks them to "please reprint it, condense it, comment on it, or write one of your own.'

"Mr. President, the cat is out of the bag. The expensive cultivation of Flathead Indian officials by the Montana Power Co., has borne fruit. The tribe's and its counsel's strong statements to Congress about opposition to the Montana Power Co., that tribal 'financing and building—the dams—present no problem' are now meaningless.

"And so, Mr. President, we now have but two alternatives, full development of the Federal Knowles project, or underdevelopment by the Montana Power Co., which charges exorbitant rates and ships its millions of dollars in annual overcharges to the out-of-State stockholders."

"AUGUST 30, 1963.

"DEAR NORTHWEST NEWSPAPER PUBLISHER: Would you please allow me 5 minutes?

"I am an Indian. I have lived all my life in my native Pacific Northwest (I was born and raised in western Montana, where I operate a successful cattle ranch near St. Ignatius). At the present time I am president of the Northwest Affiliated Tribes and president of the Montana Intertribal Policy Board. I am a member and former president of the Flathead Tribal Council. We have just concluded a convention of the Affiliated Tribes here in Spokane, Wash.

"In this era of talking about treaties and civil rights, we Indians are happy to find that people are waking up to something we have been shouting about for many years.

"We believe:

"Treaties are made to be kept. We expect our country to keep its end of the bargain, just as we expect other nations like Russia to respect treaties.

"The Negroes are not the only people being deprived of their civil rights. We Indians have faced this problem for many years, too.

"In both of these respects—treaties and civil rights—members of the Flathead Tribe (Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes) in western Montana are in danger of being shortchanged as a result of the proposed construction of Federal Knowles Dam. It would flood out much of our land (16,000 acres) including damsites in whose development we are vitally interested.

"The enclosed editorial from the Wyoming State Journal of August 25, 1963, tells the story of the courageous stand by Representative BATTIN of Montana in describing our plight. Please take time to read this editorial. If you would, please reprint it, condense it, coment on it or write one of your own.

"We Indians need your help in making known the threatened violation of our treaty and civil rights by Knowles Dam legislation now in Congress.

"Won't you help us?

"Very truly yours,

"WALTER W. MCDONALD."

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, Aug. 25, 1963]

"THE UNITED STATES IS BREAKING A TREATY, TOO

" 'Mr. Speaker,' said Montana's Representative JAMES FRANKLIN BATTIN in the U.S. House of Representatives this past Monday, 'the Senate of the United States is currently engaged in hearings and debate over the recent test ban treaty entered into by the United States with Russia and other foreign powers.

" 'Much of the discussion over the usefulness of this treaty and its benefit to the United States has centered around the reliability of Russia to live up to its treaty commitments,' observed Montana's Second District Republican Congressman.

" 'Performances of Russia in the past,' he continued, 'have certainly justified the wariness of the American people to accept the solemn promises of Russia when they are broken at will by the Soviet Government.'

"Mr. BATTIN reminded his listeners that the Constitution of the United States makes our treaty obligations the supreme law of the land.

"Was Mr. BATTIN concerned with the test ban treaty?

"Not in this specific instance; what he was getting around to saying is that while we are pondering the good intentions of the Soviets in carrying out the terms of a treaty negotiated with this country, the United States itself is in the process of violating one of its own solemn commitments—made over a century ago with the Flathead Indians.

"It is doing so in proposing to build on their lands, reserved to them by treaty, and against their wishes, the so-called Knowles Dam project, a 95-percent public power undertaking of the U.S. Department of the Interior, which also has jurisdiction through its Bureau of Indian Affairs over the welfare of these very same Indians.

"The treaty involved is the so-called Hellgate Treaty signed with the Flatheads on July 16, 1855; the treaty subsequently was ratified by the United States 4 years later and is in force and effect today. It reserved certain lands for the use and occupation of the Flathead Tribes.

" 'It is the same type of treaty and should merit the same concern and treatment as is presently being given the test ban treaty,' said Mr. BATTIN, a 38-year-old Billings attorney who is serving his second term in Congress. 'Yet the Senate of the United States, the same body which ratified the treaty with the Flathead Tribes, completely ignored that treaty and proposed the authorization of the Knowles Dam in Montana in face of the strong and emphatic opposition of the Flathead Tribes who charged that such action is a violation of their treaty rights.'

"The Indians, it turns out, possessing natural damsites within their reservation, wish to develop their own hydroelectric power projects that will be smaller in scope than Knowles, will not inundate some 20,000 acres of rich irrigated farming lands owned by the Flatheads, who wish to preserve their agricultural industry, and which will bring a profitable return from power revenues. They plan this development in connection with the Montana Power Co.

"If the Government persists in its course, the Indians say, they plan to sue the United States for $116 million for violation of their treaty rights and usurpation of their lands.

"This will make Knowles, already assailed by private power exponents as a costly, taxpayer-supported project that will not pay its way, an extremely expensive undertaking.

"The public power exponents and Montana's two Democratic Senators apparently are not to be swayed, however. Nor is that great conservator, supposedly the greatest in that field since Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, the honorable Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall.

"This matter places both Mr. Udall and the entire New Frontier in a curious position. While the Kennedy administration poses as the champion of civil rights in behalf of the Negro, it exhibits blatant disregard for those of these American Indians, the Flatheads who apparently wish only to be left alone to devise their own industrial progress.

"The Indians and Mr. BATTIN probably will be attacked by professional do-gooders as tools of the private power trust; they will be attacked, as in the Burns Creek argument, of shedding 'crocodile tears' for the Indians (in former Idaho Congresswoman Gracie Pfost's Burns Creek testimony, it was the Wyoming coal miners).

"But they cannot get around the fact that the Indians have a treaty with the United States, it is being flagrantly violated by an invasion of the Flatheads' rights and interests, and over their protests.

"Mr. BATTIN can and should call attention again and agin to this brazen breach of a solemn agreement."

Mr. METCALF. Finally, Mr. President, point No. 6 of the summary questioned the consistency of the Secretary of the Interior in the case of Knowles Dam. In this regard, I cannot improve upon the statement of the Secretary, in response to a question by Chairman Davis, of the House Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control, during the hearings June 5, 1963. Secretary Udall said:

"Knowles Dam, as I indicated in my prepared statement, is relatively speaking a high dam; it will be primarily a producer of hydroelectric power where my Department has marketing responsibilities for all hydroelectric power. You have in this area problems of irrigation, which are the problem of my Department. You have the Indian land problem, which is again my Department. You have the fish, wildlife, outdoor recreation. All these are responsibilities of my Department. These were reasons why, among others, this was felt that this was a logical project, even though both the corps and the Bureau have studied this project under assignment by Congress in the past over the years. It was felt that this was a logical decision, just as we felt for other reasons that it was logical that major construction work in the State of Alaska, whether it is high dams or low dams, should be done by the corps, which has a major construction responsibility in the construction organization in Alaska."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in closing I wish to make one comment about the Indians. Ever since I first came to Congress I have served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and have worked faithfully for the various Indian tribes. I have been critical of the operation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I helped write into the Democratic platform the provision relating to consent by Indians. That is the point the Senator from Wyoming has raised.

However, the only time the Corps of Army Engineers or the Secretary of the Interior can deal with an Indian tribe is after an authorization is made. The Secretary of the Interior has no authority at the present time to negotiate with an Indian tribe with respect to the price of the land or the development of the land. Congress must first authorize a dam before he can talk to the Indians about it.

Some contention has been made that an authorization is a taking. I point out that if an authorization is a taking, when Congress passed the Interstate Highway Act, to build highways across Indian reservations all over the United States, there would have been involved a violation of every Indian treaty that has ever been made—not only one treaty, but every one of the treaties.

Of course, we know that an authorization is not a taking. We must negotiate with the Indians for highways. We must negotiate with them for dam projects. We must negotiate with them with respect to other matters.

Therefore, my senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], Representative OLSEN, and I assured the Indians that we would give them full support, as we have already demonstrated we were willing to give in the case of the Yellowtail Dam, which involved the same kind of authorization for flood control.

Congress passed a bill providing for payment to the Indians not only for the land taken, but also for the power site value. Under a Supreme Court decision, a corporation cannot collect in such circumstances for the power site value. However, we gave the Indians compensation for the power site value at Yellowtail.

The senior Senator from Montana and I are proposing that we give compensation for the power site value at Knowles.

We are talking about a dam which has been determined to be feasible by the Corps of Army Engineers. It is needed in western Montana. The power is needed in western Montana. The storage is needed. The downstream development is needed. I urge that the Senate reject the pending amendment.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first I wish to say that I have nothing but the highest praise and appreciation for the integrity of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. Anything he has said is in full accord with the views he has expressed many times on the floor of the Senate. I honor him for his consistency, for his honesty, and for his frankness in stating his case.

Before I get into my remarks, I should like to state, as I have stated on many occasions—and I know I speak the views of my colleague from Montana also—that there is room for both public and private power development in our State, in the Northwest, and throughout the country.

If the Montana Power Co. had offered to build the Hungry Horse Dam, which they opposed for 5 long years, I am sure the Montana congressional delegation would have gotten behind the Montana Power Co. to help them take over the construction of that multipurpose project.

So far as the building of private power dams is concerned—and of course this is something which I believe to be within the ken of private companies—those dams are built for the purpose of generating electricity only, not for the multifold purpose of developing recreational areas, not for the purpose of developing irrigation and reclamation possibilities, not for the purpose—except incidentally—of controlling floods and the like, but purely, solely, and only for the purpose of generating power.

That is all right. In the State of Montana, within the past decade, a number of private power projects have been built. One of them is at Cabinet Gorge, just over the Montana line from Idaho; the other, further east in Montana, is the Noxon Rapids project. These two projects were built by the Washington Power & Light Co. Each of these projects generates 200,000 kilowatts of power. Where does every single kilowatt of that power go? Every single kilowatt of that 400,000 kilowatts goes out of the State of Montana. Not one single kilowatt is used to benefit or to develop our State or to bring new industries or employment and the like to our people.

Why did not the Montana Power Co. build those projects? Why did not the Montana Power Co. see to it that Montana resources were used for the benefit of the people of Montana?

They were built by the Washington Power & Light Co. Those 400,000 kilowatts go outside the State.

Incidentally, I understood that a few weeks ago some representatives of the Washington Power & Light Co. were in the State of Montana discussing things in a general way having to do with next year's election.

I am sure that the Senator from Wyoming is not opposed to all types of multipurpose projects, because he will recall that, so far as the delegations of the

two States in the Senate are concerned, we all look with favor upon the development of the Yellowtail Dam, which is a multipurpose project, and in the case of the Yellowtail Dam the four Senators from the two States joined in introducing proposed legislation seeking to create the Big Horn recreational area behind that dam. Therefore, there are areas in which we agree, and there are some areas in which we disagree. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague from Montana a question or two, if he would be so kind as to answer them.

First, has the Montana Power Co. ever filed an application to build dams in the area now to be covered by the Knowles Dam, if and when the authorization is given?

Mr. METCALF. The Montana Power Co. first filed an application to build dams when the Federal Power Commission was originally created. It filed application No. 5 before the Commission. It was an application to build a dam in the general area. Then it was dropped.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Dropped by whom?

Mr. METCALF. By the Montana Power Co.

Then there was some suggestion and activity concerning the building of a dam at the Paradise site. So Montana Power Co. again filed an application; and after the suggestion that a public power dam be built, it was again dropped.

For more than half a century, Montana Power Co. has been in and out of the Federal Power Commission, suggesting that it would like to build dams at this site. But it has not followed through with a single application. It has dropped each of them. It has been acting like a dog in a manger whenever the suggestion is made that the Federal Government build a public power project.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have any of those applications been approved by the Federal Power Commission?

Mr. METCALF. Never. Montana Power Co. has never followed through with any of them so that there could be a hearing. It has always been allowed to drop them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, if Montana Power Co. had followed through on its applications on those two occasions, and had its applications been approved by the Federal Power Commission, it is reasonable to state that there would be no project known as Knowles before this body today?

Mr. METCALF. On more than two occasions. On, at least, docket No. 5 in 1920; docket No. 2135 in 1953; dockets Nos. 2163 and 2164 in 1954; docket No. 2223 in 1956; and docket No. 2293 in 1960. There were all applications of the Montana Power Co. to build dams. Since 1920, Montana Power Co. has been in and out of the Federal Power Commission, but has never followed through on a single one of these applications.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think that record speaks for itself. It helps to explain why we are interested in the development of our own State of Montana and in the project now before the Senate.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am not advocating the cause of the Montana Power Co. or any other power company. I am an advocate of private enterprise, as evidenced by my amendment to this bill and also by my amendment to the foreign aid bill.

The State of Montana may need projects such as there are in the State of Wyoming, which are operated by private power companies. We are proud of the accomplishments of private enterprise in Wyoming.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I tried to say at the beginning, and shall say again, that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is a man of high integrity, great honesty, and utmost frankness. Anything my colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and I say about activities in the State of Montana has no relationship whatsoever to the attitude or feelings of the Senator from Wyoming. We believe this is a matter which is our business, and we will do our best to try to attend to it.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I concur in the statement of my colleague that the Senator from Wyoming is acting in all innocence of the facts with respect to the Montana Power Co. His opposition to this dam or this project is based upon a sincere opposition to this kind of proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming mentioned Pacific Power & Light Co. That company has a small interest in the northwestern part of Montana. Incidentally, Pacific Power & Light is a company with which the Montana delegation has never had any differences. Perhaps that is because its investment is so small; but even though it is small, its service is excellent.

In Montana, where the headwaters of the Columbia and the Missouri originate, at the present time one project is in process of completion. The Yellowtail project will serve both northern Wyoming and southeastern Montana. We have a treaty with Canada—at least, it has been agreed to by the United States—which would seek to bring about the creation of the Libby project, in Lincoln County, in the northwestern part of Montana. It is a project which would extend, if finally approved by the Canadian Parliament, 40 miles within the Province of British Columbia, for the purpose of a backup reservoir.

Then there is that great dam in Montana, the Hungry Horse project, in the northwestern part of the State. When we speak of the power development of Montana, the shining light to which we refer is the Hungry Horse project, in the Flathead country.

To indicate what we hope Knowles Dam would do, if authorized, appropriated for, and constructed, I repeat that Montana Power Co. opposed the Hungry Horse project in the Flathead country for 5 years. But what has happened since the completion of the Hungry Horse project?

First. Montana Power Co. was able to install a 56,000 kilowatt generator at Kerr Dam on the Flathead River because of the storage facilities at Hungry Horse.

Second. Montana Power Co., though opposed to the construction of Hungry Horse, has a 20-year contract, entered into in 1955; and it is my understanding that it is renewable every year—this statement is subject to correction—for 50,000 kilowatts of Bonneville Power from Hungry Horse, which it buys at the rate of 2.5 mills and feeds into its own system to sell to its customers at a higher rate.

Third. That rates of REA's in western Montana have been reduced, because of Hungry Horse power, from between 8 and 9 mills per kilowatt to 3.1 mills per kilowatt.

Fourth. Because of Hungry Horse, the Anaconda Co. built an aluminum plant at Columbia Falls, Mont., which at the present time employs about 600 persons. With the expansion of the plant, it is anticipated that several hundred more will be provided with jobs.

Fifth. In Flathead County, where the Hungry Horse project is located, the assessed valuation of the county has increased from around $35 million to around $135 million.

Sixth. Because of Hungry Horse power, the Victor Chemical Co. at Silver Bow, between Butte and Anaconda, and other industrial facilities have come into the State.

Seventh. Because of these new industries, the tax base has been broadened rather than restricted, with the result that more people are paying more taxes to the counties in which these industries are located, to the State of Montana, and to the Federal Government.

Eighth. The repayment schedule of Hungry Horse is current, and more than $35 million has been paid to the U.S. Treasury.

Ninth. Hungry Horse Reservoir has developed into a great recreational and fishing area, and has contributed to the well-being of thousands of people, not only from within Montana, but from over the Nation as a whole.

Tenth. Nobody has been hurt by Hungry Horse, because the county in which it is located, western Montana which it serves, Montana Power Co., and the REA's have all benefited.

Eleventh. The Hungry Horse is an investment in America for the benefit of the people of my State and the Nation. It is fully repayable, and it is anticipated that it will be paid out in 50 years or less.

Mr. President, these are only a few of the reasons why we of Montana are so proud of Hungry Horse. But they give an idea as to why we are so interested in the further development of our State.

Montana has an area of approximately 148,000 square miles. Its population is just under 700,000. What we seek to do is to develop our own resources for the benefit of our own people; to create jobs; to provide security; and to give hope to our youngsters as they come along.

This would be a fully repayable project. It is something that would be done for the benefit of the people of the country. It is not a foreign aid program; it is a domestic loan program for the development of our own resources.

I repeat: Every dime would be repayable with interest. For more than 50 years, the proceeds from this project, as from Hungry Horse and Yellow Tail, would go into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

This is a project from which no one would lose, but from which everyone would benefit.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In reading the report, I note a line which states that the State of Montana opposes the project. I merely ask this question for information.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What that particular statement or opinion probably indicates is that the Governor of the State of Montana came back here and testified against this project. But he does not speak for the whole State of Montana. Neither do we; but we think we speak for a very substantial portion of the State.

Mr. METCALF. Those in this body who speak for the State of Montana—the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I—and the Member of the other body who speaks for the western part of the State of Montana—Representative OLSEN—all are in favor of this project. We are the ones—not Governors or ex-Governors—who speak for the State of Montana and represent the State of Montana.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the record show that the State of Montana, through its chief executive, opposes the project?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. METCALF. The Governor of Montana testified against this project.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be rejected.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I too, hope the amendment will be rejected. I hope the Senate will provide us with an opportunity to take the bill in its present form to conference.

As the majority leader has said, I know this project has been before Congress for a long time. On two previous occasions, the bill, including this project, has been passed by the Senate. So I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. President, if there is no further request from Senators on this side for time, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time under my control; and I do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 7 minutes remaining. Does he yield it back?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments to be proposed——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. 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. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the question of final passage, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators in charge of the time yield back the remaining time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am glad by my vote to be associated with the recommendations of the Public Works Committee in reporting and urging passage of House bill 8667, as amended.

As has been explained here, the urgency of final passage and signing into law of this measure are eminent. Fifty-eight going projects are right now facing shutdown because of lack of funds. The tragedy of such forced action in loss of time, in loss of money, in loss of jobs, and in loss to the business communities in which these projects are located can hardly be realized.

To make the present situation even more ironic, the Appropriations Committee of the House and the House itself have already made appropriations to carry forward the same projects. But they were forced, because of lack of final action on H.R. 8667 or on H.R. 6016, to make these appropriations subject to a proviso that the pending proposed legislation would be enacted.

The distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, my good neighbor, has already inserted in the RECORD, on page 22929, a list of the projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used. In the Arkansas River Basin this includes 14 projects. Since rivers do not recognize State lines, I find that some of the 14 are in Kansas, Missouri, and Arkansas, as well as in Oklahoma. The basin authorization needed for fiscal year 1964 is $31 million. The total needed for both the fiscal year 1964 and the fiscal year 1965 is $157 million. I am grateful to the Committee on Public Works for including the authorizations needed for both fiscal years.

Also in the bill is an authorization for a very badily needed and highly justified project for southwestern Oklahoma—the Waurika project. On October 22, I inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A6567, the following description of this project:

Southwestern Oklahoma is one of the most aggressive areas about which I have ever known. The people of that section are for the most part of pure pioneer stock, with the friendliness of the South and the sturdiness of the West.

The Waurika project is a multiple-purpose project which is estimated to cost $25,853,000, of which the local communities would repay $12,861,000, consisting of $2,417,000 for water supply storage, $9,628,000 for conveyance facilities, and $816,000 for irrigation.

The water supply would meet present and future local requirements for the cities and towns of Lawton, Duncan, Waurika, Comanche, Temple, and Walters, in addition to serving Fort Sill and industries in the project area.

This project has been endorsed by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, has the consent of all of Oklahoma's neighboring States, and has the endorsement of the present Republican Governor and the former Democratic Governor, my colleague Senator EDMONDSON.

It has been recommended by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Three times it has passed the Senate after being reported favorably by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on one occasion and the Public Works Committee on two other occasions.

I hope the House of Representatives will see fit to take favorable action on this project without further delay.

Mr. President, I hope we can finalize action on this important bill without further delay. I congratulate the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the chairman, as well as the members of the committee for their patience, determination, and wisdom.

AMENDMENT TO BUY-AMERICAN ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, there are inadequacies in the present Buy-American Act and in the regulations issued pursuant thereto from time to time. At the conclusion of these remarks I shall offer an amendment pertaining to my purpose, which is to liberalize the Buy-American Act to provide employment for more Americans, including people in the Commonwealth I represent, as well as in many other States, and to meet the severe thrust of increased foreign competition which, in particular, in such industries as the manufacture of steel and other metals and accessories relating thereto, has caused a considerable falling away in employment from time to time.

The Buy-American Act, as covered by Public Law 428, 72d Congress, approved March 3, 1933, afforded a monetary protection by all Government agencies of 25 percent. This protection was maintained until December 17, 1954, when President Eisenhower issued an Executive order which reduced the buy-American protection from 25 to 6 percent.

The 6-percent protection mentioned above was maintained in all Government agencies until July of 1962, at which time the Secretary of Defense directed all procurement under his jurisdiction to give a 50-percent monetary protection pending the result of a study then underway by the Bureau of the Budget, which was to be made to the President by September

30, 1962. This action—which I heartily commend—was taken on the part of the Secretary of Defense and was based on the national interest clause as covered by the Executive order of December 17, 1954. As of today, the results of the study being made by the Bureau of the Budget have not been forthcoming.

During all the months that have since passed, I have vainly sought explanations from the Bureau of the Budget as to why we cannot have this essential and important report. Last January I was told that the report would be made shortly. The Bureau of the Budget had already then had since September 30, 1962, in which to make the report.

Thus, today, when the outflow of gold is of great concern to the administration, inconsistency prevails in that the Defense Department affords a 50-percent monetary protection to domestic concerns under a highly temporary and tentative provision; whereas, all other Government agencies are giving only 6-percent differential monetary protection as directed by the Executive order of December 17, 1954.

There is not only a lack of uniformity in the procedures of the Department in dealing with Government contracts, but also there is a disparity of as great as 6 percent in most instances, and 50 percent in the instance of the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has set what I believe to be a commendable standard in that respect; yet that standard is one to which industry and labor cannot repair with safety because of its tentative character and because we are waiting for the mysterious and long-delayed report from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, my amendment is a buy-American amendment.

It puts into legislative language what is now an informal procurement policy as followed by the Defense Department. It would require similar policies to be pursued by other Departments of Government.

Let us first look at the history of legislation to encourage the Government to purchase products from American suppliers.

The Buy-American Act, signed into law in 1933, requires that the Government purchase only domestic goods or materials. It leaves to the President discretion to permit exceptions when domestic purchases are deemed: "inconsistent with the public interest or the cost unreasonable."

A Treasury directive in 1934 established the general rule that the cost should be considered unreasonable only when the price of the domestic article exceeded the price of the foreign article by more than 25 percent.

In 1954 an Executive order was issued—and is still in force—providing that foreign bids must be accepted when the lowest domestic bid is at least 6 percent higher. This becomes 12 percent if the American company is in a labor surplus area.

The 1954 order, however, permits a Government department head to award contracts to domestic firms, no matter how low foreign bids may be, if he believes such action to be in the national interest.

On June 27, 1962, I appealed to the late President Kennedy to intervene in the award to foreign producers of about 2,000 tons of carbon steel plate—which I believe turned out to be 2,400 tons—to be purchased by the Navy to construct three guided missile frigates.

On July 7, 1962, an official of the Defense Department, writing at the direction of the White House, said:

> I am happy to inform you that instructions have been issued to make this award to the lowest bidders offering domestic steel for reasons of the national interest, in accordance with the provisions of section 3a of Executive Order 10582.

This Executive order made possible the employment of a number of Americans who otherwise would not have been employed, had it not been for compliance by the late President with my request in this connection.

Since that time the Defense Department has followed the new policy, but only on an informal "case-by-case" basis, of giving American companies a 50-percent cost advantage in their bids against foreign companies.

Subsequently it was learned that the Budget Bureau had undertaken a study of procurement practices with an eye toward recommending a new buy-American policy for the whole Government.

On August 23, 1962, I submitted to the Director of the Budget recommendations that there be a new Presidential Executive order.

This order would provide that all purchases of $10,000 and less, and all purchases above that figure, where the domestic cost over the foreign cost is 50 percent or less, should be made from domestic sources. All cases where the domestic cost is more than 50 percent larger than the foreign cost should be referred to the head of the procurement agency. For an end product to be considered of American origin, 80 percent of its components should be of such origin.

As recently as last August I was informed by the Budget Bureau that its study of procurement practices was still underway.

Meanwhile, other departments of the U.S. Government continue to buy foreign products, observing only the 6 and 12 percent provisions of the buy-American Executive order and refusing to exercise its option—as was done by the Defense Department—to give higher percentage advantages to American suppliers.

This is particularly germane to the bill before the Senate today since appropriations authorized in this bill will be administered by the Department of the Interior which is second only to the Defense Department in the amount of goods and services it buys for the Government.

In recent years a larger and larger proportion of the contracts let by the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation has been awarded to foreign manufacturers.

During 1962 the Bureau of Reclamation placed all of its contracts for hydraulic turbines with two foreign manufacturers. These orders accounted for 89.5 percent of the Federal Government's purchases of those products for the year.

Early this year the Bureau of Reclamation awarded to a foreign bidder the contract for pumps at the mile 18 pump plant near Los Banos, Calif. The low American bid for that project was only 13 percent higher than the foreign bid.

Of course, Mr. President, that would have employed American workmen; increased American corporate profits, of which the Federal Government would have taken 52 percent; and would have improved the gross national product situation, in addition, to a minor degree.

At almost the same time the Defense Department awarded a contract for hydraulic turbines for the Corps of Engineers' Green Peter project to an American company which bid 37 percent higher than the low foreign bid.

Mr. President, the Defense Department is acting very much in the national interest in this matter and my amendment would translate this policy into law for all Government departments to observe.

Today the U.S. Government purchases goods and services that represent about 10 percent of our gross national product. I would like to see those dollars go to work for our economy.

Many of our plants are operating well below capacity. Many of our people are walking the streets looking for work which our economy should be dynamic enough to provide.

Each time a Government contract is awarded to a foreign company, it contributes to the very dangerous flow of gold out of the United States and aggravates our imbalance of payments.

Moreover these bids by foreign producers are very deceptive. They are often based upon labor wages far below our own. It has been estimated that every ton of steel purchased from foreign sources with U.S. Government funds means up to 2 days less work for an American steelworker.

When we look at the lower bid offered by foreign producers we often overlook the substantial loss of tax revenue to the Government by this contract going abroad. An authoritative study on this subject made some years ago by the National Industrial Conference Board, showed that for each dollar in the sale of a ton of steel, 30 cents eventually went to Federal, State, and local taxing bodies through corporate, personal, property, and sales taxes.

I hope that the amendment will be adopted. I should like to see it at this place and in this form. If it is not to be so, I would of course plan to introduce legislation to this effect at a later date.

Mr. President, I offer my amendment, to insert a new section at the end of the bill, and I ask that it be stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. In the administration of title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (known as the Buy American Act; 41 U.S.C. secs. 10a–10d)—

(1) the cost of any article mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States and costing $10,000 or more shall not be considered to be unreasonable unless such cost is at least 50 per centum greater than the cost of such article if acquired outside the United States;

(2) an article shall be considered of United States origin only if at least 80 per centum of its component parts originated in the United States; and

(3) in any case where an article costing $10,000, or more, which was mined, produced, or manufactured outside the United States, is acquired in accordance with any provision of such Act, a report containing the reasons for such acquisition shall be printed in the Federal Register.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio. Is the Senator seeking an opportunity to ask a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would like to say a word or two.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. I wish to advise the Senator from Pennsylvania that even though his amendment is an important amendment, at the appropriate time, since it is obviously in violation of the unanimous-consent agreement, I shall be forced to raise a point of order. I do not wish to do so at this time, or to any manner indicate I am trying to cut off the Senator, because that is not my purpose.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand the Senator's position.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish at least that the reasons for the point of order may be assigned at this time.

Mr. McNAMARA. The amendment is in violation of the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are operating, under controlled time. It is not germane to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does not have to be germane.

Mr. McNAMARA. According to the unanimous-consent agreement, it does have to be germane.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought an exception had been made on the germaneness clause of this particular bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Apparently, as it is printed, it is included.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will not quarrel with the Senator.

Mr. McNAMARA. I hope not. I am not looking for any trouble.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not quarrel with the Senator's statement.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Illinois has said. I was informed that the germaneness clause had not been inserted in the unanimous-consent agreement. If it has not, I wish to proceed to a vote. If it has, I shall have to abide by the statement of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to have an informal ruling by the Presiding Officer, without foreclosing the matter at this time, as to the reasons why the amendment would not be germane to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that there is a germaneness provision in the unanimous-consent agreement, and that the substance of the amendment as offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania is not germane to any provision in the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I make the point that, after all, we are dealing with some projects which will use machinery, equipment, facilities, goods, commodities, and other things; and the amendment relates basically to the procurement and acquisition of facilities and equipment which would be incorporated into the projects and finally expressed in action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as presented, is not germane to any provision of the bill, and therefore would be subject to a point of order. The Chair would sustain the point of order, if made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A further inquiry which the Presiding Officer may or may not wish to answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would an amendment dealing with the bill alone, having no relatoinship to the "buy American" statute but dealing only with facilities and equipment which might be incorporated into the projects authorized by this bill, be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that an amendment of that nature would be introducing new material into the bill, not related to any provision in the bill. This would be so even though the amendment were confined to the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at this time I withdraw the amendment I have offered and I offer a new amendment which, before I send it to the desk, I will read so that we may be prepared to obtain a ruling on it:

None of the funds authorized by this Act or appropriated pursuant thereto shall be used for the purchase of any goods, commodities, machinery, equipment or facilities of foreign origin or foreign production if the price of a comparable domestic product made in the United States, whether done by negotiation or competitive bid or whether purchased directly or indirectly, does not exceed by 50 per centum the price offered by a foreign producer or any agent acting in his behalf or by any contractor.

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

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert:

None of the funds authorized by this Act or appropriated pursuant thereto shall be used for the purchase of any goods, commodities, machinery, equipment or facilities of foreign origin or foreign production if the price of a comparable domestic product made in the United States, whether done by negotiation or competitive bid or whether purchased directly or indirectly, does not exceed by 50 per centum the price offered by a foreign producer or any agent acting in his behalf or by any contractor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is this not the present law under the Buy-American Act?

Mr. SCOTT. No; it is not my understanding of the present law, because the present law provides—I am paraphrasing, but it states this in effect—that where the national interest is involved, and the finding is so made, there may be an order setting aside a foreign bid where it is not more than 50 percent greater than an American bid. This proposal would write it into the law as a matter of fact, rather than have it made a finding by the Executive.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have no copy of the Buy-American Act before me. I understand it has been in effect for several years, but it is my recollection that, instead of the 50-percent differential, the differential was and is 25 percent.

Could the Chair in some manner enlighten the Senate on that particular point?

Mr. SCOTT. The Buy-American Act has been subject to various amendments since 1934. In 1954 the differential was reduced to 6 percent, and at a later date there was a change to a 12-percent differential if the bid was from a labor surplus area. But there is a provision in the act, as I recall—and I trust I am not erroneously stating this—that a differential up to 50 percent may be used and adverted to by a Government agency where there is a finding that it is in the national interest.

The only department which I know of that has done it is the Defense Department, which has acted, apparently, by a rule of thumb on a case-by-case basis.

In further explanation of the measure, the percentages I have referred to, the 25 percent and the 50 percent, have been set from time to time by Executive order. I was pointing out the fact that the Department of Defense, by regulation and interpretation of the statute, has used the 50-percent figure, although it does not appear in the statute.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in view of the new amendment which has been offered, which changes slightly the amendment previously offered——

Mr. SCOTT. It is considerably changed.

Mr. McNAMARA. As spokesman for the Public Works Subcommittee, I am glad to accept the amendment and take it to conference and see if it can be handled. It is a worthy amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator for his kindness and for accepting the amendment. I hope it can be kept in the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I express the hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania, in view of the circumstances covering this matter, about which we had no notice, through no fault of

his, will allow us leeway so we may study the law and make sure of what we are doing, and not run afoul of the law as it now exists, because of the chairman's acceptance of this proposal and taking it to conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we have been sitting for weeks listening to witness after witness before the Finance Committee, talking about tax reduction and structural reform, for the purpose of achieving one major objective, and that is to make a deeper dent in the unemployment problem of the country.

I can understand that when a private enterprise has an opportunity to buy a foreign product for incorporation in its own product, at a price infinitely lower, it must be mindful of the cost of production. One can well understand that fact. But I find it rather difficult to understand why the Government of the United States, through any of its agencies, should bargain abroad, where there is a 15-percent difference in price, to permit the procurement of a basic commodity from abroad.

Recently a contract was let to obtain 17,000 tons of steel from Japan. The reason for it was a price differential of 15½ percent. When we stop to interpret this procedure in terms of jobs, and realize that people who have jobs pay income taxes, and the effect on revenues, it will be seen that it would have been as beneficial if the contract had stayed in this country. At least we would be making a little progress in the solution of one of the most difficult and obdurate problems that is before us.

Scarcely 1 witness out of the some 90 or 100 who appeared before the Finance Committee stated that the tax reduction and structural reform program was not designed to alleviate the unemployment problem. How does the U.S. Government, through its agencies, justify this kind of action, which is defeating the very objective that we seek to encompass as a result of the tax bill?

Perhaps this proposal requires refinement, but I believe it must be pinpointed. I am grateful to the chairman of the subcommittee for taking the amendment to conference so that the conferees can examine into it. Perhaps the language needs refinement. We must make progress in this problem. The previous administration reduced the differential to 6½ percent.

Knowing what labor costs are in this country as compared to those abroad, there is a need for our people to meet that kind of price on Government projects. It seems to me it is our first duty to look after our own industries and to see what we can do about our own jobless.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I express again my appreciation to the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who has the bill in hand, for their kindness and generosity in recognizing the situation and the merits of this amendment. I point out that what I have said is in condemnation of what is now being done by the Department of Defense, which is the largest single contractor. I point out that there exists a willful lack of uniformity and that since September 1962, all of labor and industry have been waiting for the Bureau of the Budget to simply write a report showing whether the Defense Department is doing the right thing.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Illinois that perhaps the language needs refinement, since I have offered the amendment in the form of a substitution for an earlier amendment. I hope the language can be carefully considered, so that the Government may have some guidelines, and so those who bid may know whether or not they have some chance of providing employment for American workmen.

I know of specific instances of steel mills being built overseas because it was the only way that the companies could stay in competition. As a result, Asians and Europeans are hired to do work which could be done in this country if we had a clarification of the Buy-American Act.

I again thank the Senators.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to subscribe to the statements made by the Senators from Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Illinois, with regard to the need for inducing American purchasers to buy American goods.

Within the past 2 months I have received two communications from manufacturers in Ohio, pointing out that they had lost bids to foreign companies. In each of the letters, there was a recitation of the amount of business that was involved and the number of jobs that were lost, and also the amount of the taxes that had been lost to our Government.

Though the bids were stated in dollars, and were seemingly in amounts substantially less than would have been paid if the goods had been bought in our country, the ultimate result was a loss to our Government, instead of a gain. The two contracts of which I speak involved purchases by the U.S. Government of goods produced in foreign countries.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I am very glad to learn that he feels as many of us feel who have spoken on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators on each side yield back the remainder of their time on the amendment?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Senate approval of H.R. 8667, as amended by our Public Works Committee, is a matter of major significance to millions of Americans who reside in our great river basin areas as well as to the entire national economy. It is my hope that after the Senate acts favorably on this measure, the other body will move quickly in granting a conference so that the bill will soon be on the President's desk. The Congress has too long delayed on this important legislation.

To the citizens of our State of West Virginia its significance is heightened by the fact that it will allow progress to continue in the construction of vital navigation locks and dams on the Ohio and Monongahela Rivers. It will also enable us to carry forward with the advance engineering and design activities for several newly authorized flood control projects, and will eliminate the threatened premature termination of construction work on major projects at a time when every effort must be made to maintain employment.

The pending proposal provides for engineering and construction work on four navigation locks and dams on the Ohio River which are listed as joint projects for Ohio and West Virginia—$7 million for the construction of the Belleville locks and dam, $250,000 for planning of the Hannibal locks and dam, $9 million for construction at Pike Island, and $1.5 million for construction of the Racine locks and dam.

In view of the ravages of the floods which struck West Virginia again last winter, it is also gratifying to know that the Corps of Engineers will now be able to proceed with their full capabilities. There are authorizations under this bill of $150,000 for the Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River in Wyoming County, $280,000 for the East Lynn Reservoir on Twelvepole Creek in Wayne County, $100,000 for the joint West Virginia-Maryland project, the Bloomington Reservoir on the North Branch of the Potomac River, and $73,000 for channel rectification of the Buckhannon River in Upshur County.

One of the most critically important projects which will now be continued under this legislation is the Summersville Reservoir on the Gauley River, for which some $10.9 million will now be released. This amount, which is almost sufficient to complete the work, relieves the contractor from the threat of interruption of funds which has been hanging over this project as well as others during recent weeks.

Finally, we would authorize $5,058,000 for continued construction of the Opekiska locks and dam on the Monongahela River between Morgantown and Fairmont.

All of these, Mr. President, are of far-reaching value to the people of West Virginia, either in terms of flood control or navigation, and it is most gratifying to know that Senate action this

afternoon will move them one step further toward realization.

Mr. President, the pending measure is the product of much deliberation by the Public Works Committee. There were at the outset significant differences between the Senate and the other body, and I commend the chairman of our committee [Mr. McNamara] for his diligent efforts to reach a meaningful and effective reconciliation of these differences.

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

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I yield back the remainder of the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper and Mr. Miller], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is absent because of death in his family.

The pair of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would both vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 19, as follows:

[No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Aiken	Hill	Moss
Anderson	Humphrey	Mundt
Bartlett	Inouye	Muskie
Bible	Jackson	Nelson
Boggs	Johnston	Pell
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Cannon	Kennedy	Russell
Clark	Kuchel	Scott
Cooper	Mansfield	Smathers
Dodd	McCarthy	Smith
Edmondson	McClellan	Stennis
Ellender	McGee	Symington
Ervin	McGovern	Talmadge
Fong	McIntyre	Thurmond
Gore	McNamara	Walters
Gruening	Metcalf	Yarborough
Hart	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hartke	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Morton	

NAYS—19

Allott	Douglas	Robertson
Beall	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bennett	Javits	Simpson
Byrd, Va.	Keating	Tower
Case	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Prouty	
Dominick	Proxmire	

NOT VOTING—22

Bayh	Fulbright	Miller
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Carlson	Holland	Pastore
Church	Hruska	Pearson
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Dirksen	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Magnuson	
Engle	Mechem	

So the bill (H.R. 8667) was passed.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 8667, with the Senate amendments numbered, be printed.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McNamara, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Fong the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. 1243. An act to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes; and

S. 2139. An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the 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 message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Harris, Mr. Roberts of Alabama, Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Mr. O'Brien of New York, Mr. Rogers of Florida, Mr. Bennett of Michigan, Mr. Schenck, Mr. Nelsen, and Mr. Brotzman were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Thomas, Mr. Evins, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Ostertag, and Mr. Jonas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10. An act to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes;

H.R. 130. An act to provide for the payment of compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the United States in connection with reclamation projects the construction of which commenced after January 1, 1961;

H.R. 988. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5128. An act to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement and group life and health insurance programs to certain

legislative employees, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6199. An act 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;

H.R. 6777. An act to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday.

H.R. 8462. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance of the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes;

H.R. 8751. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9004. An act to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order that such building may be preserved as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing while being utilized in the best interests of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business;

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business; and

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of certain opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public schools.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 10. An act to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5128. An act to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement and group life and health insurance programs to certain legislative employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 130. An act to provide for the payment of compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the United States in connection with reclamation projects the construction of which commenced after January 1, 1961; and

H.R. 988. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6199. An act 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.

H.R. 6777. An act to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday; and

H.R. 9004. An act to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order that such building may be preserved as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing while being utilized in the best interests of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 8462. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance of the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 8751. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions of the House were severally referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives five thousand copies of the subcommittee chairman's report to Subcommittee Numbered 1 entitled 'Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment', dated October 16, 1963."

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business five thousand copies of the chairman's report to the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Eighty-seventh Congress, dated December 31, 1962, entitled 'Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy'."

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of certain opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public schools:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) there shall be printed thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States (including concurring and dissenting opinions) in the cases of Engel against Vitale (370 U.S. 421) and Abington School District against Schempp (374 U.S. 203). Such opinions shall be printed together in one publication.

"(b) Of the thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty copies of such opinions printed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives."

DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is recognized on the House amendment to the bracero bill, S. 1703, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 648, Senate bill 1111, and that it be made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1111) to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "Act", to strike out "of 1963"; on page 2, line 14, after the word "limit", to insert "any interstate compact or"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "and"; in the same line, after the word "and", where it appears the second time, to strike out "Welfare." and insert "Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission."; on page 4, line 13, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; in line 14, after the word "projects.", to insert "Such procedures may include provision for Council revision of plans for Federal projects intended to be proposed in any plan or revision thereof being prepared by a river basin planning commission."; on page 5, at the beginning of line 2, to insert "urban,"; on page 6, at the beginning of line 3, to insert "and fix the compensation of"; in line 4, after the word "advisable,", to strike out "including a staff director at civil service grade 18;" and insert "in accordance with the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949, as amended;"; in line 6, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "(5) place one position, in addition to the staff director, above the level of grade GS-15, subject to the standards and procedures of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by such section; (6)" and insert "(5)"; in line 13, after the word "individuals;", to strike out "(7)" and insert "(6)"; in line 15, after the word "and", where it appears the first time, to strike out "(8)" and insert "(7)"; on page 7, line 16, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; on page 8, line 17, after the word "to", to strike out "date" and insert "date, to the extent practicable"; in line 20, after the word "related", to insert "resources: *Provided*, That the plan may include alternatives and it may be prepared in stages, including recommendations with respect to individual projects;"; on page 9, line 16, after the word "States,", to strike out "but a retired commissioned officer of one of the services mentioned

in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 may be appointed chairman without prejudice to his retired status and may receive the compensation payable under section 206(c) of this Act in addition to his retired pay: *Provided*, That the combined rate shall not exceed the applicable maximum rate or rates set forth in such section for the chairman;" and insert "except as a retired officer or employee;"; on page 11, line 9, after the word "Council", to strike out "and not less than one-half" and insert "or agreement of a majority"; in line 15, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; on page 12, line 4, after "(d)", to strike out "At" and insert "In the work of the commission every reasonable endeavor shall be made to arrive at a consensus of all members on all issues; but failing this, full opportunity shall be afforded each member for the presentation and report of individual views: *Provided*, That at"; in line 8, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "such time as voting is considered necessary in conducting the business of a commission the voting shall be only by the chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and by the vice chairman, upon instruction from the State members" and insert "any time the Commission fails to act by reason of absence of consensus, the position of the Chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and the Vice Chairman, acting upon instructions of the State members, shall be recorded"; in line 18, after "SEC. 204.", to strike out "(a)"; on page 13, line 10, after the word "plan", to strike out "and" and insert "or"; in line 11, after the word "major", to insert "portion or"; in line 15, after the word "major", to insert "portion or"; in line 21, after the word "the", to strike out "plan" and insert "plan, portion"; on page 14, line 5, after the word "proposed", to strike out "plan" and insert "plan, portion"; in line 7, after the word "the", to strike out "plan" and insert "plan, portion"; in line 13, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "plan" and insert "plan, portion"; on page 18, line 25, after "(c)", to strike out:

The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements shall be audited by a qualified public accountant who, where practicable, shall be licensed or certified by a regulatory body of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

And insert:

The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The accounts shall be audited at least annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified or licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

On page 19, line 13, after "(d)", to strike out "The accounts of the commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by such agency, representatives of the jurisdictions which appropriate funds to the commission." and insert "The accounts of the commission shall be open at all reasonable times for inspection by representatives of the jurisdictions and agencies which make appropriations, donations, or grants to the commission."; in line 23, after "SEC. 301.", to insert "(a)"; in line 24, after the word "States", to strike out "if the planning and other activities authorized by this Act are" and insert "in water and related land resources planning"; on page 20, line 5, after the word "developing", to insert "and participating in the development of"; in line 6, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; in line 7, after the word "resources", to strike out "plans and in participating in the development of the comprehensive water resources plans authorized in title II of this Act" and insert "plans"; after line 9, to insert:

(b) The Council with the approval of the President, shall prescribe such rules, establish such procedures, and make such arrangements and provisions relating to the performance of its functions under this title, and the use of funds available therefor, as may be necessary in order to assure (1) coordination of the program authorized by this title with related Federal planning assistance programs, including the program authorized under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 and (2) appropriate utilization of other Federal agencies administering programs which may contribute to achieving the purpose of this Act.

On page 21, line 1, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; in line 18, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; in line 25, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; on page 22, line 1, after the word "all", to strike out "Federal and" and insert "Federal,"; in line 2, after the word "State,", to insert "and local"; in line 3, after the word "in", to strike out "such" and insert "affected"; after line 3, to insert:

(2) Provides, where comprehensive statewide development planning is being carried on with or without assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, for full coordination between comprehensive water resources planning and other statewide planning programs and for assurances that such water resources planning will be in conformity with the general development policy in such State;

At the beginning of line 12, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)"; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)"; at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)"; and at the beginning of line 24, to insert "for keeping appropriate accountability of the funds and"; 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,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Planning Act".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the conservation, development, and utilization of the water and related land resources of the United States shall be planned on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

EFFECT ON EXISTING LAWS

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the field of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, or limit any interstate compact or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects; nor to limit the use of other mechanisms, if preferred by the participating governmental units, in the water resources field;

(b) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

SEC. 101. There is hereby established a Water Resources Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Chairman of the Council shall request the heads of other agencies to participate with the Council when matters affecting their responsibilities are considered by the Council. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the President.

SEC. 102. The Council shall—

(a) maintain a continuing study and prepare a biennial assessment of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to meet the water requirements in each water resource region in the United States and the national interest therein; and

(b) maintain a continuing study of the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the Nation, and of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of the water and related land resources policies and programs of the several Federal agencies; it shall appraise the adequacy of existing and proposed policies and programs to meet such requirements; and it shall make recommendations to the President with respect to Federal policies and programs.

SEC. 103. The Council shall establish, with the approval of the President, principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the preparation of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources projects. Such procedures may include provision for Council revision of plans for Federal projects intended to be proposed in any plan or revision thereof being prepared by a river basin planning commission.

SEC. 104. Upon receipt of a plan or revision thereof from any river basin commission under the provisions of section 204(a)(3) of this Act, the Council shall review the plan or revision with special regard to—

(1) the efficacy of such plan or revision in achieving optimum use of the water and related land resources in the area involved;

(2) the effect of the plan on the achievement of other programs for the development of agricultural, urban, energy, industrial, recreational, fish and wildlife, and other resources of the entire Nation; and

(3) the contributions which such plan or revision will make in obtaining the Nation's economic and social goals.

Based on such review the Council shall—

(a) recommend such modifications in such plan or revision as it deems desirable in the national interest; and

(b) transmit such plan or revision, including its recommendations and the views, comments, and recommendations with respect to such plan or revision submitted by any Federal agency, Governor, interstate commission, or United States section of an international commission, to the President for his review and transmittal to the Congress with his recommendations in regard to authorization of Federal projects.

SEC. 105. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Council may: (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949, as amended; (5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (6) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (7) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) Any member of the Council is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of the Council may be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the Council, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to the Council such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such Council on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The Council shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds.

TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

Creation of commissions

SEC. 201. (a) The President is authorized to declare the establishment of a river basin water and related land resources commission upon request therefor by the Council, or request addressed to the Council by a State within which all or part of the basin or basins concerned are located if the request by the Council or by a State (1) defines the region, river basin, or group of related river basins for which a commission is requested, (2) is made in writing by the Governor or in such manner as State law may provide, or by the Council, and (3) is concurred in by the Council and by not less than one-half of the States within which portions of the basin or basins concerned are located. Such concurrences shall be in writing. Whenever, within a reasonable time, sufficient concurrences by States are not obtained to effectuate a request of the Council that a commission be established, the Council may find that the national interest requires coordinated and comprehensive planning in the region, river basin, or group of river basins with respect to which it has made a request and shall, in the event of such finding, recommend to the President an alternative means of accomplishing such planning.

(b) Each such commission for a region, river basin, or group of river basins shall—

(1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate, and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in its region, river basin, or group of river basins;

(2) prepare and keep up to date, to the extent practicable a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan for Federal, State, interstate, and local development of water and related resources: *Provided*, That the plan may include alternatives and it may be prepared in stages, including recommendations with respect to individual projects;

(3) recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning, and construction of projects; and

(4) foster and undertake such studies of water and related land resources problems in its region, river basin, or group of river basins as are necessary in the preparation of the plan described in clause (2) of this subsection.

Membership of commissions

SEC. 202. Each river basin commission shall be composed of members appointed as follows:

(a) A chairman appointed by the President who shall also serve as chairman and coordinating officer of the Federal members of the commission and who shall represent the Federal Government in Federal-State relations on the commission and who shall not, during the period of his service on the commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except as a retired officer or employee;

(b) One member from each Federal department or independent agency determined by the President to have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken by the commission, such member to be appointed by the head of such department or independent agency and to serve as the representative of such department or independent agency;

(c) One member from each State which lies wholly or partially within the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the commission is established, and the appointment of each such member shall be made in accordance with the laws of the State which he represents. In the absence of governing provisions of State law, such State members shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Governor;

(d) One member appointed by any interstate agency created by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is created;

(e) When deemed appropriate by the President, one member, who shall be appointed by the President, from the United States section of any international commission created by a treaty to which the consent of the Senate has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is established.

Organization of commissions

SEC. 203. (a) Each river basin commission shall organize for the performance of its functions within ninety days after the President shall have declared the establishment of such commission, subject to the availability of funds for carrying on its work. A commission shall terminate upon agreement of the Council or agreement of a majority of the States composing the commission. Upon such termination, all property, assets, and records of the commission shall thereafter be turned over to such agencies of the United States and the participating States as shall be appropriate in the circumstances: *Provided*, That sudies, data, and other materials useful in water and related land resource planning to any of the participants shall be kept freely available to all such participants.

(b) State members of each commission shall elect a vice chairman, who shall serve also as chairman and coordinating officer of the State members of the commission and who shall represent the State governments in Federal-State relations on the commission.

(c) Vacancies in a commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made: *Provided*, That the chairman and vice chairman may designate alternates to act for them during temporary absences.

(d) In the work of the commission every reasonable endeavor shall be made to arrive at a consensus of all members on all issues; but failing this, full opportunity shall be afforded each member for the presentation and report of individual views: *Provided*, That at any time the Commission fails to act by reason of absence of consensus, the position of the Chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and the Vice Chairman, acting upon instructions of the State members, shall be recorded.

Duties of the commissions

SEC. 204. Each river basin commission shall—

(1) engage in such activities and make such studies and investigations as are necessary and desirable in carrying out the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act and in accomplishing the purposes set forth in section 201(b) of this Act;

(2) submit to the Council and the Governor of each participating State a report on its work at least once each year. Such report shall be transmitted through the President to the Congress. After such transmission, copies of any such report shall be sent to the heads of such Federal, State, interstate, and international agencies as the President or the Governors of the participating States may direct;

(3) submit to the Council for transmission to the President and by him to the Congress, and the Governors and the legislatures of the participating States a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan, or any major portion or necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which such commission was established. Before the commission submits such a plan or major portion or revision to the Council, it shall transmit the proposed plan or revision to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and each interstate agency, from which a member of the commission has been appointed, and to the head of the United States section of any international commission if the plan, portion, or revision deals with a boundary water or a river crossing a boundary, or any tributary flowing into such boundary water or river, over which the international commission has jurisdiction or for which it has responsibility. Each such department and agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall have ninety days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan, portion, or revision to report its views, comments, and recommendations to the commission. The commission may modify the plan, portion, or revision after considering the reports so submitted. The views, comments, and recommendations

submitted by each Federal department or agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall be transmitted to the Council with the plan, portion, or revision; and

(4) submit to the Council at the time of submitting such plan, any recommendations it may have for continuing the functions of the commission and for implementing the plan, including means of keeping the plan up to date.

Powers and administrative provisions of the commissions

SEC. 205. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, each river basin commission may—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable;

(2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary;

(3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States;

(4) employ and compensate such personnel as it deems advisable, including consultants at rates not to exceed $100 per diem;

(5) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or the United States, or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

(6) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for or continuing in another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel;

(7) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and

(8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) The chairman of a river basin commission, or any member of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of each river basin commission shall be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the chairman of any river basin commission, or any member or employee of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to such commission such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The chairman of each river basin commission shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed by such commission, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds available to such commission. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the chairman shall be governed by the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it, and the timing thereof.

Compensation of commission members

SEC. 206. (a) Any member of a river basin commission appointed pursuant to section 202 (b) and (e) of this Act, shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of his membership on the commission, but shall continue to receive, from appropriations made for the agency from which he is appointed, the salary of his regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

(b) Members of a commission, appointed pursuant to section 202 (c) and (d) of this Act, shall each receive such compensation as may be provided by the States or the interstate agency respectively, which they represent.

(c) The per annum compensation of the chairman of each river basin commission shall be determined by the President, but when employed on a full-time annual basis shall not exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS–18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; or when engaged in the performance of the commission's duties on an intermittent basis such compensation shall be not more than $100 per day and shall not exceed $12,000 in any year.

SEC. 207. (a) Each commission shall determine the proportionate share of its expense which shall be borne by the Federal Government and each of the States. Each commission shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Council and the States. Estimates of proposed appropriations from the Federal Government shall be included in the budget estimates submitted by the Council under the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, and may include an amount for advance to a commission against State appropriations for which delay is anticipated by reason of later legislative sessions. All sums appropriated to or otherwise received by a commission shall be credited to the commission's account in the Treasury of the United States.

(b) A commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

(c) The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The accounts shall be audited at least annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified or licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

(d) The accounts of the commission shall be open at all reasonable times for inspection by representatives of the jurisdictions and agencies which make appropriations, donations, or grants to the commission.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 301. (a) In recognition of the need for increased participation by the States in water and related land resources planning to be effective, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Council for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the nine succeeding fiscal years thereafter, $5,000,000 in each such year for grants to States to assist them in developing and participating in the development of comprehensive water and related land resources plans.

(b) The Council with the approval of the President, shall prescribe such rules, establish such procedures, and make such arrangements and provisions relating to the performance of its functions under this title, and the use of funds available therefor, as may be necessary in order to assure (1) coordination of the program authorized by this title with related Federal planning assistance programs, including the program authorized under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 and (2) appropriate utilization of other Federal agencies administering programs which may contribute to achieving the purpose of this Act.

ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year the Council shall from time to time make allotments to the States, in accordance with its regulations on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the land area, (3) the need for comprehensive water and related land resources planning programs, and (4) the financial need of the respective States. For the purposes of this section the population of the States shall be determined on the basis of the latest estimates available from the Department of Commerce and the land area of the States shall be determined on the basis of the official records of the United States Geological Survey.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year the Council shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under section 305) of the cost of carrying out its State program approved under section 303, including the cost of training personnel for carrying out such program and the cost of administering such program.

State programs

SEC. 303. The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is substituted by a State, if such program—

(1) provides for comprehensive planning with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources or both in such State to meet the needs for water and water related activities taking into account prospective demands for all purposes served through or affected by water and related land resources development, with adequate provision for coordination with all Federal, State, and local agencies having responsibilities in affected fields;

(2) provides, where comprehensive statewide development planning is being carried on with or without assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, for full coordination between comprehensive water resources planning and other statewide planning programs and for assurances that such water resources planning will be in conformity with the general development policy in such State;

(3) designates a State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") to administer the program;

(4) provides that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Council from time to time reasonably requires to carry out its functions under this title;

(5) sets forth the procedure to be followed in carrying out the State program and in administering such program; and

(6) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for keeping appropriate accountability of the funds and for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

The Council shall not disapprove any program without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering such program.

Review

SEC. 304. Whenever the Council after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State agency finds that—

(a) the program submitted by such State and approved under section 303 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of such section; or

(b) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Council shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title until it is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until the Council is so satisfied, it shall make no further payments to such State under this title.

Federal share

SEC. 305. (a) The Federal share for any State shall be 100 per centum of the cost of carrying out its approved program less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the entire United States, except that (1) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ per centum or less than 33⅓ per centum, and (2) the Federal share for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ per centum: *Provided*, That in no event shall the Federal share exceed a State's allotment under section 302.

(2) The Federal shares shall be promulgated by the Council on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the entire United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for the first fiscal year for which payments are made under the provisions of this title and the succeeding fiscal year, and a promulgation shall thereafter be made for each succeeding two years and shall be conclusive for such years.

Payments

SEC. 306. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to this title shall be as follows:

(1) The Council shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by it, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title for such period, such estimate be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Council may find necessary.

(2) The Council shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by it for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which it finds that its estimate of the amount to be paid such State for any prior period under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State for such prior period under this title. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Council may determine.

Definition

SEC. 307. For the purpose of this title the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of title I and II and the administration of title III.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 402. The Council is authorized to make such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary or appropriate for carrying out those provisions of this Act which are administered by it.

Delegation of functions

SEC. 403. The Council is authorized to delegate to any member or employee of the Council its administrative functions under section 105 and the detailed administration of the grant program under title III.

Utilization of personnel

SEC. 404. The Council may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the United States, utilize such officers and employees of such agency as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Employee benefits

SEC. 405. The Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with any commission established under section 201 of this Act for coverage of the river basin commission's employees in the employee benefit programs of the Federal Government, as provided in section 205(a)(6) of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I wish to state that this bill has been made the pending business, but no action on it will be taken this afternoon.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED—HOUSE AMENDMENT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1703) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 510 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking "December 31, 1963" and inserting "December 31, 1964".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [putting the question].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield, and if it is agreed that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. First, Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. First, Mr. President, will the Chair restate the motion which has been made by the Senator from Louisiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator from Louisiana has moved that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate bill 1703.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, under the rules, is it in order to move, as a substitute, that the House amendment be referred to a committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be in order, under rule XXII, which sets forth the various motions available to the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Then, Mr. President, with the permission of the majority leader, and if the Senator from Louisiana will permit, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well; but I point out that I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a moment ago I moved that the Senate concur in the House amendment to 1703.

When the bill was sent to the Senate by the House a few weeks ago I consulted with a number of Senators, and particularly with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. It was agreed that it would be useless to send the bill to conference, because we could debate the issue involved by making a motion to concur in the House amendment.

The House amendment would eliminate from the Senate bill the so-called McCarthy amendment, which would have the effect of killing the bill.

The McCarthy amendment provided, in effect, that there be given to American workers the same opportunities given to Mexican workers; as to workmen's compensation, occupational insurance coverage, housing, and so forth. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry concluded that with such language in the bill the effect would be more or less to kill the bill.

Mr. President, the Mexican farm labor program has been before Congress since 1951. It was enacted at that time in order to provide effective control procedures for the movement of Mexican nationals into the farmlands in the United States. Prior to the enactment of the program covered by the bill now before the Senate, many Mexicans swam across the Rio Grande into the United States to work for whatever wages they could obtain. Immigration authorities found that as many as 500,000 Mexicans had entered the United States without authority.

Because there were no control features and because there were so many so-called wetbacks involved it presented a special problem to both the Mexican and United States Governments.

Many of us believed that this problem could be handled much better by providing a law, under which the United States and Mexico could enter into an agreement whereby the Mexican laborers could be sent into the United States in quantities sufficient to take care of what is more or less stoop labor.

Mechanization has relieved the pressure for many workers. However, in the absence of adequate machinery, it was and is necessary for the farmers in California, in Arizona, and in many of the border States as well as the States of the interior, to obtain additional labor, for the reason that laborers could not be hired locally. It is difficult to hire Americans to do stoop work; to gather cotton,

to harvest fruits and vegetables, and to do other things of that kind.

As a result of the passage of the act in 1951, the employment of Mexicans was handled in a more orderly manner, and the wages agreed upon and fixed were, of course, more equitable. With the adoption of adequate control procedure fewer and fewer Mexicans came into our country illegally.

In subsequent years, the act passed in 1951 was amended in order to satisfy some of the opposition to the program which arose. It seems that many individuals felt that the program should not be reenacted for a number of reasons. Some felt that it did not do justice to the Mexicans. Others felt that the American worker was not given the same opportunity to be employed as the Mexican worker.

The Mexicans who are hired and contracted for are provided with housing, transportation, insurance, a guarantee in regard to being crippled, and various other things including a firm contract to work. In other words, both employers and employees are protected.

Requests were made to amend the bill so that American employees would receive the same benefits as would accrue to Mexican laborers.

As time went on, and as cultivating and harvesting machinery was improved, the number of Mexican laborers decreased considerably. Today the number of Mexicans who come into the country to do stoop labor is a pittance as compared to what it was in 1951.

As machinery was developed, improved, and became more complex, the committee saw fit to add to the law provisions which made it almost impossible for Mexican labor to be employed except to do stoop work or manual labor. Prior to the last two extensions of the Mexican labor law, Mexicans were permitted to do other than stoop work.

The law for which an extension is now sought provides just that; namely, that the Mexicans who will be employed next year in this country will be employed principally to do stoop labor.

I am told that unless the extension is granted, many of the crops in California, Arizona, and other States bordering on or located near Mexico will suffer considerably. Particularly is that true of the State of Texas, where many crops are grown for which it is necessary to have a large number of laborers.

So far we have been unable to invent machines that make it possible to pick melons, lettuce, or other vegetables of that kind, or even to pick certain kinds of beans.

It is therefore necessary that the law be extended.

When the bill was before the Senate, the proponents of the measure desired an extension of 2 years, instead of 1 year. The committee saw fit to provide merely for an extension of 1 year, in the hope that the measure could go through the Senate without too much difficulty. But when the bill was presented to the Senate, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] offered his amendment, which, in my opinion, had the effect of nullifying the law.

The McCarthy amendment, in including work period guarantees, went beyond the request of the Secretary of Labor when he presented a draft bill to the Senate on March 26.

The first amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, which contained the language finally adopted, plus an additional section, lost by a tie vote of 45 to 45. The amendment which was adopted was agreed to by a vote of 44 to 43—only by 1 vote. Subsequently, a motion by the Senator from Minnesota to table a motion by me to reconsider the third reading was rejected by a vote of 45 to 45, and the motion to reconsider the third reading was then rejected by a vote of 45 to 45.

The House Committee on Agriculture rejected the McCarthy amendment by a vote of 28 to 4.

The McCarthy amendment was offered in the House by Representative ROSENTHAL as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for an amendment offered by Representative ROOSEVELT. Representative ROSENTHAL's amendment was defeated in the House by a vote of 79 to 131.

I call attention to the votes in the Senate to show how close they were. In the House, however, the vote was overwhelmingly against the McCarthy amendment. I express the hope that the Senate will agree to the simple motion I have made. So far as I am concerned, I wish to give assurance to the opponents that I shall not move in the future to extend the law any further than the year 1964.

It is my belief that by giving this notice in advance, the proponents of this law will be warned that the Senate will not act again on this measure and that they must begin to look elsewhere for relief.

I am sure that in Texas, and probably in other States, such as California and Arizona, particularly, many crops are now growing that will mature in the early part of next year. If the Senate fails to extend the law, there will be much loss to the farmers who are now engaged in planting and cultivating crops.

I wish to state to the Senate something else that may occur. There may be a reversion to the old method of Mexicans swimming across the Rio Grande, in violation of our immigration laws. If that is permitted, labor from Mexico will continue to come into this country, as was true before 1951. Wages will be lowered. No doubt the Mexicans will come in greater numbers than would be true otherwise.

I express the hope that the Senate will vote favorably on the motion I have made. If that is done, all persons will be on notice that, beginning in 1965, other methods will have to be used to provide for stoop labor. What they will be, I am unable to say at this time. However, the farmers will at least be warned in advance.

I wish to repeat again that the motion merely extends the existing law for 1 year. No changes are made in the existing law, except that the year of expiration is 1964 instead of 1963. By so doing, I feel confident it will be of assistance to farmers. It will also assist Mexicans in that they will work under the same conditions as in 1963.

I do not know what the effect will be on our relations with Mexico. A good many proponents of the bill take the position that unless there is an extension it will do violence to our relations with Mexico. I do not know that it will do that. However, it is something that we must consider. There is no doubt that many Mexicans who come to this country and send their money back to Mexico do perform a service, by more or less giving dollars to Mexico that Mexico needs. The adverse effect on our relations with Mexico if this bill is not extended has never been discussed or determined by the committee. However, during the debate some time ago the matter was brought up, and it was said that it would cause some friction between our countries. I hope it will not be so.

When the question of the labor contracts between the United States and Mexico was first discussed, I attended the conference in Mexico City. We had very cordial relations then. I hope that the cordial relationship will continue in the future.

I have nothing further to say, except that I hope the Senate will agree to the motion that I have made.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for his statement regarding his determination that this program shall end after 1 year. I accept his statement. I am sure that he will not, as he said, again propose an extension of the program.

Of course, he does not speak for the people who have advocated this legislation through the years. The record shows that from the beginning of this program in 1951 it has been presented as a temporary program, and that every time it came under debate, the argument was made that the program would be extended for only 1 more year or for 2 years more.

In each of those debates, when it was proposed that certain standards and requirements be established to give protection to potential American migratory workers, the argument was made that we did not need to set up such protection because the program was to be phased out in 1 or 2 years.

Therefore, in the course of approximately 12 years we have heard the same argument made over and over again, and the same presentation of the program has been made, namely, that it is a temporary program designed to meet a problem for only a short length of time.

Again today we find ourselves in the same situation. I should like to review the history of the case which has been made for an extension, a reextension, and still other extensions of the program since 1951.

When the program was proposed in 1951, the Senate debated the bill from April 26 until May 7, when it finally passed the bill. At that time it was strongly opposed by the late Senator Chavez, of New Mexico, who personally knew something of the problems of the

migratory workers in the Southwestern States.

At that time I was a member of the House Committee on Agriculture. I recall the arguments that were made in committee and in debate on the floor of the House. Two principal arguments were advanced in support of the program. One was that the Korean conflict had resulted in a manpower shortage. The Government of Mexico at that time opposed having Mexican nationals come to work in this country under the exploitative conditions which prevailed then. Most of these workers came in illegally, and were generally described as wetbacks. Officials of the Mexican Government came to our country, and asked us to provide for some kind of protection for their people who were coming into the United States to work in the cottonfields and in the production of vegetables and fruits and other crops in the southwestern part of our country.

It was stated that it would be necessary to enact legislation if we were to have an orderly and decent program; otherwise, these officials said, no Mexicans would be permitted to come.

This was a threat on the part of the Mexican Government, and a protest on the part of the Mexican Government, against the kind of treatment that its nationals had been receiving.

Therefore, a temporary measure was proposed. The program for the importation of Mexican workers came before the House for consideration on June 26, 1951.

Representative COOLEY, who handled the bill on the floor of the House, made the following statement:

American agriculture has embarked upon a greatly expanded program. High production goals have been fixed and the farmers of the Nation have been called upon to produce the abundance which will be needed. American agriculture has been called upon again to fill the bread basket of democracy. We can recall with great pride how the American farmer discharged his assignment in World War II. Our farmers performed magnificently and actually amazed the world with their production.

The bill which we are presenting seeks to deal with an unfortunate situation. It is unfortunate that we do not have in America sufficent farm labor to harvest the abundant production of our farm labor. There is no question about a shortage of farm labor. Everyone familiar with the situation is apparently willing to admit that there is a great need for a great number of laborers for the farms of America.

Representative POAGE advanced similar arguments. He said:

Last year we were barely able to pick that cotton crop with the labor force that was available—and it included a substantial number of Mexicans, both contract Mexican nationals and illegal entrants. Since that time there have been thousands of American boys who have left those farms and gone to work in the industries of the Nation, in the war plants, and in the Armed Forces of the country. Our own labor force is not nearly as large as it was 1 year ago. We were barely able, with a long picking season, to gather 9,750,000 bales of cotton. With 16 or 17 million bales this year and a smaller force to gather it, how can we hope to have that fiber without the help of our neighbors to the south? How can we hope to save the beet crop of America without someone who is willing to get down on his hands and knees and do the stoop labor required to do it?

Representative Clifford Hope stressed that it was a temporary program, stating:

The Committee on Agriculture held extensive hearings on this bill. We gave it a great deal of consideration in executive session. We heard a large number of witnesses. We heard all the different viewpoints, and as a result of this very exhaustive consideration we bring you this bill which I feel does what it sets out to do. It is a temporary measure but one which will meet the present situation. It will help alleviate the shortage of certain types of farm workers and will enable our farmers to help meet the obligation which has been put upon them by the Secretary of Agriculture to produce the greatest amount of food and fiber that has ever been produced by the farmers of this country.

The same view was expressed by Representative Hill of Colorado who said:

Yes. There is another thing I want to say, and that is this is a temporary bill. This bill expires on December 31, 1953. What we are trying to do here is to take care of the situation during this war emergency.

Mr. President, the Korean conflict has been over for 10 years.

Great changes have taken place in planting and harvesting crops. Mechanization has eliminated much of the hand labor formerly required for cotton and some other crops in which braceros were used.

At the same time we have gone from a period of a somewhat tight manpower situation in 1951 to one of widespread unemployment. Unemployment for the past 5 years has been at the average yearly rate of 5.5 percent or more. The Department of Agriculture has estimated unemployment and underemployment among our rural population at a rate equivalent to 4 million workers. In 1962, California growers contracted or recontracted for 127,000 Mexican nationals under this program—but at the same time the estimated annual average of unemployed domestic workers in California was 395,000, or more than twice the number of Mexicans who were imported under this program.

Across the Nation, the number of farms and farmworkers has declined sharply since 1952. In 1962 alone the number of hired farmworkers averaged 4 percent less than in 1961, and the number of family farmworkers was down 3 percent last year.

All these facts indicate that if displaced and unemployed farmworkers were offered conditions of work regarding transportation, housing, and work period guarantees comparable to those enjoyed by Mexican nationals, the needs could be met without using foreign workers.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator arguing that if a contract were entered into, let us say, by workers from Illinois, the farmer could enforce that contract in the same manner as he is capable of enforcing a contract involving Mexican labor?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would depend upon the terms of the contract. If it were a formal legal contract, it would be enforcible at law.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, if a contract were entered into by an American worker who went from Illinois to Nevada, the worker could not be forced to work. He might work for 2 or 3 days and then leave. However, if a Mexican laborer refused to work, he would be deported. Personally, I do not believe there would be any way by which to enforce a contract between an American laborer and a farmer. It would be impossible to do so, under the law.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Louisiana to urge as an argument for the bracero bill that Mexicans can be held to involuntary servitude, whereas Americans cannot be?

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not argue that at all. I said that if a Mexican refused to work, he could no longer remain in the country; he would have to return to Mexico. The inducement for him to remain in this country is that he continue to work. On the other hand, if the worker were an American, such a contract would be illegal under the law, as I understand it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suspect that the labor contract of an American is what is termed an at-will contract, which is not binding. The Senator from Louisiana is saying that the great advantage of bringing in Mexicans is that no matter what the conditions, no matter how poorly they may be treated, they must continue to work under penalty of expulsion from this country. I think that is involuntary servitude; and under the 13th amendment, involuntary servitude is outlawed by the Constitution.

Mr. McCARTHY. The proceeding under this law is one of providing rented "slaves." It is not a question of having to buy them and take responsibility for them for a long period of time. Essentially, the commitment is similar to that under slavery, except that it is a sort of temporary servitude; and the penalty for not working, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, is that the workers will be returned to Mexico. They are, of course, free to leave their work and return to their own country. The pressure on them is that if they refuse to work, they must return to their own country.

Mr. ELLENDER. A Mexican is free to leave whenever he desires; but the condition under which he may remain in the country is that he must work under the contract he entered into. If after a few days of employment he wants to quit, he may quit; but he must return to Mexico; he may not remain in this country.

Mr. McCARTHY. If Americans were offered employment, and offered the same terms as were offered Mexicans, I assume from the statement of the Senator from Louisiana that they would be offered such employment only on the counterconsideration that they would not be free to leave their jobs and find

employment in other areas. This is a consideration. But if Americans were offered similar terms and conditions to remain, most of them would seek this kind of work and continue to work and fulfill their obligations, if there were a contract.

Mr. ELLENDER. There would be no way to enforce such a contract.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is quite correct. There would be no weapon or pressure to use on the Americans. But I am satisfied that if they were offered comparable terms, they would be willing to work and to fulfill the contract.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The 13th amendment of the Constitution provides:

> Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

It seems to me to be somewhat regrettable at this stage that there can be involuntary servitude for Mexicans but not for Americans, and that therefore Mexicans can be brought in.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think there is any question but that this kind of control over the workers is one of the reasons that many employers desire a continuation of the program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I once spent some weeks in Arizona and happened to meet a Mexican living there who had apparently entered this country illegally. He was in mortal terror that he would be shipped back. He was scared to death of his employer, because he believed his employer knew he had entered this country under difficult circumstances. He was afraid he might be sent back, so he did not feel himself to be a free agent.

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly the Mexican workers constitute unfair competition for potential American agricultural workers. The conditions that have been described are important considerations. Mexican workers are carefully screened, so it is not necessary for an employer to take run-of-the-mill Americans, as he would have to do if he hired his employees from American workers. Most of the Mexicans come alone, so the growers do not have their family responsibilities to be concerned with.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will concede, I am certain, that if the proposed extension is not granted, there may be a recurrence of conditions that existed prior to 1951, when Mexican labor came by the thousands, some of them swimming across the Rio Grande, and becoming known, as the Senator stated a while ago, as "wetbacks." Many of them had to remain hidden, too, in order to escape arrest by immigration officials. My fear is that there might be a recurrence of that situation.

Certainly the type of contract that is now entered into with the sanction of both the American Government and the Mexican Government is not, by any means, of the kind described by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as a slavery contract, because a Mexican can enter the United States and leave the next day, if he desires.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The important point is that if he quits, he must return to Mexico.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the only difference.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the argument just made by the Senator from Louisiana about the danger of a recurrence of the wetback problem and illegal entries of Mexican workers if the legislation is not continued is subject to challenge.

This very argument was made in the debates as long ago as 1951. It was stated that because of the wetback problem, the Mexican farm labor bill should be passed.

At that time the Senate adopted an amendment offered, I believe, by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which would have made some improvement in the situation, but the amendment was lost in conference. As a result, the program did not play a significant role at that time in solving the wetback problem.

Two years ago, I wrote to Commissioner of Immigration Swing on this particular point and asked whether he thought the passage of the legislation had had any significant effect on the wetback problem. He replied that it did not play any significant part in the solution of the wetback problems. In his letter, he said:

> U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
> IMMIGRATION AND
> NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
> *Washington, D.C., February 8, 1961.*
>
> Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: Your letter requesting information as to the possible effect of proposed modification of Public Law 78, addressed to the Attorney General, has been referred to this Service for reply.
>
> In response to your first question, the Service does not believe that the enactment of Public Law 78 on July 12, 1951, brought about a significant reduction in illegal wetback entries. From the attached table it will be observed that for at least 3 years following the enactment of that law the apprehension of wetbacks rose appreciably to the alltime high of over 1 million in the year ending June 30, 1954. The provisions of Public Law 78 were largely inoperative in certain areas of the country because of the availability of wetback labor. Not until the stemming of the tide of illegal entry during the year 1954 was the lawful importation of Mexican braceros firmly established as the chief source of alien agricultural labor in the United States.
>
> In this connection you may be interested in the enclosed article on the subject which appeared in the July 1956 issue of the I & N Reporter. This article contains statistics as to the number of agricultural laborers admitted annually during the years 1950 through 1956. On page 8 of this article there is a partial answer to your second question in the paragraph which reads:
>
> "The so-called wetback problem no longer exists. The southern border has been secured. The Immigration and Naturalization Service now has control over the illegal entries of Mexicans. However, continuous efforts must be made by the Service to maintain this security and to prevent illegal entry. The continued support of the Mexican Government, employers of laborers, other agencies, and the Congress is needed to assure the success of this program."
>
> If bracero or domestic labor is not available in the United States, the pressure of illegal entry on our southern border will undoubtedly increase. If the Service is given the same authorized manpower, however, I am confident that the control of the border can be maintained.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> J. M. SWING,
> *Commissioner.*

That is the judgment of the Commissioner of Immigration on this point.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator know of anyone in the United States who is a better authority on this subject than the Commissioner of Immigration?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. I think he is the expert on whom we must rely.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that on this subject he can speak with greater authority and greater knowledge than anyone else; and is it not also true that we must accept his judgment on this subject, unless we obtain contrary evidence?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, for he is the best source of information on this question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator know of any hard evidence of any kind which is contradictory of the statements made by Commissioner Swing?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. All the evidence sustains the statements he has made. It was clear that effective control came only when our officials improved control of the border and began to use all their strength, as well as that of the Mexican Government, to stop such illegal entries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the argument that the bracero program is necessary in order to prevent illegal entries by Mexicans is not supported by the evidence we have and the statistics which are available, which demonstrate that the bracero program has nothing whatever to do with prevention of illegal entry by Mexicans into the United States?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the evidence fully sustains the position implied by the Senator's question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understood the Senator from Minnesota to say that the Commissioner of Immigration stated that in 1954—which really was 2 years after the act went into effect, although it was passed in 1951—the apprehension reached an alltime high. I wonder whether there is in the Commissioner's statement anything to show that after the passage of the bracero bill, the Immigration Service of the United States made an intense drive to round up all the illegal entrants into the United States—an intense drive which it had not made theretofore. I have personal knowledge of this, at least insofar as it pertains to my own State. I also have personal knowledge that many of those who were rounded up—some of whom had been in the State 10 or 11 years, and thus had been able to circulate in the

labor market, wherever they could get work—were then returned to Mexico.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. The Commissioner's statement was that it was not the enactment of that law which caused the decline in the number of wetbacks who entered and the number who were returned by the Immigration Service, but, rather the cause was the more thorough enforcement of the immigration laws.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would agree with the Commissioner's statement in this respect: During that period the Immigration Service, for some reason—I suppose it was to make the law partially workable—conducted a drive, with which I am in wholehearted accord, to return those people to Mexico. But I would go further, and suggest that I do not think anyone can correctly contend that the wetback situation—of course, I refer to the illegal entrants, not to those who have entered under the bracero law—would be improved to any extent if this bill did not become law for another year. It would become worse, because these people—and anyone who has been to Mexico to any extent knows this—look to the United States with eyes of envy and wonderment, and wish to come to the United States because those who are in the United States do so much better than those in Mexico. Therefore, I would not wish to state for a minute that the enactment of this law would shut off the incursion of wetbacks; but neither do I think that it can be successfully argued that this incursion will not increase—because I think it will increase to some extent.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is a possibility. All I can do is set against the Senator's opinion the statement of the Commissioner of Immigration, who says:

> If the Service is given the same authorized manpower, however, I am confident that the control of the border can be maintained.

We must wait to see what the actual results will be before we can determine who is more nearly correct—the Senator from Colorado or the Commissioner of Immigration.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the Senator from Minnesota ever been to Brownsville, Nogales, El Paso, or any of the other border towns, and seen there the many thousands of people who daily cross the border between the two countries, by crossing the bridges, and who are subject to only cursory examination? It would be almost impossible to provide the Immigration Service with a force sufficiently large to be able to check on those who thus walk back and forth, across the border, let alone to check on those who go up the river. Unfortunately, the river does not have as much water as it used to have in it at various places. So those who wish to cross the river there do not have to swim across it; generally they can wade across it. Sometimes they can actually ride across it. So it is very difficult to maintain effective control for a distance of a thousand miles or more, and thus prevent the illegal entry into the United States of Mexicans who seek to cross that river at one point or another. It would be almost impossible even to check on those who seek to cross the border at El Paso and at various places farther down the river. That job would require perhaps double the present force.

Mr. McCARTHY. Again, all I can do is cite the opinion of the Commissioner of Immigration, who stated, in his letter, that the Immigration Service could handle the situation. I have cited the best available authority—the Commissioner of Immigration—who, I am sure, has seen the situation which has been described to us by the Senator from Colorado, and who was personally and directly active for many years in this field.

Mr. President, I oppose the motion that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703.

The Senate should follow the traditional procedure in connection with proposed legislation when there is a substantial difference between the Senate version and the House version.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has said that if the Senate provision is retained, the House will refuse to accept it. But I submit that this shows there is a substantial difference between the two versions, and that therefore, if for no other reason, a conference should be held, in order to discuss the difference.

If the differences were so slight that the House would accept it anyway, we could say, "Why go to conference on a minor point?"

But here he acknowledges that this is a major difference. The only argument made against going to conference is that the House will not accept the Senate version. If this were the case, each time a major difference between the House and Senate occurred, the argument could be made that because of this difference we should surrender to the House and accept their version because the differences are so great.

If we look into it further than that, we make a kind of "numbers" argument, saying that the reason why we should give in to the House on this issue is that the amendment offered by myself and a number of other Senators was passed by a single vote. Then we have to look up the vote in the House on the same issue. When we do so, we really get into difficulty, because the record in the House shows that when they first voted on extension of Public Law 78 last May, the whole program was rejected by the House. The vote was 174 to 158 against extension. Then on October 31 the House reversed itself and approved a 1-year extension by a vote of 173 to 158. There were two votes in the House. On one occasion the vote was 174 against extension and then later the vote was 173 in favor of extension; in both cases there were 158 on the other side. So if we consider the total vote in both rollcalls—counting House Members twice—the difference comes out to a single vote. The numbers game really does not take us very far.

We are moved back again to the question of whether the action of the Senate in adopting the amendment, even though it was by a single vote, should be sustained in conference.

The will of the Senate stands today, as it did on August 15. A majority of Senators supported the position that the Senate was willing to extend this program for 1 year only on the condition that employers make a reasonable offer to provide some benefits to domestic workers before they turned to importing Mexican nationals.

The immediate question is: Shall the Senate accept the judgment of the House Committee on Agriculture—which removed the Senate amendment from S. 1703—or shall the House be required to consider the decision of the Senate at least in conference?

This special legislation, I believe we should note, provides benefits for only about 33,000 of the more than 3 million farmers in the Nation.

This program adversely affects American farmworkers who are already underprivileged. It should not be extended unless some action is taken to safeguard the rights of these citizens.

There is evidence that the special benefits that a few growers get from this program gives them a competitive advantage over family farm operators who grow the same crops in other sections of the Nation. We should not be authorizing the importation of foreign workers at a time when our rural population suffers from great unemployment and underemployment.

All the defenses made for this program, and all the pleas to let the growers have Mexican nationals for 1 more year, cannot hide the central fact that this program has depressed the economic and social conditions of domestic migratory workers. It has adversely affected the welfare of American citizens who, even before the program was established 12 years ago, were the most underprivileged group in the United States.

In 1952, when the Mexican farm labor program went into effect, male migratory farmworkers in the Nation averaged $7.35 per day. During the last 10 years as many as 400,000 Mexican nationals annually have entered the United States under Public Law 78 to compete with Americans. In 1961, the average wage of male migratory farmworkers was $6.70 per day—65 cents per day less than they averaged in 1952. This was a period in which wages throughout the economy rose sharply and in which costs for the necessities of life also greatly increased.

A wage of $6.70 a day is $40.20 for a 6-day week, or $160 per month. But these workers would praise the Congress if our action would only guarantee them $160 per month; for these men do not work regularly. They work during special seasons, depending on the weather and depending on the size of the crop—and they suffer from extensive seasonal unemployment. In 1961 they averaged only 109 days of farmwork a year. They managed to get a few days of nonfarm work, but the report of the Department of Agriculture shows that the total wages earned—farm and nonfarm—of the male migratory farmworkers, who did 25 days or more of farm wagework in 1961, was $1,039.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table from the Department of Agriculture publication "The Hired Farm Working Force of 1961," relating to wages of migratory farmworkers.

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

TABLE 34.—*Average days worked and wages earned at farm and nonfarm wage work by persons who did 25 days or more of farm wage work, by migratory status, and sex of worker, selected years, 1949–61*

Year, migratory status, and sex	Farm and nonfarm			Farm			Nonfarm		
	Days worked	Wages earned		Days worked	Wages earned		Days worked	Wages earned	
		Per year	Per day worked [1]		Per year	Per day worked [1]		Per year	Per day worked [1]
	Number	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Number*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Number*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
1949:									
Migratory	119	594	4.95	89	448	5.00	30	146	4.80
Male	135	739	5.50	98	549	5.60	37	190	5.20
Female	82	234	2.85	67	198	2.95	15	36	2.35
Nonmigratory	173	719	4.15	148	574	3.85	25	145	5.85
Male	190	818	4.30	165	655	3.95	25	163	6.65
Female	102	291	2.85	76	224	2.95	26	67	2.55
1952:									
Migratory	124	884	7.15	87	600	6.90	37	284	7.75
Male	144	1,101	7.60	99	731	7.35	45	370	8.15
Female	65	259	4.00	53	222	4.20	12	37	3.10
Nonmigratory	169	911	5.40	140	698	5.00	29	213	7.40
Male	195	1,074	5.50	161	815	5.05	34	259	7.70
Female	68	265	3.90	58	234	4.00	10	31	3.20
1954:									
Migratory	156	1,033	6.60	124	794	6.40	32	239	7.35
Male	166	1,160	6.95	135	899	6.65	31	261	8.30
Female	117	565	4.80	81	410	5.05	36	155	4.25
Nonmigratory	169	972	5.75	145	800	5.50	24	172	7.05
Male	187	1,119	5.95	161	919	5.70	26	200	7.60
Female	91	344	3.75	75	287	3.80	16	57	3.45
1956:									
Migratory	143	1,178	8.25	116	935	8.05	27	243	9.15
Male	157	1,369	8.70	126	1,069	8.50	31	300	9.55
Female	91	500	5.55	81	458	5.70	10	42	4.35
Nonmigratory	162	958	5.90	140	776	5.55	22	182	8.10
Male	189	1,188	6.30	163	958	5.90	26	230	8.95
Female	86	295	3.40	73	254	3.45	13	41	3.25
1957:									
Migratory	131	859	6.55	115	745	6.45	16	114	7.25
Male	148	1,045	7.05	129	900	7.00	19	145	7.55
Female	80	304	3.80	75	280	3.75	5	24	4.45
Nonmigratory	147	898	6.15	127	737	5.80	20	161	8.05
Male	168	1,095	6.50	145	895	6.15	23	200	8.70
Female	78	270	3.50	67	233	3.45	11	37	3.55
1959:									
Migratory	143	911	6.40	119	710	6.00	24	201	8.40
Male	156	1,025	6.60	128	782	6.10	28	243	8.70
Female	88	447	5.05	81	418	5.15	7	29	4.05
Nonmigratory	165	1,063	6.45	142	852	6.00	23	211	9.10
Male	188	1,278	6.80	162	1,019	6.30	26	259	9.95
Female	85	314	3.70	72	271	3.75	13	43	3.25
1960:									
Migratory	157	1,016	6.50	123	819	6.65	34	197	5.90
Male	174	1,170	6.70	138	949	6.85	36	221	6.10
Female	90	444	4.95	66	336	5.05	24	108	4.55
Nonmigratory	170	1,143	6.75	142	889	6.25	28	254	9.20
Male	190	1,339	7.05	160	1,040	6.50	30	299	10.05
Female	96	427	4.45	76	335	4.45	20	92	4.60
1961:									
Migratory	136	902	6.65	109	677	6.25	27	225	8.40
Male	144	1,039	7.20	115	774	6.70	29	265	9.20
Female	101	340	3.40	82	280	3.40	19	60	3.25
Nonmigratory	160	1,083	6.75	139	919	6.60	21	164	7.75
Male	183	1,306	7.15	160	1,112	6.95	23	194	8.60
Female	83	326	3.95	67	265	4.00	16	61	3.85

[1] Rounded to the nearest 5 cents.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this situation would be unthinkable for any other economic group in the Nation. Protests would be heard from coast to coast if auto workers or steel workers or chemical or laundry workers or retail clerks were averaging only $6.70 per day—to say nothing of what would happen if we approved a law authorizing the Department of Labor to enter into an international agreement with a foreign nation to import its nationals to compete with these workers. But the persons involved here are the homeless ones, poorly educated, unorganized, moving from place to place with no leaders from their own ranks able to speak for them.

And now we are asked to extend this program which discriminates against these people, which increases their burdens, which makes their task of living even more difficult, without even making an attempt to go to conference or to hold the Senate amendment which provides for these neglected citizens a minimum of protection.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Minnesota said that people about whom he has been speaking are people who have been drifting from their home base and have no voice in Congress which can be raised for them. I believe he is correct.

Is it not true that the real weakness of these people is the fact that, by and large, they are people who do not live permanently in one State? The chances are they are not registered to vote. Few if any do vote. It is very obvious they are not the kind of people who could bring any direct, political, organized pressure to bear. The result is that they have no political strength and no political muscle. If there is no appeal to the conscience of the Senate in recognition of the needs of these people to have some opportunity to take part in the great economic progress we have enjoyed in America in the past few years, they will be left out because they are people that do not have the kind of pressure and force needed to have their problems brought to the attention of Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the best evidence of that is the manner in which the legislation was treated by Congress this year. The Senate committee bill which provided for a 1-year extension, was reported to the Senate without any hearings. I believe the Senator knows that if there is any support or opposition to a bill that is well organized in the country, the least concession made to that organized group is to hold hearings

and permit people to come in and testify before the respective committees of Congress dealing with the proposal.

The bill was reported to the Senate without any hearings.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Can the Senator from Minnesota imagine what would happen if proposed legislation to authorize the importation of some manufactured goods that would compete with an industry which was well established in this country should come before a committee? Can the Senator imagine a situation in which no hearings would be held to permit a manufacturer to appear before a committee of Congress and protest?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is extremely difficult to imagine circumstances under which no hearings would be permitted to be held. Even the Department of Labor had not been heard on this particular proposed legislation. It appeared as though the advocates wanted to do the deed both quickly and quietly. Fortunately, the Department of Labor was able to express its views through a side window at the hearing held by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

At that hearing it was possible to obtain testimony from the Department of Labor and Under Secretary of Labor John F. Henning testified on the administration position regarding the extension of Public Law 78 on July 30. Excerpts from his testimony are as follows:

With an inexhaustible supply of alien workers at our very borders we find, conversely, that the terms and conditions of employment offered domestic workers not only remain static but in many cases are less favorable than those offered domestic workers in areas where no alien workers are employed. We find, further, the incredible situation where alien workers are offered better terms and conditions of employment than are afforded our own agricultural workers competing for the same jobs.

Essentially, Senator, it is because of this that we submit Public Law 78 is a broad law; it is a wretched law that should be buried. Being an American citizen places one at a serious disadvantage under the option of this law, because the simple fact is that under the present system an employer can refuse to offer domestic workers the same terms and conditions that he is required to offer alien workers. If the domestic worker refuses to accept the job at less favorable terms, the employer is permitted to bring in Mexican workers who are then afforded the very terms and conditions which were denied to our own workers.

This situation exists basically because of the limited authority vested in the Department of Labor under Public Law 78. The legislative history of that law makes it abundantly clear that the Congress did not intend to permit the Secretary of Labor to require, as a condition of obtaining Mexican workers, that all of the same terms and conditions afforded Mexican workers be offered first to domestic workers. It is for this reason that we would oppose any further extension of Public Law 78 without amendments which would bring the required job offers made to Mexicans and to domestic workers to an approximate level. * * *

In a very real sense, the availability of domestic workers depends largely upon the terms and conditions of employment offered. The exemption of agricultural employment from most social legislation such as minimum wage, unemployment insurance, and to a significant extent old-age and survivors' insurance, makes such employment unattractive to our own unemployed domestic workers. Low wages, poor working conditions, inadequate housing facilities in the area of employment, complicate the recruitment picture. With a large reservoir of foreign workers available there is a propensity to depend upon this source of labor supply rather than to extend more attractive offers to domestic unemployed workers. The result—employment of Mexican workers in this country at the expense of unemployment of domestic workers.

We are thus confronted at this time with the simple question of whether we should continue to any extent subsidizing, at the expense of the taxpayers of this Nation, a farmworker program which prolongs and aggravates this unfortunate situation. The resultant unemployment not only saddles the local communities with all the costs attendant upon giving public assistance and other forms of aid to unemployed workers, but it exacts a terrible price in loss of human dignity and human resources—a price that dictates the need for everyone to extend every effort to avoid these consequences.

The amendment recommended by the administration, and transmitted to the President of the Senate on March 26, is designed to narrow the existing differential. Its objective is to make the job offers more attractive without imposing any undue burden on agricultural employers. It would require—this is the administration position on Public Law 78—it would require employers seeking to obtain Mexican workers to offer to domestic workers workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage, housing, and transportation expenses equivalent to that furnished Mexican workers. Mind you, this would not close the gap. The Mexican worker is guaranteed the right to collective bargaining with the growers, a right denied American farmworkers; he is guaranteed employment under the contract period, 75 percent of the contract period is assured him, but the gap would be narrowed here in a significant manner.

None of these provisions would require employers to incur any greater expense in obtaining domestic workers than they are now assuming in obtaining and utilizing Mexican workers. The costs of employing domestic workers under this proposal would be substantially less than the costs of employing Mexican workers.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the first sentence of article 8 of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, reads as follows:

Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under this provision, which provides that neither Mexican nationals nor Americans of Mexican ancestry shall be discriminated against, communities have been forced to admit these groups to community facilities, such as swimming pools, parks, playgrounds, schools and the like.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. There was testimony—or at least statements—to the effect that in order to obtain such workers segregation practices regarding such facilities had been discontinued.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, a public accommodations law prevails for Mexicans and Mexican-Americans; is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would apply to Mexican nationals in this country, but not necessarily to Americans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the point. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, which was adopted by the Senate, it provides that American workers shall not be discriminated against in comparison with Mexican workers on the job; that is, they shall have the same labor rights, including workmen's compensation, housing, transportation, and work period guarantees; is that true?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Those are the limits, really, of what we ask.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we agree to the proviso that Mexicans and Mexican-Americans shall not be discriminated against socially in comparison with Americans of non-Mexican ancestry, why should there be any objection to having Americans treated as well as Mexicans on the job? Should not nondiscrimination be a two-way street? Mexicans should not be discriminated against socially in comparison with Americans, and Americans should not be discriminated against economically in comparison with Mexicans.

Mr. McCARTHY. That seems a most logical case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that not what the Senator from Minnesota really is trying to establish?

Mr. McCARTHY. I really do not ask that American workers be treated as well as Mexican nationals. I ask only that the gap between the kind of treatment given Mexican nationals and the kind of treatment given to Americans be somewhat reduced.

There is an argument in support of the Mexican national program. It has established some standards. The standards for the most part were written in Mexico City, for migrant workers, to be applied only to Mexican nationals. At least the program has established some standards to which we can point, as we try to improve the conditions of American migratory workers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yet we are told that if we provide a greater degree of comparability in working conditions for Americans as compared with Mexicans, the big planters and farmers will reject the bill; is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what is presented as a kind of threat. I do not consider it a threat. It is almost in the nature of a hopeful promise. But that is the situation as we consider the question of whether we ought to go to conference and insist on the terms the Senate adopted several months ago.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has said that Mr. Henning of the Department of Labor testified that the bill was a wretched bill which should be buried unless something like the McCarthy amendment were adopted. In taking that position I presume the Under Secretary was speaking not merely for himself as an individual, but was speaking

first for the Department of Labor; and, second, for the Kennedy administration; is that not correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that is the only conclusion which could be reached.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The position of the Kennedy administration—and President Kennedy was President at that time—was that the bill should not be passed unless American domestic agricultural migrant workers were given exactly the same protection as Mexican workers are given.

Mr. McCARTHY. They did not go so far as to say exactly the same.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At least, to the modest extent which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has urged on the Senate and has succeeded in getting the Senate to adopt.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have a letter from W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, dated November 1, 1963. The letter is in response to an inquiry from me requesting the administration's position on the extension of Public Law 78. He said:

> The administration has continued to maintain the position I indicated before the House Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower of the Committee on Agriculture on March 27. We support a 1-year extension, provided the act is amended to require employers seeking to obtain Mexican workers to demonstrate that they have offered to domestic workers workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage, housing and transportation expenses equivalent to that furnished Mexican workers.
>
> We are opposed to an extension without these amendments.

The position of the administration, as stated on November 1 by the Secretary of Labor, was that without amendment the extension for 1 year was opposed by the administration; that it would rather have the program end.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the administration would oppose the measure as it would be before the Senate if the Ellender motion should prevail?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the only possible interpretation that can be put upon this letter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The administration is against it. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senate bill, in effect, told the growers that the Senate would go along with a 1-year extension, provided the growers were willing to take a limited step toward recruiting domestic workers.

We did not ask the growers to provide American workers with the same benefits they provide Mexican nationals under the International Agreement. Undoubtedly that would have been denounced as revolutionary.

Rather, the benefits required by the Senate bill are very limited in comparison with the benefits guaranteed to Mexican nationals under the International Agreement.

It is interesting to read some of the guarantees which the Mexican Government insists upon before it will let its citizens come to work in our Nation.

The statement of conditions in the International Agreement runs 22 pages, in double columns. I am sure many American migratory workers would like to work under a contract which provided such guarantees.

For example, article 8 of the International Agreement provides:

> Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of article 8 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ARTICLE 8. PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry. Within a reasonable time after the effective date of this agreement and from time to time thereafter, the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations will furnish the Secretary of Labor a listing of the communities in which it considers that discrimination against Mexicans exists. If there is concurrence by the Secretary of Labor that there is such discrimination in any such area, he will not issue, or where appropriate will withdraw, the authorization provided for in article 10.

If the Secretary of Labor does not concur, the appropriate Mexican consul may request a statement signed by the chief executive officer or officers or the chief law enforcement officer of the community in which the Mexican workers are to be employed, pledging for the community that—

(a) No discriminatory acts will be perpetrated against Mexicans in that locality; and

(b) In the event that the Mexican consul reports the existence of acts of discrimination against any Mexican because of ancestry or nationality, the local governmental officers who signed the statement will have such complaints promptly investigated and take such community and individual action as may be necessary to fulfill the community pledge.

The Mexican Government will permit employment in such areas if such pledges are furnished.

If, notwithstanding the foregoing, the Mexican consul reports that discriminatory acts have been committed against Mexicans because of their nationality or ancestry in a locality where Mexican workers are employed, the Mexican consul having jurisdiction in the locality may request the representative of the Secretary of Labor to join the Mexican consul in a joint investigation in which event the procedure prescribed in article 30 of this agreement will be followed.

Explanatory note: The use of the word "authorization" is simply an editorial change to conform the language in this provision with the appropriate terminology contained in articles 1 and 10.

Joint interpretation and amendment of March 1954

The Government of Mexico will not include "counties" under article 8 of the agreement in the list of towns, communities, localities and places where it is considered that discrimination exists against Mexicans on account of their nationality or of their ancestry.

Mr. McCARTHY. We do not include such protection in the Senate bill. As I read the article, it goes beyond the protections provided in the proposed civil rights bill for American citizens. The prohibition is not confined to certain kinds of public accommodations, but refers to communities.

Article 21 of the same agreement gives the Mexican workers the right to elect their own representatives "who shall be recognized by the employer as spokesmen for the Mexican workers."

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the text of article 21.

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

ARTICLE 21. REPRESENTATIVES OF MEXICAN WORKERS

The Mexican workers shall enjoy the right to elect their own representatives who shall be recognized by the employer as spokesmen for the Mexican workers for the purpose of maintaining the work contract between the Mexican workers and the employer: *Provided*, That this article shall not affect the right of the Mexican worker individually to contact his employer, the Mexican consul, or the representative of the Secretary of Labor with respect to his employment under this work contract.

Joint interpretation of August 1954

This article is designed to assure that Mexican workers are permitted to elect, by a majority vote, a representative for the sole purpose of presenting to their employers only those complaints arising out of failure of the employer to comply with the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, or the work contract.

The elected representatives may be an individual or individuals from the workers' own numbers, or from any legitimate and bona fide labor organization and the employer must recognize such representatives as spokesmen for the workers. This interpretation does not in any way deprive the worker of the right to be represented in any case by a Mexican consul.

A worker may personally or through the elected representative present his claim to the employer and the employer is, under article 21, required to deal with either the worker individually or the elected representatives on complaints arising out of the work contract.

If, however, an individual worker desires to have his complaint presented by a personal representative other than the one elected by the majority of the workers pursuant to article 21, the employer is required to recognize such representative only to the extent that such recognition is required by Federal or State law.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are not proposing that American farmworkers be given the right to organize or elect their spokesmen to represent them, although the international agreement gives such rights to Mexicans imported under this Act.

Article 32, in effect, provides a guarantee that the United States will pay Mexican workers their wages and other cash benefits if the employer defaults. An American worker, of course, can go into court and sue if he does not get paid, but this is a costly and time-consuming process. Under this article, the Mexican workers have the strongest guarantee possible for collecting their wages—the pledge of the U.S. Government. I am certain that American migratory workers would be pleased to have the Government guarantee their wages in this fashion—but the Senate amendment does not ask for this protection.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD

article 32 of the international agreement.

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

ARTICLE 32. GUARANTEES BY U.S. GOVERNMENT AND SECONDARY LIABILITY OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS

(a) The Government of the United States guarantees the performance by employers of the provisions of this agreement, including the work contract, relating to the payment of wages, which shall include for the purpose of this article cash wages and all other forms of remuneration to a Mexican worker, and relating to the furnishing of or payment for transportation. The employer agrees that he will reimburse the United States for any amounts paid by the United States in pursuance of such guarantee.

(b) The Government of the United States shall, with respect to any amount found to be due from a defaulting employer, pay to the Mexican Government, as agent of the Mexican worker the amounts determined to be due within 20 days after the final determination has been made as to the employer's indebtedness, or as promptly as possible thereafter. With respect to any contributions found to be due from a defaulting employer pursuant to article 25 of the work contract the Government of the United States shall make payment under its guarantee directly to the Government of Mexico for transmission to the Mexican Social Security Institute.

(c) Where there has been a final determination, finding an association in default of its obligations to a Mexican worker under this agreement, arising out of the association's violations of the terms and provisions of this agreement, in the event of the association's failure to pay any amount found due, the individual members of the association for whom Mexican workers are obtained shall be liable for such amount to the extent of their pro rata share as members of the association. In the event of such final determination, arising out of the association member's violation of the terms and provisions of this agreement, the association member shall be liable for any amounts found due from the association if the association defaults.

(d) The employment of any Mexican workers by a member of an association shall constitute acceptance by such member of the obligations provided under the terms and provisions of this Agreement.

(e) Whenever the Secretary of Labor determines that the individual liability of a member of an association is not necessary to assure performance of the association's obligations to the United States, he may waive such liability.

Explanatory note: The purpose of the amendment contained in paragraph (a) of article 32 is to indicate the extent of the U.S. Government's guarantee to the Mexican worker.

The amendment contained in paragraph (b) of article 32 is designed to clarify the authority of the Government of the United States to pay to the Mexican Institute of Social Security contributions due that agency from a defaulting employer. The amendment contained in paragraph (b) also authorizes the Government of the United States to pay any amount due a worker from a defaulting employer to the Mexican Government on behalf of the Mexican worker. This provision contemplates that payment to the Mexican Government shall constitute payment to the Mexican worker.

The amendment contained in paragraph (c) of article 32 is for the purpose of spelling out the liability of the individual members of an association to the United States in the event of the association's default under its contract.

The amendment contained in paragraph (d) is to provide assurance that the employment by any member of an association of any Mexican workers shall subject that member to all of the obligations and responsibilities provided under the terms and provisions of the agreement and the standard work contract.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, article 35 involves the U.S. Government in using its moral influence with the State and local authorities "to the end that Mexican workers may enjoy impartially and expeditiously the rights which the laws of the United States grant to them."

It further guarantees that no Mexican workers shall be employed if the employment presents a menace to their health or safety.

I ask unanimous consent that pertinent sections of article 35 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ARTICLE 35. PROTECTION OF MEXICAN WORKERS

(a) The Government of the United States of America agrees to exercise special vigilance and its moral influence with State and local authorities, to the end that Mexican workers may enjoy impartially and expeditiously the rights which the laws of the United States grant to them.

(b) No Mexican workers shall be employed or remain employed where their employment by the employer would present a menace to their health or safety.

Mr. McCARTHY. Article 11 guarantees that all employment of Mexican workers shall be governed by terms of the work contract. The work contract runs 13 double column pages and includes numerous items not generally provided by contract for domestic workers—nor are these benefits provided in the Senate amendment.

The work contract includes a provision that "subsistence shall be furnished to the worker at no cost him whenever he is not afforded the opportunity to work 64 hours or more in each 2-week period." This provision is in addition to the work period guarantee.

Also:

When the employer furnishes meals to the Mexican worker, they shall be furnished at cost, but in no event shall the charge to the Mexican worker exceed $1.75 for three meals.

This is a kind of "truth in feeding" amendment, I may say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

If the employer does not provide restaurant facilities, the work contract requires that:

He shall furnish, when requested by Mexican workers, preparing their own meals, necessary cooking utensils and facilities, including fuel ready for use for cooking purposes.

Mr. President, the Senate bill does not include these nor many other benefits listed in the International Agreement and the Standard Work Contract. The bill adds only four of the many items which would have to be included if we legislated that the employer must offer the same benefits to American workers that he offers to Mexican nationals.

And even with these four items the Senate bill does not require identical benefits, but only comparable ones.

The Senate bill provides that if growers want Mexican nationals they must first offer American workers the following:

First. Workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage comparable to that provided Mexican nationals.

This is not an unreasonable requirement. This is not unemployment insurance. It is workmen's compensation in case of injury or illness incurred in line of work.

Second. Housing provisions comparable to those offered Mexican nationals. This proposal is not new. It was discussed by Mr. Goldberg when he was Secretary of Labor. In his statement before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, June 13, 1961, he stated that the Department would not expect growers to furnish housing for an entire family since the present agreement only requires housing for single Mexican nationals. He stated:

For example, take the housing situation. The Mexican laborer coming to the United States comes up himself; he doesn't bring his family. We wouldn't want this to happen to us; we want a man to live with his family as much as possible, and not leave his family stranded somewhere, usually on relief. The impulse to move his family is an impulse to support his family with dignity. So it would be unfair to the growers to insist that they provide housing for a family when they only provide housing for a single worker under the system which operates under the Mexican labor program.

But we can do this. We have reliable statistics which demonstrate what the cost of providing that single housing is and we can give the domestic worker the financial equivalent of that cost so he can apply it toward the housing of his family.

Third. Transportation comparable to that offered Mexican nationals. This also is a reasonable request, and Secretary Goldberg had suggested this back in 1961. Mexican nationals have their transportation costs paid by the grower. He testified how the Department would handle this matter if domestic workers were guaranteed a comparable benefit. He stated:

Take the transportation allowance. Today in most instances, as I pointed out, the domestic worker must pay for his own transportation.

Now we could allow the domestic worker the same transportation allowance which now is being paid by employers to bring in Mexican labor.

Now I read the record—you can take some horrible examples—and I found the statement made, "Well, this means that the Secretary will require that a grower who will want labor will recruit it in North Carolina and have to pay the expenses of bringing labor from North Carolina up to the State of Washington."

This is the case, the horrible example.

Well, in the first place, that is an extremely unlikely occurrence, as you, Senator, can testify better than anybody, your workers are not going to uproot themselves from your fine State and go wandering all the way across the face of the Nation.

However, it is very interesting that when our farmers, when some of these growers

wanted Mexican labor, they sent them across the face of the Nation and paid for them.

Our figures show that transportation allowances were paid for Mexican labor at that and even greater distances.

But if we get this amendment, as I hope we will, I can say to you quite categorically that we are going to administer it in the spirit of reasonableness, that we are going to issue regulations—and this is a firm commitment in this record—that will assimilate the cost on a sensible basis comparable to what is being paid by employers for Mexican labor. And here, too, that is a statistical matter, and we can easily work out how this is to be done.

Now, I have also seen the objection raised that there are safeguards in the Mexican labor program to see to it that if a worker does not fulfill his commitment, the transportation allowance is refunded to the employer. There is no reason why we cannot work out arrangements which we have worked out by voluntary agreement in our annual workers plan whereby our employment services—our Federal Employment Service, together with our State employment services—now recruit people and send them considerable distances. And we work out arrangements, under those plans, to protect the employer by reserving the transportation allowance and providing if there is a breach that it is deductible from the amount of compensation which is available to the worker. And this is not hard to do. And I would be perfectly willing to work out our regulations so that we can take care of this particular problem.

Fourth. Work period guarantees. The international agreement provides that the employer shall guarantee Mexican nationals the opportunity to work for at least three-fourths of the workdays of the period during which the work contract is in effect. If it is reasonable that Mexican nationals have a work period guarantee, a comparable benefit should be offered to domestic workers who also have to travel. One reason, of course, for labor shortages in local areas is that domestic workers from the surrounding territory cannot afford to come as easily as Mexican nationals since they have neither transportation benefits nor a minimum work period guarantee.

I submit that on all counts the arguments are against the extension of the program unless this very limited and modest amendment, which was adopted by the Senate after prolonged debate, and after three or four very serious test votes, is adopted. The least we can ask is that the decision made by the Senate be taken to conference with representatives of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota. I take it that what he is saying is that he hopes there will be an emphatic "nay" vote on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. McCARTHY. I urge, on the merits of the case we have made, and also in protecting what I consider to be the integrity of an action taken by the Senate, that the motion before the Senate be rejected.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has been said that the poor are always with us; I am beginning to think that the braceros will always be with us. In this session, 200,000 foreign workers who are used primarily by three States have taken up a great deal of the time and energy of the Congress. The House of Representatives has voted twice on a bracero bill. The measure is now before the Senate for a second time. It is unfortunate that the eloquence and energy that have been devoted to extending a temporary program still have not been turned toward legislation to help the more than 2 million American men, women, and children who follow the crops.

It is even more ironic that the Congress seems to have shown more concern for the well-being of foreign workers than it has for American citizens. The bill before us now is a simple 1-year extension of the Mexican farm labor program. It does not contain the Senate amendment which would insure that the job offer to American workers contains the same benefits offered to the Mexican. If the Senate does not insist on its amendment, the Mexican worker will continue to receive workmen's compensation protection, free transportation to and from his job, adequate housing, and a guaranteed amount of work. The American citizen is still not assured these benefits and protections.

The claim has often been made that braceros cannot displace American workers because a farmer must first prove that he has been unable to find Americans to do the work. But the grower must only offer to Americans the same wage as he does to the bracero. The American worker must get himself to the job, scramble for decent housing when he gets there, and still not have any assurance that the job will last long enough to make his effort worth it. The interests of the bracero are looked after and carefully protected by the Governments of the United States and Mexico. The American migrant is completely on his own.

It is obvious that the bracero has a considerable advantage over the American worker. The American may receive a similar wage offer, but he has none of the protections and benefits offered to the Mexican. In August, the Senate acted to rectify this unfair situation. Under the terms of the amendment, the grower would be required to offer the same housing, workmen's compensation protection, and transportation, and guaranteed work period now given to the Mexican. This amendment incorporated the recommendations of the Secretary of Labor. In fact, administration support for still another extension of this "temporary" program was conditioned on the inclusion of these provisions.

This amendment will impose no burden on the farmer. For 12 years he has been willing and able to provide these benefits for the bracero; surely he can and must do the same for his fellow citizens.

I know that many of my colleagues feel that the bracero program should come to an end. Its longrun effect has been to deprive tragically underemployed Americans of the work they know best. It has held down agricultural wages. It has prevented the construction of decent family housing for American workers. It has made several of our largest agricultural States unnecessarily dependent on a foreign labor supply.

Recognizing that an abrupt cutoff might impose hardships on those growers whose production had become completely tied to a foreign labor source, the Senate agreed to the 1-year extension asked by the Secretary of Labor. But—and this is a very important but—the Senate only agreed to an extension which included the amendment so eloquently urged by Secretary Wirtz. The Secretary stated on behalf of the administration that, "We are opposed to an extension without these amendments."

If we must continue this program for another year, let us at least correct one longstanding injustice. Fairness to our own citizens demands that the Senate insist on the administration amendment which it has already approved. I and many of my colleagues voted to extend the bracero program only because it contained this fairness amendment. Without it, the program remains a continuing injustice, and I cannot support it. I hope my colleagues who favor this program will keep in mind that the House bill is not acceptable to the administration. If the Senate accepts the House version, I hope the President will veto the bill.

The hardships the bracero program has imposed on the American farmworker have continued too long. As this imported labor program comes to an end, growers should recognize that only better treatment of American workers will bring them the stable and reliable labor force they need. Practical economics, as well as humanitarian concern, compel the American farmer to do for his fellow citizens what he has been willing to do for the foreign worker. Legislation has been introduced which will lift the American migrant from second-class citizenship to full participation in the American way of life. Let the farmer support that legislation, and he will find that he has all the workers he needs. But he cannot any longer avoid providing decent working conditions and decent wages for American workers by relying on a foreign labor source.

BRACERO PROGRAM TERMED NECESSITY FOR WYOMING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in this modern age it is difficult to remember that there are still many jobs that must be performed by hand and, unfortunately, our American civilization has progressed to a point where many Americans, without employment, find some occupations so uncomfortable that they will not perform them.

This is the case in the cultivation of sugarbeets, a major industry in the State of Wyoming. Although much of this agricultural operation has become mechanized in recent years, there are still jobs which cannot be done by machine—thinning and hoeing for example—without serious loss of productivity.

In the Wyoming beetfields these jobs are now done by imported farmworkers from Mexico—braceros. Many people have complained that by importing these workers we are denying jobs to local

workers in a time when unemployment has become all but chronic in many areas of the Nation. The truth is that there have been many attempts to use local people for these jobs and invariably those recruited for such labor do not stick to the job and cause considerable hardship to the farmers who must find last minute replacements for them. The braceros have proved that they can and will do this type of work and I support the extension of the legislation to permit their entry into the United States for that purpose, as I have on every occasion since coming to the Senate.

The State of Wyoming has 23 counties, 8 of which are major sugarbeet producers. Sugarbeet processing factories are located in the towns of Torrington, Worland, and Lovell. The production of sugarbeets and, therefore, a large part of our agricultural economy is based upon the continued supply of economical labor for this difficult field work.

It is very possible that within a few years new chemical and mechanical processes will make even this type of manual labor unnecessary. Until that time, the use of braceros is a necessity for Wyoming's sugarbeet industry.

Mr. DOMINICK. 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. DOMINICK. I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

FRAUDULENT WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS OF SOYBEAN AND OTHER VEGETABLE OILS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, within the past couple of weeks considerable publicity has been given to the mysterious manner in which a multimillion-dollar swindle in fraudulent warehouse receipts of soybean and other vegetable oils has been perpetrated by the Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp., of Bayonne, N.J., one of the Nation's biggest suppliers of oil for export.

The Wall Street Journal of November 22, 1963, carried an article on this transaction entitled "About $15 Million of Soybean Oil Gone, Dealer Says—Forged Orders Are Claimed." In this same paper there was notice of two brokerage firms being suspended as the result of the loss they were expected to sustain as holders of some of these faked warehouse receipts. I understand that these brokerage houses have since been reinstated or taken over.

Yesterday, December 2, 1963, the Wall Street Journal carried another long article on this same subject; this time the article was entitled "Outdoing Billie Sol—How Phantom Salad Oil Was Used To Engineer $100 Million Swindle—Commodity Dealers, Storage Firms, Banks Duped at Big Tank Farm in New Jersey."

Since this story first broke I have received numerous calls concerning the possible connection this company may have had with the soybean oil deal which I denounced in the Senate under date of August 15, 1963. On that date I called attention to the fact that in 1961 the Department of Agriculture had sustained a sizable loss under contracts for the procurement of 500 million pounds of refined salad oil and shortening—principally soybean oil. This oil had been bought by the Government on the excuse that they were supporting the price of soybeans. In reality on the date of the purchase the market for soybeans was considerably in excess of the support price.

It was later found that in accepting delivery of this oil practically all of it had been of an inferior quality or was packed in leaking containers, with the result that it was rejected in the numerous countries throughout the world as unfit for human consumption.

My remarks concerning that scandalous situation may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15.

Following the recent disclosure of a multi-million-dollar swindle in forged warehouse receipts for vegetable oils, I began getting inquiries as to whether or not the same company, the Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Co., was involved in both swindles.

The answer is yes, Allied Crude & Vegetable Oil Refining Co. was involved in both transactions. I have conferred with the Comptroller General, and in the light of the recent developments he has approved the release of the complete report in connection with this first case, dated December 27, 1962, No. B-149686. This complete report is now available at the Comptroller General's Office to anyone interested in obtaining a copy.

In addition to this report of December 1962, a supplemental letter was received from the Comptroller General's Office under date of February 26, 1963. This second letter outlines in greater detail certain aspects of the case.

The Comptroller General, after conferring with the Department of Justice, has agreed to release the full report of December 27, 1962, and to the release of the supplemental information as contained in his letter of February 26, 1963, minus two sections concerning pending or contemplated litigation.

Accordingly, I am at this point asking that there be incorporated in the RECORD first, the Comptroller General's letter of December 2, 1963, authorizing the release of this material. Second, I ask that there be printed that portion of the Comptroller General's letter of February 26, 1963, the release of which they have approved. The Comptroller General's report itself is too voluminous to have incorporated in the RECORD; however, as stated earlier, it is available at his Office upon request.

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

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, December 2, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Reference is made to our conversation with you concerning the release to the press of our report of December 27, 1962, and supplemental letter report of February 26, 1963, regarding certain aspects of the procurement of salad oil and shortening by the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture.

We have reviewed the contents of those reports both in this office and with Department of Justice representatives. We have found no objection to the release of the report of December 27, 1962, and will do so in accordance with your request.

As indicated to you in our telephone conversation of November 27, there are certain portions of the letter of February 26, 1963, the release of which might adversely affect the interests of the United States in pending or contemplated litigation. We are enclosing a copy of that letter, with suggested deletions on pages 6 and 8 thereof, as discussed with you, in view of our understanding that you may wish to insert an appropriate part of the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Enclosure.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 26, 1963.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Further reference is made to your letter dated December 31, 1962, requesting additional information on certain aspects of the procurement of salad oil and shortening by the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, which was the subject of our report to you dated December 27, 1962 (B-149686).

We have obtained from files made available to us by the Department of Agriculture and the Maritime Administration the following information pertaining to the matters and the companies mentioned in your request. Your attention is invited to the fact that we have not independently checked the accuracy of this information.

SHORTENING CORP. OF AMERICA, INC.

Corporate information

Address: 542 Henderson Street, Jersey City, N.J.

Officers: President-treasurer, Anthony De Angelis; vice president-secretary, Alfredo Suarez; directors, Anthony De Angelis, Alfredo Suarez, Maurice Samel, Vito Scaminaci.

Principal stockholders

Details regarding stockownership in the Shortening Corp. of America, Inc. (Shortening Corp.) were not available in files of the Department of Agriculture. Also, our inquiries of other sources did not disclose the ownership of the stock.

Summary of the violation for which Shortening Corp. was suspended from participating in programs financed by Commodity Credit Corporation

The Shortening Corp. was included in a group of firms suspended on July 14, 1961, from participating in programs financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation because the group may have been involved, or affiliated with parties involved, in the submission of allegedly false shipping documents in connection with a shipment to Spain of soybean oil financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701), commonly referred to as Public Law 480. This transaction, which involved an outlay of about $1.2 million by the U.S. Government, was not eligible for such financing. Under title I of Public Law 480 the Commodity Credit Corporation generally provides dollars, through reimbursement to domestic banking institutions, to finance the sale and exportation of surplus agricultural commod-

ities to certain nations in exchange for foreign currencies.

While Shortening Corp. did not appear to be directly involved in the transaction, it was included with those suspended because information available to the Department of Agriculture indicated that the corporation's President, Anthony De Angelis, controlled a firm—Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp. (Allied)—that did appear to be directly involved in the matter. The suspension was terminated on July 24, 1961, after a settlement amounting to about $1.5 million had been agreed upon by the parties to the suspension.

A summary of the facts in the case, as disclosed by information in the files of the Department of Agriculture, follows.

On January 27, 1958, the Governments of the United States and Spain entered into an agreement whereby the United States agreed to finance, pursuant to authority contained in title I, Public Law 480, certain surplus agricultural commodities to be purchased in the United States by Spain. Pursuant to this agreement, the Department of Agriculture issued a purchase authorization on February 11, 1958, for Spain to buy soybean and cottonseed oil, valued at up to $41,800,000, with financing to be provided by the Commodity Credit Corporation under terms of Department of Agriculture regulations governing title I transactions. Subsequently, on April 18, 1958, a U.S. exporter entered into a contract to sell to the Government of Spain 7,900 metric tons of soybean oil. On the basis of shipping documents indicating that 3,506 metric tons of soybean oil had been shipped to Spain in April 1958, the Commodity Credit Corporation paid the exporter, through a commercial bank, the sum of $1,186,642.

Information in the files of the Department of Agriculture indicated that an official of the Foreign Agricultural Service was informed that part of the soybean oil sold to Spain by the exporter had been shipped prior to April 18, 1958, the date of the sales contract in question. If such was the case, the shipment would not be eligible for financing, since the Department's title I regulations provided that, except for cotton, commodities shipped from the United States prior to the date of sale under the title I program would not be financed under the program. Therefore, the Department instituted an investigation of the matter. Reports on the investigation were issued on August 1, 1958, and November 14, 1958, by the former Commodity Stabilization Service—now designated as Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—Department of Agriculture.

According to the investigation reports, evidence was developed indicating that the shipping documents showing that the 3,506 metric tons of soybean oil had been exported in April 1958 were false and that the oil had, in fact, been shipped to Spain on March 4, 1958, prior to the date of the sales contract. The reports contained evidence that the exporter had obtained the soybean oil from Allied and that Allied had obtained for the exporter the necessary shipping documents required by the Commodity Credit Corporation before it would finance the sale. Also, the investigation reports indicated that an ocean carrier may have been involved with Allied in submitting the allegedly false shipping documents.

On August 4, 1958, the Department of Agriculture forwarded to the Attorney General copies of various documents, including its investigation report dated August 1, 1958, for appropriate criminal and civil frauds action and for other action to protect the interests of the Government. The investigation report dated November 14, 1958, was forwarded to the Attorney General on January 14, 1959.

In March 1960, the Department of Justice filed a civil suit against the exporter and the commercial bank that paid the exporter on behalf of the Commodity Credit Corporation and that subsequently was reimbursed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Department of Justice sought a judgment in the sum of $1,186,642 together with interest and costs. Subsequently, civil frauds action was filed against Anthony De Angelis, Allied, the ocean carrier, and one other individual, seeking recovery of double damages and forfeitures allowable by law under the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. 231).

According to information contained in the Department of Agriculture files, the soybean oil that had been shipped to Spain in March 1958 was subsequently disposed of by sale to the Government of Spain in June 1960 for dollars in the amount of $1,040,680. A memorandum dated July 5, 1961, from a vice president of the Commodity Credit Corporation stated that the sale was consummated by and with the agreement of the U.S. Government, the exporter, the ocean carrier, and Allied. Information in the Department's files indicated that the Commodity Credit Corporation was reimbursed $20,251 out of the sales proceeds for certain expenses incurred in the sale and that the balance of the proceeds ($1,020,429) was deposited with the U.S. Government to be held until the lawsuits were disposed of.

At the suggestion of the Department of Justice, the Commodity Credit Corporation on July 14, 1961, suspended Anthony De Angelis, Allied, the ocean carrier, and affiliated firms from participating in any programs financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Department of Justice suggested this action so that the Commodity Credit Corporation would not be in a position of jeopardizing the outcome of the pending court action by continuing to do business with the parties charged with alleged violations of the False Claims Act.

On July 24, 1961, the Attorney General accepted a compromise offer made by Allied and the ocean carrier in settlement of all claims against any and all defendants in the civil actions, and on that date, in accordance with the terms of the offer, the Commodity Credit Corporation terminated the suspension against the affected parties and affiliated firms.

Records of the Department of Agriculture show that under the terms of the settlement the Commodity Credit Corporation retained the $1,020,429 received previously by the United States from the sale of the oil, plus an additional $466,000 which was to be paid by Allied and the ocean carrier as follows: $150,000 upon acceptance of the offer by the United States and the balance of $316,000 in 12 equal monthly installments bearing interest at the rate of 4 percent a year. Agency records show that these amounts were paid in accordance with the terms of the settlement.

Also, the defendant's offer of settlement, as accepted by the Government, provided that the offer was not to be deemed an admission of liability but that it was made solely by way of compromise and settlement of the pending civil frauds actions. In this connection, the Department of Agriculture files indicate that the exporter was not aware that the oil had been shipped to Spain prior to the date of the sales contract.

Other violations with which Shortening Corp. has been charged

Our review of the files at the Department of Agriculture did not disclose other violations with which the Shortening Corp. has been charged. However, the files show that the president of Shortening Corp., Anthony De Angelis, was reported as being the controlling official in two other firms (Adolf Gobel, Inc., and Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp.) which were the subjects of investigations by agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

1. Adolf Gobel, Inc. (Gobel), was the subject of an investigation report dated December 3, 1952, concerning possible false claims on deliveries to the Department of Agriculture of smoked pork products purchased for distribution under the Department's school lunch program.

According to the files, this matter was disposed of when the Department of Agriculture, with the approval of the Department of Justice, accepted an offer of settlement submitted on February 6, 1953, by Anthony De Angelis, as president of Gobel, whereby Gobel would pay $100,000 to the Government. The $100,000 represented an estimated $50,000 in actual damages suffered by the Department of Agriculture and $50,000 in forfeitures under the False Claims Act. Agency records show that the $100,000 was paid.

Gobel's offer of settlement contained the following statement:

"This offer does not constitute an admission that any act or omission on our part was of such character as to subject us to any liability under the contracts or the statutes referred to."

In addition, by letter dated May 21, 1953, the Department of Agriculture notified Gobel that the firm had been debarred from participation in any contracts of the Department for a period of 5 years because of the contractual irregularities in this case.

[Deletion.]

SCARBURGH CO., INC.

Corporate information

Address: 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Officers: President, Jakob Isbrandtsen; vice president, Alexander S. Abdirkin; treasurer, David H. Whamond; secretary, Roy F. Pierce; assistant secretary, Henry A. Scherrer; directors, Jakob Isbrandtsen, M. S. Crinkley, A. E. Rising, Jr., W. M. Isbrandtsen, and Roy F. Pierce.

Principal stockholders

Scarburgh Co., Inc. (Scarburgh), is a wholly owned subsidiary of Isbrandtsen Co., Inc. According to records of the Maritime Administration, Jakob Isbrandtsen is the sole trustee of two trusts that own about 65 percent of the voting and about 56 percent of the nonvoting common stock of Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., and is cotrustee with Albert E. Rising, Jr., of a third trust which owns about 33 percent of the voting and about 28 percent of the nonvoting common stock. Jakob Isbrandtsen owns about 2 percent of the voting and about 14 percent of the nonvoting common stock. The preferred stock is owned primarily by the three trusts and by several related companies.

Summary of the violation for which Scarburgh was suspended from participating in programs financed by Commodity Credit Corporation

As previously noted a group of firms was suspended by Commodity Credit Corporation on July 14, 1961, from participating in programs financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation because of possible involvement in the submission of allegedly false shipping documents that caused the Government to finance an ineligible sale under title I, Public Law 480. Scarburgh was included in the group of suspended firms because it was a wholly owned subsidiary of the ocean carrier that appeared to be involved in the transaction. The records and investigation reports of the Department of Agriculture disclosed no evidence that Scarburgh was directly implicated in the case.

Scarburgh's suspension was terminated on July 24, 1961, after a settlement had been agreed upon by the parties to the suspension.

Our review of the files of the Department of Agriculture did not disclose any other

violations with which Scarburgh had been charged.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest that both the SEC and the appropriate committee of the Congress examine this case, first to see what has happened and then, how and why it happened and make recommendations as to what steps can be taken legislatively or otherwise to provide protection for legitimate investors and to prevent its reoccurrence.

LEGISLATIVE DELAYS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in times of tragedy and crisis our national institutions are tested. The American people, and indeed the people of the whole world, now are following governmental affairs with intense interest. Must the loss of a great President plunge us into a period of weakness and futility, or will we rise with renewed determination to carry on the task of perfecting democracy?

President Johnson has already shown the courage and competence the Members of this body knew he possessed. The world now sees that our executive branch is in good hands. But what of the Congress?

The founders of our Nation believed in a government of law, and a government of law requires lawmaking. Yet the lawmaking function of the U.S. Government has now run into grave difficulties which only the lawmakers themselves can remedy. We cannot expect outside help. We cannot gloss over our difficulties with apologies or with unrealistic reviews of our alleged accomplishments. The facts against the record of this Congress are, at this point, beyond refutation. Here we are, on December 3, with major appropriations for a fiscal year that is nearly half gone still not yet enacted.

Can the Congress still submit to tactics of delay and to petty haggling while the public looks on with growing scorn and dismay? A threat to the Nation remains as long as business as usual and creeping paralysis prevail on the Hill.

In the wake of tragedy the Nation's press and millions of private citziens have begun to analyze more carefully the prevailing attitudes toward Government. Violence, hatred, and bigotry have been decried in volume. We have had a new diagnosis of the disease of political extremism, of unreasoning violence growing out of abject disgust for established law and order.

Identifying the disease is not enough, however. We all know that good health is the first step in preventing disease. The health of the legislative branch is in our hands, and at this moment we are letting it decay through our neglect.

The people of this Nation cannot understand why a few Members of the Senate should be able to block the whole Senate from considering and voting on measures of immense public interest. While they appreciate the great checks and balances written into our Constitution, they do not see the necessity for so many additional checks and balances in the internal operation of the Congress that the only product is inaction.

This is not a time for explanations or elaborate defenses of the status quo. It is a time for decision. One of the first orders of business should be action on proposals designed to improve legislative procedures. Our Rules Committee has already considered three of these and has reported them to the Senate. They have been on our calendar since September. Many Senators favor them.

Two of these measures are simple resolutions. They were the outgrowth of a bipartisan study early this year by the ad hoc committees named by the majority and minority leaders to recommend means of expediting the Senate's business.

Senate Resolution 89, relating to germaneness of debate in the Senate. This resolution provides that at the conclusion of the morning hour, or after the unfinished business or pending business has been laid before the Senate and for the 3 succeeding hours, all debate, motions, and appeals must be germane. It provides for exceptions on the basis of unanimous consent or on motions without debate. The senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] introduced Senate Resolution 89 for himself and 30 other Senators.

Senate Resolution 111, relating to meetings of committees while the Senate is in session. This resolution provides that no standing committee shall sit without special leave while the Senate is in session after the conclusion of the morning hour, or after the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business, whichever is earlier. As the Rules Committee points out in its report, adoption of this resolution would enable committees to continue in session while the routine and relatively unimportant business of the morning hour proceeds on the floor. Surely now is the time, Senators, to declare that no longer shall one Member, by refusing unanimous consent, delay the work which many other Senators seek to do. The senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] introduced Senate Resolution 111 for himself and others.

The Rules Committee also gave careful consideration to the third proposal still pending, Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, which the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] introduced. The committee redrafted this resolution after hearings. As now presented to the Senate, it would establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker. The committee would be equally divided between the majority and the minority parties.

The Rules Committee restricted to structural matters the area of study by the proposed joint committee, avoiding ideological pitfalls such as rule 22. It rightfully took the position that Members of Congress are fully informed concerning the pros and cons of the present rules of floor procedure. Furthermore, the Constitution provides that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings."

Comprehensive reports are available on all three of these measures, and, therefore, I will not recite the detailed provisions of them. They are not complicated. They do not commit us to any great or sudden changes.

This is not a time for timidity. It is not a time for business as usual. This is no time for politics as usual. It is a time to keep uppermost in our minds the objective of restoring confidence in government among those Americans who, however misled or misinformed they may be, have found reason to view the established order with distrust, scorn, or hatred.

Mr. President, the brutal truth of recent events demands action. It is time for the Congress to take stock, to shape up. To do otherwise would be to risk the fate of other democracies, no less noble political institutions of the past, that through neglect and decadence became mere debating societies—their former power absorbed by all-powerful executives.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I understand an informal agreement has been reached to have the yea-and-nay vote on the pending Ellender motion on the bracero bill held at 1 o'clock tomorrow, I feel I am not interfering with the business of the Senate by asking unanimous consent that two editorials published this morning in the New York Times and Washington Post, respectively, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

These editorials make the point that the civil rights bill has been before Congress for almost 6 months, and that there seems to be very little prospect that it will be voted on by the other body this year.

Both of these two eminent and influential newspapers urge that Congress take action and at least bring the civil rights measure before the Senate before adjournment for the Christmas holidays.

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

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1963]

TOO MUCH DELAY ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The declaration by Representative ALBERT, the House majority leader, that he sees no possibility of a House vote on civil rights in this session is deeply disquieting to all who hoped President Johnson's strong plea for quick action would break the long stalemate in Congress. Once again the deep-freeze tactics of Chairman SMITH of the Rules Committee are preventing the House from expressing its will on a measure which the Nation needs and which, there is good reason to believe, a majority in both parties favor.

The result of this footdragging is bound to be an intensification of the resentment that has prompted Roy Wilkins of the NAACP to warn that his organization will set up a purge list of Congressmen hostile to civil rights legislation. Mr. Wilkins, whose sound judgment has been exhibited repeatedly over

the years, must be aware that purge lists are a double-edged sword—aggravating divisions in the community and often backfiring against the causes they are supposed to serve.

Organized labor learned this lesson in the immediate postwar years, and has been careful to avoid any suggestion of a national purge list ever since. Civil rights groups will continue to make their greatest progress—as has been suggested by Bayard Rustin, principal organizer of last summer's March on Washington—by broadening their ties with all the other community forces that share their determination to make equal opportunity a reality for all Americans.

The place where this progress is most emphatically needed today is in the House. The defeatism of the majority leader ought not to become the death knell for the sense of urgency President Johnson tried so hard to impart. "We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights," he declared. "We have talked for a hundred years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter, and to write it in the books of law."

Representative BOLLING of Missouri has announced that he will circulate a petition to bypass the Rules Committee and thus break the logjam. He will have to buck the traditional reluctance of the House to force discharge of a bill before Chairman SMITH has signified his imperial pleasure to have it go forward (except where handouts to veterans are concerned). He is also up against the apparent resolve of Congress to adjourn for the Christmas-New Year holiday on December 20.

With all these handicaps to overcome, his effort will require a supreme demonstration of support from the leaders of both parties and from the country if it is to produce a vote this session.

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

TOUCHSTONE

It is time for a showdown on civil rights. The issue has plagued and divided the country far too long. Congress simply cannot, in good faith to the American people, go home for the holidays without at least bringing the civil rights bill to a vote in the House.

There are two devices by which the bill can be brought to a vote. One is for the House Rules Committee to send the bill to the House floor without delay. It should do so at once. The House Judiciary Committee has held full and fair hearings on the bill and has reported a sound and effective measure. Additional hearings in the Rules Committee can have no other purpose than obstruction. The Rules Committee's function is simply to fix the conditions for debate on the House floor. It can fulfill this function before the House meets tomorrow if Chairman HOWARD SMITH will stand aside, or if a majority of his committee will take the measure away from his obstructive control.

The other device is a discharge petition. Representative RICHARD BOLLING, a member of the Rules Committee, has already set this procedure in motion. It can be successful only if the petition obtains 218 signatures, a majority of the House membership; and it cannot bring the bill to the floor for debate until December 23, 2 days before Christmas.

It would be harsh to make the Members of Congress stay in Washington through Christmas. But it is worth remembering that other Americans, in the service of their country, will be spending Christmas in South Vietnam, in Korea, and in other distant outposts. And if Congressmen, forced to stay here for the holidays, want to know who killed Santa Claus for them, they can look to the man who compelled recourse to the discharge petition: HOWARD SMITH.

If the discharge petition is necessary, let the signers make themselves known. For this will, in itself, be the touchstone, the decisive vote, on civil rights. Those who sign the petition will be recorded and known as supporting civil rights; those who fail to sign will be identified as opposed.

President Johnson and his legislative spokesmen can do no less than compel Congress to remain in session until the House acts. Postponement will be a betrayal of the hopes and faith of millions in the orderly processes of representative government. No Member of the House can, in good conscience, go home to observe the birthday of the Prince of Peace without casting a vote in favor of the brotherhood of man.

INJUSTICES IN EXISTING TAX LAWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an able article entitled "Machines Are More Important Than People (Yes or No?)," written by Philip M. Stern, and published in the New York Times magazine of December 1, 1963. Mr. Stern is writing a series of articles which make a strong case for tax reform and which point out with great cogency and exactitude the many injustices and paradoxes contained within existing tax laws.

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

MACHINES ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN PEOPLE (YES OR NO?)

(By Philip M. Stern)

The following is an attitude test. Do you agree or disagree with these statements?

1. Repairing a dented fender is more important than fixing a broken arm. (Yes; no.)

2. People should not try to educate themselves for a better job, but should be content with their present job. (Yes; no.)

3. The boy working his way through college is less deserving than the football star on an athletic scholarship. (Yes; no.)

4. People should be penalized for continuing to work beyond age 65. (Yes; no.)

5. People should be encouraged to go into debt rather than to live within their means. (Yes; no.)

6. Places of learning are less important than places of worship. (Yes; no.)

7. Machines are more important than people. (Yes; no.)

8. The inventor of, say, a new pretzel bender is more important than the writer of a new book, play, poem, song, or symphony. (Yes; no.)

9. A blind person deserves financial help, but a paralytic does not. (Yes; no.)

10. People who work for a living are less deserving than those who don't. (Yes; no.)

11. The work of money is entitled to a greater reward than the work of people. (Yes; no.)

If you disagree with eight or more of the above statements, it is not time to see your doctor—but it may well be time to see your Congressman or Senator and ask him a few questions about our tax laws.

Why? Because every one of the above statements is contained in those laws. Of course, you won't find them stated in just the way they are in the attitude test; nor, in most cases, did the writers of the tax laws intend to make such value judgments when they framed the tax code. The fact is, though, that no tax law can be free of such judgments, and when, some weeks hence, the members of the Senate Finance Committee begin writing amendments to the pending tax bill and to the tax code itself, they will doubtless insinuate some new moral precepts into the statute, just as their predecessors did before them.

As the attitude test shows, many of the value judgments in the tax laws do not coincide with what a preponderance of Americans believe.

Most people are probably unaware they exist. Even now, for example, you may be highly dubious that the tax laws really do draw the conclusions on which the attitude test was based. Where, for example, does it say that repairing a fender is more important than fixing a broken arm? Well, section 165(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code provides that all so-called casualty losses—even the most minor ones, such as dented fenders—are tax deductible, whereas section 213(a)(1)(B) states that, for those under 65, medical expenses that come to less than 3 percent of income are not deductible. (The House version of the pending tax bill allows casualty deductions only for items in excess of the first $100; but these days, even a fender may well cost more than $100 to fix.)

Americans schooled to revere the virtues extolled by Horatio Alger will surely be shocked to learn that the tax laws discourage initiative, self-advancement and the quest for knowledge. Yet consider the case of Nora Payne Hill, a Danville, Va., schoolteacher very much in the Horatio Alger tradition. Although Miss Hill could have fulfilled her State teaching requirements right in Danville, she chose to journey to New York to attend Columbia University summer school, in the belief that "she could do a better job in Danville by so doing."

The Tax Court sternly disallowed the deduction of her $239.50 of summer school expenses, applying the accepted rule of law that educational expenses incurred in the pursuit of a higher position are not deductible. The expenses of standing still, yes—those are deductible—but not those devoted to moving ahead in life. "However commendable (Miss Hill's) conduct may have been," the Tax Court found, her journey to the fount of knowledge was not necessary to maintain her present position. Besides, the court observed, "she said she loved to go to summer school."

Happily, a higher court reversed the Tax Court as "unreal and hypercritical" and allowed Miss Hill her $239.50 deduction—but only because it exonerated her of the sin of trying to elevate herself to a higher station. Had the appeals court suspected her of such a sinister motive, it would have upheld the Tax Court, for the rule against self-advancement must be maintained. (The rule is defended on practical grounds: Unless some line is drawn to define what educational costs are "ordinary and necessary" business expenses, it is argued, all educational outlays would have to become tax deductible, and the drain on the treasury would be formidable.) A group of research chemists, similarly, was not allowed to deduct the costs of attending law school in order to become patent chemists; and a psychiatrist was denied a deduction for the expenses of his own psychoanalysis—a prerequisite to his advancement to the status of a qualified analyst.

Now that being born in a log cabin has gone out of style, a modern equivalent for the aspiring politician is the claim of having worked his way through college—preferably by waiting on tables. While such industriousness thus appears to enjoy great public approbation, the law takes a more critical view. It taxes the hard-earned income of the college waiter, but leaves untouched the athletic "scholarship" which enthusiastic alumni bestow upon the football hero (and which the law treats as a gift).

In order to ease what are commonly called the "twilight years," Congress has compassionately conferred on those over 65 a tax credit on the first $1,200 of their income from pensions, dividends or other investment income. But the elderly are encouraged to suppress any desire to supplement that income and to keep busy, for the moment they earn more than $1,200 a year, the tax credit begins to fade away. When their earnings reach $2,400 it vanishes entirely.

Their unearned income, however, can rise to any height without penalty. So long as all remunerative work is meticulously avoided, the tax credit retains its full glory. Once they have safely reached the age of 72, though, they may once again join the ranks of the gainfully employed without adverse tax consequences.

"Poor Richard's Almanack" and similar fountainheads of wisdom are replete with admonitions about the evils of borrowing and the virtues of living within one's means ("He that goes a-Borrowing goes a-Sorrowing. * * * The Borrower is a Slave to the Lender").

Benjamin Franklin would doubtless be horrified, therefore, by the manner in which the tax laws make the Government of the United States an active partner in encouraging people to stray from the balanced family budget. For, after all, since interest payments are tax-deductible, Uncle Sam bears a part of the cost and makes borrowing less expensive. Modern-day economists, to be sure, might well applaud the ample use of credit; but Poor Richard would never condone such erosion of fiscal virtue.

Wherein do the tax laws either state or imply that institutions of learning are inferior in importance to institutions of worship? Section 511(a)(2)(A) states that if a college or any other charitable organization owns an "unrelated business," such as a macaroni factory, the profits of such a business are subject to regular taxes.

However, if the same macaroni factory is owned by "a church, a convention or association of churches," the macaroni profits are immune from taxation. "The exemption conferred for our spiritual needs," observes Louis Eisenstein, tax attorney, "also embraces the worldly pursuit of profit."

Judging from the tax law, the inventors in our midst are clearly to be revered over our authors and composers, for while section 1235 specifically confers a tax blessing upon the fruits of the inventor's imagination, section 1231(b)(1)(C) just as specifically denies that tax favor (the special 25-percent capital-gain rate) to authors, composers, and artists.

In the eyes of the tax law, it appears, any invention—even the aforementioned pretzel bender—contributes more to the well-being of society than, say, a Faulkner or Hemingway novel, a Robert Frost poem, an Aaron Copland symphony—or, perhaps a Rodgers and Hammerstein Broadway musical.

As to the preference shown the blind, the story is simple: Congress has sympathetically conferred an extra $600 exemption upon those to whom sight is denied—but this expression of compassion for the handicapped mysteriously began and ended there.

And who, reading the tax laws, can doubt that machines are more important than people? After all, when a businessman invests in a machine, he is entitled to take tax deductions on the cost of that machine over its useful life. But the tax laws give him no comparable merit points for investing in his son (by sending him to college).

Moreover, the tax laws are most understanding about the aging of machines. A year-by-year allowance is made as machines lose their zip and zest and approach the age of retirement. But leaving aside the minor concessions made at age 65, the tax laws sternly forbid any recognition of the gradual aging of human beings—except, perhaps, in one instance.

The initial purchase price of professional baseball and football players, bought and sold precisely like indentured slaves, may be "depreciable." But do not rejoice for the players, for they derive no benefit. Only the purchaser of the ball club is thus blessed.

Any youngster reading the biographies of the titans of America's past (the Franklins, Jeffersons and Lincolns, the Lewis-and-Clarks, the Andrew Carnegies and the Henry Fords), cannot escape the deeply held American precept that it was heroic personal effort—hard work—that made these men and their country great. "Poor Richard's Almanack" confirms this wisdom ("Diligence is the Mother of good luck. * * * Idleness is the greatest prodigality").

Yet in many respects, the tax law seems to frown upon those who work for their living—or, at least, to smile warmly upon those who don't. Some of these respects have already been mentioned: the comparative penalty, for example, suffered by those who work beyond the age of 65, or who wait on table to get a college education. Wives, moreover, may be said to be discouraged from working since this reduces the tax advantages their husbands derive from matrimony.

But these are peripheral disadvantages compared with the dramatic preference accorded unearned income over earned income. Those blessed with large holdings of corporate stock, for example, derive their dividends income through the managerial efforts and talents of others but are nevertheless favored with the "dividend credit," a tax concession denied those whose income is wholly earned. Others may, without lifting a finger, inherit great wealth generated by the efforts of their forebears, and pay not a penny of tax when they receive it.

But by far the greatest advantage enjoyed by unearned income is the special capital-gains tax rate, which openly proclaims that the work of money is entitled to a greater reward than the work of people. Lawyers (and other high-paid professionals, such as doctors or engineers), it is said, live well, but die poor. Why? Because they perform the work of people, and for their efforts they are taxed at the regular income-tax rates, ranging up to 91 percent. Others, on the other hand, who have the means to put their money to work, are favored with a tax rate that rises no higher than 25 percent.

This is not to depreciate the value of capital, an essential ingredient in society. But capital without human effort counts for little—indeed, it is the addition of human effort and ingenuity that brings capital to life.

In times past, the American tax laws have sought to favor this human factor through a preferential "earned-income credit." But human effort requires no such preferential recognition. What is wrong with simple equality, which can be effortlessly achieved by taxing the work of money and the work of people according to the same rates—including, of course, an averaging device for smoothing out "bunched" income of various sorts?

These and many other value judgments are scattered throughout the tax law—although few are as overtly stated as section 152(b)(5), which expresses a deeply ingrained American attitude toward mistresses (it denies their benefactors the right to claim them as dependents). Most of them are subtly buried in the inscrutable legal verbiage of the Internal Revenue Code. But as the Duchess said, "Everything's got a moral—if only you can find it."

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED—HOUSE AMENDMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703 to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a vote on the Ellender motion, now pending, at 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, with the following proviso: That there be a morning hour until 12:30 p.m.; and that the half hour between 12:30 p.m. and 1 p.m. be equally divided between the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], or Senators whom they may designate, each side to have 15 minutes, with the vote to take place at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That the Senate proceed to vote at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, December 4, 1963, on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to concur in the House amendment to S. 1703, to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes: *Provided*, That the time from 12 noon until 12:30 be used for the transaction of routine morning business, and that the time from 12:30 until 1 p.m. be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] respectively.

AMENDMENT OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar 643, S. 1698.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1698) to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, 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 proviso at the end of section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That until January 1, 1964, in addition to the extensions hereinbefore permitted, further extensions may be granted ending not later than December 31, 1964."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect December 31, 1963, or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever date first occurs.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Montana what measures he will ask to have laid before the Senate following the yea-and-nay on the Ellender motion tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The pending business is S. 1111, to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, and for other purposes.

It is hoped that following the disposition of that bill, in which the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK] have an interest, it will be possible to have the Senate consider Calendar 462, H.R. 82, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses; Calendar 502, S. 927, to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title; and such other measures as may be ready for consideration.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED—HOUSE AMENDMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703, to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it seems to me that the opponents of the motion of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] have based their argument largely on two phases: First, that if the bracero program did not exist, it would be possible to fill the requirements of agricultural labor with domestic labor.

Their second position is that whether that be true or not, the elimination of the program would automatically benefit domestic agricultural labor, and therefore be good so far as the country as a whole is concerned.

It does not seem to me, upon analysis, that this point will stand up. Public Law 78, which is what we are dealing with, contains specific requirements. Such requirements must be certified by the Secretary of Labor prior to the time that any braceros can be recruited under contract. In order to make this point crystal clear, I shall read these provisions into the RECORD:

> No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed; (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed; and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

Simply stated, these three provisions require certification by the Secretary of Labor, before any bracero program can be made effective in any particular area of the country, that there are not enough domestic agricultural workers available for jobs in an area. In order to preclude a contention that workers were not available when, in fact, they had not been offered sufficient wages, a second finding is made necessary; namely, that the braceros who may be brought into the area will not adversely affect wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed. In other words, there cannot be competition from braceros which will adversely affect domestic labor.

The third requirement is proof that one has made a reasonable effort to recruit domestic agricultural workers before braceros may be imported into an area at all.

When those three requirements have been fulfilled, then, and only then, is anyone entitled to have bracero labor brought into a particular area where there is a labor shortage.

I have before me a letter from the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California, commenting on the need for the bracero program. In my opinion, it is an exceptionally good letter. I should like to read excerpts from it into the RECORD, because the points made bear upon what I was discussing; namely, the argument that there really is no need for the importation of Mexican labor, and that an adequate supply of domestic agricultural labor can be obtained if only agricultural employers try hard enough to obtain them.

The letter begins:

> Vegetable and berry production in the central coastal area of California is practically a year-round operation. We commence harvesting in April and are harvesting in large quantities from the first of May until the first of December. This area ships approximately 60,000 carloads of fresh vegetables throughout the Nation. Our major vegetable crops are lettuce, celery, carrots, broccoli, onions—dry and green, tomatoes, artichokes, brussels sprouts, cauliflower, green and dry beans, sugarbeets, and strawberries. Ninety percent of the fresh vegetables and berries are shipped out of the State and are distributed throughout the country for consumption.

I think it is important to note that not one of those crops is in the surplus category. So in dealing with this bill, we are not in the process of debating a measure which would result in the importation of additional labor in order to make available additional surplus crops.

I read further from the letter:

> We grow and ship from 20 to 45 percent of the Nation's supply for several of these commodities.

In other words, in this one area in central California, 20 to 45 percent of the entire country's supply is grown.

Then it is stated in the letter:

> At the peak of our harvesting season, May and September, we have historically used approximately 12,000 supplemental workers. From March 20 until January 1, we use a minimum of 2,000 to 3,000.
>
> For the last 2 years the Department of Labor would not certify for supplemental workers for the months of January and February and it has been necessary for some of our growers to reduce their acreage during the winter months. We have recruited several thousand domestic workers from the San Francisco, Sacramento and San Joaquin areas. These workers have proved quite unsatisfactory as they only worked a few hours to a few days and left.
>
> If the growers are able to continue their historic production it will be necessary to recruit domestic agricultural workers. It is doubtful if there are available workers willing to go into agricultural production in numbers up to 12,000. Many of these people, of course, would be family people and we would be required to furnish suitable housing for families which we presently do not have to accommodate such large numbers. Because of the vagaries of agriculture, we would not be able to afford them a continuity of employment as agricultural crop production does not permit continuous employment. Were we placed in a position to have to depend on domestic agricultural workers recruited from areas throughout the country, the cost would be prohibitive in that thousands of them may mentally think they can do the work but would not be able or care to do the work required. Obviously the welfare problem would be of staggering proportions.

Mr. President, I also have before me a letter dated July 22, 1963—it really is a series of statements—from Agricultural Commodities, Inc., of Phoenix, Ariz. This organization is a central Arizona farmers association engaged in growing and shipping fruits and vegetables which require foreign supplemental field labor.

On the same point, this organization submits some excellent material, from which I read, as follows:

> There has been much said about the decrease in the number of Mexican nationals contracted during the past 3 years.

This point was brought up during the debate in an effort to show that Mexican labor is not needed, because its use has been decreasing over the years, and that therefore the smaller number needed can be replaced by domestic workers.

The statement by this group continues as follows:

> This primarily is due to the increased use of cottonpicking machines. The need of Mexican stoop labor remains about the same it has been for several years and there is every indication this trend will continue for many years to come.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The statistics certainly prove beyond any doubt that we have fulfilled every responsibility and in many instances have gone beyond the requirements of the law.

The reference is to the Arizona State Employment Service, established by a law which requires that domestic agricultural workers coming into that group shall be placed in employment if physically possible.

I read further from the statement:

This is confirmed in statements from officials of the Arizona State Employment Service that at no time has a foreign worker taken the place of a domestic.

The attached records show that in spite of our efforts to attract, recruit, and employ domestic labor, especially stoop, the State officials over a period of years have found it necessary to certify the contracting of supplemental Mexican nationals in order to get the job done.

We have never been accused of cutting any corners or failure to provide work for all available domestic labor and it will be noted that during a congressional farm labor hearing in Phoenix in 1958 Mr. E. P. Theiss, regional director of AFL–CIO for Arizona and New Mexico, testified he was not opposed to recruitment of Mexican nationals and not opposed to the extension of Public Law 78.

This is quite an interesting statement, in view of some of the comments made on the floor of the Senate; I refer to statements that, in general, the unions are opposed to this program. Apparently the person who was most closely associated with it, insofar as Arizona and New Mexico were concerned, did not feel that way.

I read further:

It is an absolute fact based on performance and recommended by Arizona State Employment Service officials and supported by documentary evidence, attached hereto, that supplemental foreign labor is urgently needed.

Mr. President, I could cite many more examples of this sort.

I hold in my hand a letter written by Mr. James C. Hanagan, of Lamar, Colo.; his letter was addressed to the Reverend James H. Kane, of Pueblo, Colo. A copy of the letter was sent to me. In the letter, Mr. Hanagan replied to a series of editorials protesting against extension of the bracero program. One of the things he pointed out in his letter—and it is of extreme interest—is that the very nature of domestic migrant labor makes it almost impossible for those engaged in that work to have any established family life or any continuity of schooling or any ability to provide for the domestic migrant laborers the education which we are so desperately trying to give to so many people in this country. In the letter, Mr. Hanagan points out that if this program is ended, and if an effort is made to increase the number of domestic migrant laborers, and if that effort is conducted with sufficient force to bring into the program enough domestic workers to take care of all the crops, the result will be by virtue of this program itself, the creation in the United States of a whole new group of younger people who, because of the nature of this employment, will not be able to have access to the desired educational facilities. In the letter, Mr. Hanagan goes into some detail in discussing this point.

He makes one more point which I tried to make during the previous debate on this subject. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has mentioned this point. In addition to the problems which we might have from the welfare point of view and the education point of view, as a result of developing a new group of domestic migrant laborers, we also have the question of the exploitation of the Mexicans if this program is rescinded and if Public Law 414 is allowed to remain on the statute books. On that point, Mr. Hanagan writes:

Let Congress repeal Public Law 78, and you will see the most flagrant exploitation of our American labor group since slavery days. There simply won't be nearly enough able and willing workers to perform the necessary stoop labor in the growing and harvesting of certain fruit, vegetable, and other specialized crops.

Then I suggest that you visit the Spanish-speaking settlement of some southern Texas city, San Antonio for example, next March or April; and you will see the mad rush by sugar companies, canning companies, fruit and vegetable packers, corporate farms and the like vying for the workers' favor. Then you will see the Spanish speaking exploit the Spanish speaking because of their generally poor education, low standard of living, and lack of ambition; the recruiter interested only in his fee. Why should he care for the old, the sick, or the young so long as the recruiting fee is paid on each? No doubt he has contacted his Congressman asking repeal of Public Law 78, as such action would certainly put him in "tall clover."

(At this point Mr. PELL took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have quoted the statement of a man who is writing with deep compassion for the migrant laborer. He feels that, until we have had an opportunity to prepare a schedule ahead of time as to how to take care of these problems, repeal of the program at this time would be one of the worst things we could do, not only in relation to the importation of Mexicans who are coming across the border, but also from the point of view of our own domestic agricultural migrant labor supply.

In that same connection, I hold in my hand a short article from the El Paso Herald Post, dated November 5, 1963, entitled "Wetback Total Soars in October." It reads:

A heavy increase in the number of illegal entrants from Mexico was reported today by the U.S. immigration border patrol.

Apprehensions during October of this year exceeded 600 in greater El Paso, twice the number usually made in October, Patrol Chief Herman Moore said.

The total does not include juveniles who are caught and shooed back across the Rio Grande.

Nearly all those apprehended are adult males seeking jobs here or trying to make their way into the interior of the United States. Seventy-five percent of the wetbacks are caught near the border within 72 hours after they cross. The others are nabbed at highway check points, on trains or buses, or at work.

Most of the illegals cross at night. Some carry small bundles of clothing.

Immigration officials said the number of wetbacks caught is the highest in 7 or 8 years. Curtailment of the bracero import program and economic conditions in Mexico are believed to have stimulated the wetback influx. A Juarez newspaper estimated that there are 35,000 unemployed "chiefs of family" in that city alone.

The point I am making is to reiterate that the reason we put the bracero program in to begin with was to try to do something to prevent the exploitation of the Mexican laborer under conditions through which Mexicans out of work would come to the border and try to slip across to try to get some kind of work in this country. All kinds of abuses occurred because of that practice. No one was responsible for any of the conditions under which they were working. If we, in effect, repeal Public Law 78, as has been suggested on the floor of the Senate, all that we shall do will be to revive the evil that we tried to stop in the first place.

So, when we hear that the bracero program is bad, in and of itself, and that we should no longer go on with it in the interests of humanity and welfare, it is not necessarily a fact.

The fact is that the bracero program has been well operated. It has been operated well. It has been of substantial value to the U.S. agricultural economy throughout the country. The program has been beneficial not only to our agricultural economy, but also it has been conducted in such a way that it has not hurt domestic agricultural labor. It has been carried on in such a way that it has been of great help to Mexicans themselves.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The last statement of the Senator that the Senate amendment would not help the domestic worker shapes the issue. Is not the issue which is before the Senate whether we shall pass the House bill, which provides for a simple 1-year extension of the Public Law 78 program, or whether the Senate shall insist on a conference with the House, in which would be considered a 1-year extension of the Public Law 78 program and the McCarthy amendment? Such procedure would help the American domestic worker by providing that, before the Mexican worker could work in a community, the American worker would have to have offered to him some of the job and personal protection that the Mexican worker is given. Is that not the issue?

Mr. DOMINICK. The issue is whether the Senate will concur with and pass the House version, which provides for a simple 1-year extension of the act without the McCarthy amendment.

The assumption of the Senator from New Jersey that the bracero program can be put into effect in any area of our country with any harm to domestic agricultural labor is erroneous. In my comments at the start of the debate I cited the three requirements that must receive certification by the Secretary of Labor before any braceros can be put into any area. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is aware of the details of those requirements, but they are fairly explicit.

In general, the requirements provide that braceros cannot be employed in any area in which there is domestic agricultural labor available, that the employment of the braceros cannot adversely affect domestic agriculture workers similarly employed, and that farmers in the area have made reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers to take on those jobs and they have been unable to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask an additional question. In the Public Law 78 program and the treaty with Mexico there is most precisely written the requirement that a community which seeks Mexican national labor cannot discriminate within the community because of the national origin or, indeed, the ancestry of the worker. Is there any requirement that would provide that the community had to eliminate discrimination in public accommodations against Americans before Mexicans could be brought in?

Mr. DOMINICK. No; but I hope that we shall get some action on that question during the present Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What I have stated is not one of the requirements under the McCarthy amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. But some of the other protections that Mexican nationals are afforded are not afforded to our own American agricultural workers.

I am not disturbed because, after the Mexican Government had hammered out job protections for Mexican nationals who come here in response to seasonal need, we have granted those protections; what bothers me is why on earth we cannot do as much for our own people—Americans, our citizens. Why can we not do the same for them? Why should we not go to the House of Representatives and insist that we do? The Senate has adopted an amendment which would impose that requirement. It would protect our own people, though it would give them only a part of what we give to Mexican nationals.

Honestly, is there any human reason or any debater's logic that would deny Americans what we give Mexican nationals?

Mr. DOMINICK. We are talking about two wholly different subjects. The Senator has made some very good points——

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Those are the provisions of the McCarthy amendment, which the Senate has adopted. The issue is whether we shall go to conference or take the old program of a 1-year extension that we have had for years without any protection for American workers.

(At this point Mr. METCALF took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is trying to say that we should take up labor legislation, which would come from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, instead of the bracero program, which comes out of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, tie the two concepts together, and do something about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I hope that the Senator from Colorado has supported some of the proposed legislation related to labor that has been reported out of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare dealing with migratory farm workers. We have not had too many record votes on those issues, but I am sure that in the back row—as I, too, am in the back row—the voice of the Senator from Colorado was loud and clear for the American worker and for his family. I was glad to hear the Senator express concern about the youngsters of American migratory workers and their lack of education.

One of the bills passed by the Senate is at the other end of the Capitol. Let us work together to have it passed.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DOMINICK. The point I was about to make related to the question of the value of this program to the Mexican economy. In the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 26, page A4066, is an article inserted by Representative GATHINGS, of Arkansas. It is written by David Weber. It has a dateline of Mexico City. It strikes me as being extremely good. I wish to read, not all of it, but a portion of it, in the context at this point. It reads in part:

> Mexico could be in serious trouble if the United States closes its doors to "braceros," the migratory farmworkers who every year go north of the border to help bring in the crops. * * *
>
> If the bracero is legislated out of existence, they fear, Mexico's economy and possibly its political stability will suffer.
>
> Bracero dollars, about 35 million of them every year, have traditionally made up a third of Mexico's favorable balance of payments. More significant than the loss of dollars is the burden that these 200,000 workers would throw on the already strained rural unemployment in Mexico.
>
> The lack of food, work, and land—exaggerated in recent years by persistent droughts and Mexico's inexorable population growth—has turned the docile peasant into an active and angry political factor that is particularly worrying to the Government because of next year's presidential election. If the bracero is added to the huge rural unemployment lists, the situation could be explosive.

That is only a portion of the article, which continues in like strain.

These points were emphasized in the hearing on the bill. The representative from the Department of State, Mr. Sayre, explicitly said that this is one of our most important programs insofar as our aid to Mexico is concerned.

My distinguished colleague [Mr. ALLOTT], in the process of discussing the situation in Colorado, pointed out quite clearly that $1 of bracero money earned and taken back to Mexico was worth $5 of foreign aid, and this is another reason why the program should be continued.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have some help from the Senator from Colorado with respect to certain questions of fact involved in the bracero problem, because I wish to be sure I am correct in the conclusions I have previously drawn. I know of no one who is better qualified to tell me whether or not I am correct than the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. If I cannot do it, I will call on my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator can.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Colorado read the terms and conditions our Government officials must apply before braceros can be hired in any community in this country. Am I correct in my understanding that the terms and conditions which must be met in any community before a bracero can be brought in guarantee full economic protection to any American domestic worker who is available for work on the farms?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct. The Secretary first must certify that there is not adequate domestic labor available at comparable wages before the braceros can be brought in.

Mr. MORSE. That was my next point. If it is found that there is not adequate domestic labor available, employers can look into the possibilities of obtaining bracero help; is that correct?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct. Before they do that, once again, they must not only show that they have looked in their own local area but also that they have made reasonable efforts outside their area to bring in domestic workers, and have been unable to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that they also must offer the same pay and working conditions to American domestic workers that they would offer to and provide for bracero workers?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct, with two exceptions, I believe. I do not believe it is necessary to offer housing to the domestic laborer, insofar as the entire family is concerned, if the family is being brought in. Obviously, if they are to obtain them, they must provide housing, but this is one reason why they do not like to go too far afield. They do not know how long a person, if imported, will stay. With the braceros only coming in—the head of the families, males only—farmers do not have that particular problem.

Mr. MORSE. What basis in fact is there, then—if any—for the argument which is used against the bracero program, that it discriminates against American domestic workers?

Mr. DOMINICK. I really do not believe there is any basis for it. That is one of the points I was trying to bring out. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Oregon has brought it out.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator any reason to believe that a part of the opposition of organized labor in this country to the bracero program may be related to the fact that the braceros perhaps would not be considered potential members of American organized labor?

Mr. DOMINICK. I hesitate to reply in the affirmative, because I have never had that statement made to me by the head of a union. I have usually been told that the problem is that they are trying to put on a drive to unionize agricultural workers and that so long as there is a right to bring in braceros it is very difficult to do so. This is a part of the problem that must be dealt with. Whether the other statement is true or not I do not know.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Oregon have to yield to any other Senator in our desire to protect American domestic workers, but it seems to me that those who argue that there is some discrimination against American

workers because they are being denied jobs by the bracero program have a duty to submit the evidence to show that domestic workers are available. Some of us who come from areas where braceros are used know that domestic workers are not available.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. They cannot possibly be obtained. If the program is dispensed with, it will put upon the farmers in those areas a problem with respect to losing perishable crops.

If an American labor organization could provide the domestic workers, I would certainly insist that the domestic workers be hired. But it is the duty of the Secretary of Labor to determine that domestic labor is not available before the braceros are hired in the first place. That is true, is it not?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is absolutely correct. I wholly agree with the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Is it not true that bracero labor is not less costly than the hiring of domestic migrant workers?

Mr. DOMINICK. It is not a bit less costly.

Mr. TOWER. The requirements are somewhat severe; are they not?

Mr. DOMINICK. They are, because of the transportation and housing that must be paid for by the employers.

Mr. TOWER. So if a farmer were able to obtain American labor, he would use it and thereby keep his costs down; would he not?

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe so. Most farmers have been scrambling to obtain help of almost any kind, and they have not been able to get it.

Mr. TOWER. I did not hear the earlier remarks of the Senator, in which I understand he touched on the effect of the bracero program on American-Mexican relations. Is the Senator aware that the bracero program accounts for Mexico's second biggest source of dollar earnings?

Mr. DOMINICK. I had the pleasure of listening to the distinguished Senator from Texas point out this fact very clearly in our previous debate. I think it is extremely important to emphasize that fact.

Mr. TOWER. Is it not true that the United States has a favorable balance of trade with Mexico?

Mr. DOMINICK. It is.

Mr. TOWER. So this program actually contributes to the trade intercourse between Mexico and the United States, and we are the indirect beneficiaries, in that the Mexicans buy more from us.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is a very good point.

Mr. TOWER. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the opinion of Mexican ambassadorial and consular officials with reference to the bracero program?

Mr. DOMINICK. I cannot say that I am, other than the statement of the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Sayre, in which he explained that this was an extremely important program to Mexico.

Mr. TOWER. If the Senator will indulge me, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement from the Embassy of Mexico, contained in the report of the committee, to the effect that the bracero program has worked very well, and that there is no doubt that the program has been a firm foundation for good relations between the people of the two countries.

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

EMBASSY OF MEXICO

The Ambassador of Mexico presents his compliments to His Excellency the Secretary of State and has the honor to inform him of the position of the Government of Mexico with respect to the decision taken by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States on May 29 last, rejecting the bill that would have authorized the executive branch of the United States to extend the international migrant labor agreement that expires on December 31 of this year.

The Government of Mexico considers that there would be no call for any observation whatever concerning the aforesaid action, had the need for Mexican labor that has existed for a number of years among the farmers in various parts of the United States disappeared, or if systems other than those used so far were available to meet that need. It is not to be expected that the termination of an international agreement governing and regulating the rendering of service by Mexican workers in the United States will put an end to that type of seasonal migration. The aforesaid agreement is not the cause of that migration; it is the effect or result of the migratory phenomenon. Therefore, the absence of an agreement would not end the problem but rather would give rise to a de facto situation: the illegal introduction of Mexican workers into the United States, which would be extremely prejudicial to the illegal workers and, as experience has shown, would also unfavorably affect American workers, which is precisely what the legislators of the United States are trying to prevent.

The Governments of Mexico and the United States have for many years been faced with the problem of the illegal entry of Mexican workers into U.S. territory in search of work. The maximum number of arrests made by the Immigration Service of the United States reached 803,618 in 1953, a year in which only 201,380 workers were contracted. Since that time the efforts of the two Governments to eliminate illegal entries, at the same time leaving the door open under the legal procedures of the international migrant labor agreement of 1951, produced the desired results, the number of arrests having been reduced to 31,106 in 1959, during which year 437,643 workers were contracted.

Despite the fact that in 1960 the number of contracted workers began to decrease markedly, the number of illegal workers did not increase, the conclusion being that the Mexican workers have understood and accepted the fact that if they cannot obtain work by contract, it is because they would not obtain it either by entering the United States illegally. Here are some pertinent data:

Year	Contracts signed	Deportation
1960	315,846	28,492
1961	291,420	31,350
1962	194,978	12,283

In the last 3 years there has been a considerable increase in the number of Mexican farmworkers who have applied for and obtained residence visas to come to the United States, through letters issued by farmers and growers in the United States who have offered them employment. It is estimated that no less than 32,000 farmworkers obtained their documents in 1961 and possibly some 40,000 in 1962. The statistics on the contracting during the last 5 years show that there were barely 50,000 jobs for the workers during the 12 months of the year, open at various times during the year and in various States, so that in order to be able to work without interruption during the entire year, it would be necessary for the workers to move from one place to another. Since it is impossible to achieve precision and coordination even with the means available to the two Governments, it is concluded that the aforesaid increased number of resident farmworkers do not have permanent work but in fact continue in their status as seasonal workers, working for an employer for 6 or 8 weeks and then returning to Mexico in the hope of being called upon to work for another short period—an operation that is repeated two or three times a year. As may easily be seen, this situation will create problems for both Mexico and the United States, since during the jobless seasons the worker with a residence visa will burden the economy on one of the two countries, with the same consequences of accepting ill-paid work, obtaining official assistance, etc.

There is good reason to believe that the absence of an international agreement governing temporary employment of farmworkers will lead to an increase in the types of migration pointed out above.

Finally, it should be considered that on various occasions when at international meetings on migrant worker problems representatives of the Government of the United States have indicated their purpose of decreasing the contracting until the elimination point is reached, the Mexican representatives have requested that an attempt be made to make the decrease gradually, in order to give Mexico an opportunity to reabsorb the workers who have habitually been working in the United States and thus to stave off the sudden crisis that would come from an increase in national unemployment. The stoppage of the contracts at the start of 1964 would leave approximately 200,000 persons out of work.

It is not considered that the contracting of Mexican workers under the international agreement has produced unfavorable effects on American workers. Quite the contrary. The benefits granted the contracted braceros, in the matter of insurance covering occupational accidents and illness, the extremely careful regulations on lodgings and transportation, and the constant inspection of food have provided a pattern that can be followed for domestic workers who lack such protection. And with regard to the wage increase obtained for Mexican workers on various occasions, chiefly in the year 1962, what was obtained through the effort of the Mexican Government and the cooperation of the Department of Labor of the United States, to such an extent that in some localities the wages are higher than those paid to domestic workers, represents the reason why this type of work is now looked upon as acceptable by the American workers.

It was precisely the presence of the "wetbacks" in the fields of the United States that created a situation undesirable from every standpoint, since those persons have not even the most elementary kind of protection and were the victims of exploitation in respect of wages, because they were forced to accept whatever pay was offered to them, and domestic workers were unable to compete and found themselves compelled to move to other areas. The lack of an agreement to facilitate contracting as long as there is a shortage of farm labor, which the Mexican workers have been covering, would tend to bring about a return to that situation. And although Mexico would make efforts to prevent it, as was indicated by the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico at a

press conference on June 5, the willingness of American employers to give work to the wetbacks explains why in many cases the Mexican workers violate the law of the United States, and it is very important for the Government of this country to solve this problem.

The virtual extinction of discrimination against and segregation of persons of Mexican nationality in areas of the United States where such practices once existed can decisively be attributed to the contracting of Mexican workers under international agreements. The need for labor which only the Mexican could supply but which was not authorized for localities where special schools were maintained for Mexicans, or where they were segregated in restaurants, theaters, etc., and discriminated against in respect of wages, etc., led the authorities concerned to put an end to that situation.

There is no doubt that this has been a firm foundation for the good relations between the peoples of the two countries.

In this connection, it is appropriate to note that in September 1954, the President of Mexico stated in his annual message to the Congress that efforts were being made to solve the difficult problem caused by the exodus of Mexican farmworkers, "acting in full and friendly cooperation with the Government of the United States in this task, in order that those who go to work may do so under the protection of existing agreements." And if indeed the contracting should come to an end, it is hoped, as the Secretary of Foreign Affairs said during the press conference mentioned above, that the two Governments will act vigorously and determinedly to prevent the illegal traffic of workers, which benefits neither Mexico nor the United States and is a constant point of discussion between the two Governments and the communities where the braceros who enter illegally work.

(Initialed.)

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 21, 1963.*

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas. These are extremely important points, and ones that should be emphasized. Heaven knows, we spent enough time on the foreign aid bill. If we have a program which is so much more effective, at one-fifth the cost, for that reason alone it should be adopted.

Mr. TOWER. The State Department has always recognized the fact that the bracero program has made an important contribution to good Mexican-American relations. In a Federal district court suit brought by the American Federation of Labor, seeking to force the Federal Government to ban laborers living in Mexico from crossing the border to labor in Texas, the State Department notified the court that a ruling against the Federal Government might have adverse effects on international relations. So it is apparent that the State Department is concerned with this program and recognizes that bracero labor promotes good relations between the United States and Mexico.

Mr. DOMINICK. I share the view of the Senator from Texas. I appreciate his support.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I was very happy to hear the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Colorado. I join him in support of the motion of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, that the Senate concur in the House-passed version of the so-called bracero bill.

The hour is growing late. I believe that all of the statistical data—if not all, a great deal of it—has been inserted in the RECORD, both this afternoon and in the previous hearings and debate in the Senate. Therefore, I intend to confine my remarks, which will be reasonably brief, to what I consider to be the chief issues in the Senate and to try to explain them in a cold, logical, and, I hope, humane way, for the benefit of the Senate and of the country.

I am shocked to find there are so many people in this country who have picked up the slogan of "slave labor," or something like that, and who have marched up and down the street, almost literally waiving this banner, without an investigation into the facts.

I had occasion to read the hearings in the House at some length before the measure was taken up in the Senate earlier this year. I was astounded at the number of witnesses testifying in the House committee against the bill who stated, in effect, "We have had reported to us this or that."

I wish to make it plain that what I am discussing on the floor of the Senate this evening is what the Senator from Colorado knows of his own knowledge. I speak about this problem not from an academic standpoint, not from reading a series of reports. I discuss it not on the basis of listening to somebody who has read somebody else's report, and who has become enthusiastic about some slogan or banner behind which he wants to walk up and down the street. I talk about it as a person who knows of the problem, who has lived with it 33 years of his life. Except for the time spent in the Senate, those 33 years have been spent in eastern Colorado, in a farming community. I have represented farmers, trying to help them solve their problems and working with them. From that experience I speak tonight.

First of all, let us discuss the need. There is no question that not only in my State, but in other States, such as California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming, there is an agricultural need for what has been referred to as stoop labor.

I do not like the term, but everybody knows what it means. I do not like the term because to me it is un-American in its aspects and concepts. But it designates the kind of labor a man does in the field, which is hard labor—the picking of beans and tomatoes, in which he actually stoops, and even travels on his knees along the rows to pick the vegetables, to cut lettuce at the stalk, to thin beets. These are activities that are referred to as stoop labor.

While I personally detest the term, I use it because everyone else uses it and everyone knows what we are talking about.

In the Western States, though there has been an improvement, for example, in the kind of seeds used to grow sugarbeets, which eliminates much of the thinning of sugarbeets, and we have gone this far to help eliminate the need for stoop labor, such labor is still needed to thin sugarbeets. How can a machine determine which cucumbers should be made into pickles or which ones are of the right size or of the right maturity to go into the hopper with the brine? It cannot be done. How can a machine determine when tomatoes can properly be harvested? Of course, it might be able to pick out the tomatoes which we unfortunately have to be contented with in this city, and which may be called tomatoes only because they bear a superficial resemblance to the kind we are blessed with in the West.

I see the Presiding Officer [Mr. METCALF] nodding his head. He knows what I mean. I am sure the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is present on the floor, also knows what I am talking about.

So the need for this kind of labor is established.

We talk about machinery. It is true that important advances have been made in machinery. Sugarbeets are now harvested completely by machinery. Yet just a few years ago it was done with a plow, and essentially by hand.

We are making further advances in the picking of other vegetables. However, the cold fact, which cannot be denied, is that a certain amount of this labor has to be obtained if the American people, the consumers, are to have these vegetables of Arizona, Colorado, Texas, California, or wherever they may be grown, in their homes at a reasonable price, which they can afford to pay.

I do not believe that any of the opponents are advocating for a moment that we should try to deprive the American people of these products.

Therefore the program contemplates the need, and it also contemplates the machinery factor, which I do not believe will ever—and I use this term advisedly—do away completely with stoop labor, no matter how far it has gone.

The next question I wish to discuss is the question of the American market for labor. The cry has rung out several times, again and again, that this makes slave labor out of their own Spanish-Americans, as we call them—other people call them Mexicans—and that it depresses the labor market.

Of course, all of this is absolutely false. I refer first of all to the colloquy which occurred on the floor a few moments ago between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and my colleague from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], in which the Senator from New Jersey asked, "Why not provide the same things for American labor?"

What could stand out as more plausible and just? I am for it. Everyone is for it. However, there are some fundamental differences between the kind of labor that is available in the American market, when it is available, and if it is available, and the kind of labor that comes over from old Mexico.

The first great difference is that when laborers come over from old Mexico—and they go through their own Government, and the contract is essentially a contract between the two Governments—the workers come over as adult males;

they do not have their families with them.

The first question that arises is, "We want to be fair. We want to give the same treatment to Americans that we give to the Mexican nationals, the braceros, who come in."

If we are to be fair, what must we do? Is it a fair and equal condition of employment for the employer to transport the local man and his wife and three or four or five or six children across the country, and pay for this transportation and for the housing for such a family? This is not a comparable condition of employment. It is not possible to provide the barrack-type of buildings that are used for braceros. We cannot provide that kind of building for an American farm family. It is not possible. They must have more room. At the least they must have the family-type accommodation, not the barrack-type accommodation.

The experience of this country has been, I am sorry to say—and I went into this in some detail—that we have not been able to utilize our American labor because, for one thing, our labor does not want to do this kind of labor. I read from page 16 of the House report on the bill, as follows:

> As noted in the tables above, most domestic workers are local people requiring neither transportation nor housing.

In my own experience, in the majority of cases that is true in Colorado.

The report continues:

> To endeavor to establish such requirements with respect to some but not all domestic workers would involve insurmountable administrative complications and embroil farmers and Department officials in constant controversies.
>
> It is reasonable to require a farmer to pay transportation from the border and return for a group of Mexican workers who normally complete their contract terms because they must return to Mexico if they leave the employment of the farmer. But to require farmers to pay transportation from distant points to domestic workers who may leave his employment the day after they arrive would be an unreasonable requirement.
>
> Any relationship between the use of braceros and displacement of American workers classified as hard core unemployed can be judged by the experience in Michigan. The Michigan Employment Security Commission, in attempting to place urban unemployed into seasonal agriculture jobs found fewer than 1 out of 20 stayed on the job long enough to have a successful work completion record.

What does this mean? Does this mean that our workers are incompetent and worthless? I do not think so. It means that people who have been accustomed to a higher type of work will not go back into the fields to do stoop labor if they can possibly help it.

The second point I wish to address myself to—and I see the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon in the Chamber—is the point that he raised when he addressed questions to my colleague from Colorado. I read the three requirements from the law, Public Law 78, as it was enacted:

> The Secretary of Labor must determine and certify that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed.

Let me interpolate something at this point. There has not been a year in my service in the Senate when I have not been besought at one time or another by farmers in Colorado who could not find domestic labor to do their work and who were having a difficult time convincing the local and State employment service and the Secretary of Labor that the workers were not available.

So the employers wait while their crops ripen in the fields, and sweat it out, hoping that they will be able to obtain workers to harvest their crops before they are overripe and destroyed.

If any of the critics of the bill think it is easy to convince the Secretary of Labor that there are not sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified, and not available at the time and place needed, let him try—in the spring, summer, or fall—to convince the Secretary of Labor.

The second condition that must be met is:

> The Secretary of Labor must determine that employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and the working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Next:

> That reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

We thus have three standards that must be met. Who must be satisfied? Not the farmer, not the local community, not the State, but the Secretary of Labor himself must be satisfied: First, that workers are not available; second, that the employment will not adversely affect their wages; third, that reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers to the jobs.

The other side begs the question again and again, but they will not face the fact that it is the Secretary of Labor of their own administration who must make this determination; the farmer himself has no control over it.

I now move to another phase of my argument. The assertion has been made that the bracero program in the United States has contributed to a moral breakdown of the braceros themselves. I wish that some of the critics would take a short trip to Mexico. I wish they would travel through the countryside and see the people who come to the United States to do stoop labor, and see how they live at home.

I know farmers who employ braceros. I have been in the housing that is provided for them. I have seen the extra food that farmers provide for the braceros. I have seen the plentiful supply of water that is provided for them. Yes, even though it is not called for in the contract, I know of the medical facilities that are provided for braceros. The farmers provide many other benefits that any decent, ordinary American would provide. There is no class of people in the whole world who are more decent or have a greater sense of anxiety about being their brother's keeper than the farmers of this country. I am not talking about corporation farmers; I am talking about the individual family farmers whom I know and have known all my life.

Does it break down a man's morality to live in a little hut composed of twigs and thatches in the mountains or on the plains of east Mexico, but who when he comes to the United States to work can live in clean barracks and have decent food, good water, and medical care? In all probability, he gets better water in this country than he has ever drunk before in his life. Also, he is provided with showers. Probably he never heard of a shower or saw one before. Often he has to be taught to use a shower and a toilet. Do such improved conditions help to break down the morality of braceros who come to this country? Let us not be so stupid or so silly as to think so.

Considering the financial aspect of the situation, the distinguished Senator from Texas has said that the program affects the balance of trade between the United States and Mexico to the extent of some $37 million a year, although this is decreasing, as has been said before. What does this mean to the bracero who comes into the United States? Let us consider the question from his standpoint. I have already discussed the conditions under which he lives. In Mexico, the earning power of that type of person is about $100 a year. That indicates how people of that class live in Mexico. I do not say that in disparagement. I only wish they could live as we in the United States live. But when such a man comes to the United States and works a maximum of 210 days a year, which is what the law will permit him to work in the United States, he usually takes back with him, if he works a full season, between $500 and $600. Can we, considering our own prosperity, possibly imagine what $500 or $600 means to that man's family in Mexico, when the family before that time lived on $100 a year? Their standard of living is raised.

The Ambassador from Mexico made a statement to the State Department—I do not have it before me at the moment, but there is no question about it—approving this proposal, as did the Government of Mexico.

I wish to read from the remarks of Representative TALCOTT, of California, at page A5126 of the daily RECORD of August 12, 1963. He was referring to an editorial that was published in the Odessa, Tex., American. The editorial concludes:

> It ought also to be noteworthy that the Mexican consul in San Francisco took occasion to disagree publicly with the Congressman who said the bracero program was degrading to Mexicans.

Mr. President, I could continue on this point for a long time. However, I think I have adequately covered it. I do not believe there is any question that from the standpoint of living, morality, and the effect on the man's own family when he returns to Mexico, the bracero is much better off when he comes to the United States. Strangely enough, con-

sidering the remarks of some of the opponents of my position that our own labor market is depressed, I do not regard that to be the situation. We still must consider the requirement that the Secretary of Labor must make the determination that the program does not depress farm labor in the United States.

For example, I notice that the minimum wage paid braceros in Colorado was 90 cents an hour. I had a hand in that 90-cent figure. The people of my State were not concerned about it. The rate originally had been fixed at $1 an hour. I visted the office of Secretary of Labor Goldberg in the spring of 1961 and said, "We do not want this amount to be reduced. The farmers of Colorado do not want it to be reduced below $1 an hour. They do not care about its being lower than $1. All we want is to have our rate equalized with that of Texas and some of the other States."

Texas still has a 70-cent rate; Colorado has a ate of 90 cents. On a piecework basis, the rate averages 90 cents an hour for a pay period which cannot be more than 2 weeks or less than 1 week.

What is the situation with respect to wages paid to domestic farmworkers in Colorado?

Based on the minimum wage provided in the Sugar Act of 1948, there is a wage of $1.05. I have just noticed a publication in the Federal Register of November 20, 1963, in which the Secretary of Agriculture has set the same wage for the coming year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on this particular aspect of the situation.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT: BRACERO

We have heard much about how braceros depress the agricultural wages. However, I think it has been adequately demonstrated that the braceros themselves are fully protected in their rights with work and wage guarantees enforced by the Secretary.

In the November 20, 1963, issue of the Federal Register on page 12282, there appears a notice to "interested parties" regarding public hearings to be held for the purpose of receiving evidence likely to be of assistance to the Secretary of Agriculture in determining fair and reasonable wage rates "for persons employed in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugarbeets for the 1964 crop." This authority to establish wage rates is granted the Secretary in the 1948 Sugar Act (61 Stat. 929; 7 U.S.C. 1131), and specifically contained in subparagraph (c)(1) of section 1131, of title 7, U.S.C., which provides in substance that before subsidy payments will be made to the farmer under this act all wages must have been paid to workers in full; and that they must have been at a rate not less than the rate to have been determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable; and that if such wages have not been paid then the Secretary may withhold an amount equal to the amount of accrued but unpaid wages from the farmer's payment and pay that amount directly to the worker. In Colorado there were 8,657 farmers in 1961 who were receiving such payments and thus subject to the provisions of the Sugar Act that I have just mentioned. I believe that this figure represents virtually all of the sugarbeet farmers in the State of Colorado, just as 39,826 producers in all States receiving payments under the Sugar Act in 1961 represents the vast majority of all the sugarbeet producers in the United States.

This is just one example of how the executive branch of the Government is not only fixing the wages of the domestic farmworker but is also guaranteeing the payment of those wages. Now we are asked to believe that the Secretary is not performing his lawful duty and is not establishing a fair and reasonable wage. I would not so indict the Secretary.

[From the Federal Register, Nov. 20, 1963]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE.

SUGARBEETS: 1964 CROP; WAGES AND PRICES IN STATES OTHER THAN CALIFORNIA, AND DESIGNATION OF PRESIDING OFFICERS

Pursuant to the authority contained in sections (c)(1) and (c)(2) of section 301 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (61 Stat. 929; 7 U.S.C. 1131), and as further amended by Public Law 87-535 and Public Law 87-539, and in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure applicable to wage and price proceedings (7 CFR 802.1 et seq.) notice is hereby given that public hearings will be as follows:

At Salt Lake City, Utah, on December 6, in the Bankruptcy Court Room No. 220, Federal Building, 350 South Main Street, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

At Fargo, N. Dak., on December 18, in the community room, Metropolitan Savings & Loan Association Building, 303 North 5th Street, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

At Detroit, Mich., on December 20, in the Sky Room, Pick-Fort Shelby Hotel, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

At San Antonio, Tex., on January 7, 1964, in the assembly room, Gunther Hotel, Houston at St. Mary's Street, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

At McAllen, Tex., on January 9, 1964, in the Fairway Motor Hotel, South 10th at Wichita Street, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

The purpose of these hearings is to receive evidence likely to be of assistance to the Secretary of Agriculture in determining (1), pursuant to the provisions of section 301 (c)(1) of the act, fair and reasonable wage rates for persons employed in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugarbeets for the 1964 crop in States other than California, on farms with respect to which applications for payments under the act are made, and (2), pursuant to the provisions of section 301(c)(2) of the act, fair and reasonable prices for the 1964 crop of sugarbeets in States other than California, to be paid under purchase or toll agreements by producers who process sugarbeets grown by other producers and who apply for payments under the act.

To obtain the best possible information, the Department requests that all interested parties appear at the hearings to express their views and to present appropriate data with respect to wages and prices.

The hearings after being called to order at the time and places mentioned herein, may be continued from day to day within the discretion of the presiding officers and may be adjourned to a later day or to a different place without notice other than the announcement thereof at the hearings by the presiding officers.

C. B. Freeman, D. E. McGarry, W. S. Stevenson, and C. F. Denny are hereby designated as presiding officers to conduct either jointly or severally the foregoing hearings.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on November 15, 1963.

E. A. JAENKE,
Acting Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

[F.R. Doc. 63-12142; Filed, Nov. 19, 1963; 8:48 a.m.]

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in Colorado, the average wage of domestic workers is $1 an hour. In almost every instance, the average hourly wage for farmworkers in Colorado, without room and board, is $1.16. It can hardly be said that braceros in Colorado have depressed farm wages in that State.

I shall bring my remarks to a conclusion. My colleague [Mr. DOMINICK] spoke of a letter from Mr. James Hanagan, of Lamar, Colo. I refer again to this letter because I have known Mr. Hanagan for many years. He lives about 4 miles from my hometown, and on what is known as the old Koen Ranch. I shall read a part of his letter, because it was not solicited by me or by my colleague. It is addressed to the editor and business manager of the Southern Colorado Register, Rev. James A. Kane, who has been both vituperative toward and critical of both my colleague [Mr. DOMINICK] and me concerning this matter.

The covering note, which is handwritten, reads as follows:

OCTOBER 28, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: Note the different approach to the solution of a difficult problem.

Thank you for your support of the bracero program.

Respectfully,

JIM HANAGAN.

I wish to read the concluding paragraph of his letter, which is as follows:

I sincerely urge you to work for the extension of Public Law 78 to aid our migrant farmworker and his family, forced to move from place to place as the season demands; to improve our relations with the Mexican Government, and especially with the Mexican people; to produce an abundance of food for a hungry world; and to help insure the independent operator of the family-size farm with a supply of seasonal labor. Then we can look for further improvement by working for an orderly increase in farm labor wages as conditions and profits warrant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

LAMAR, COLO.,
October 28, 1963.

REV. JAMES H. KANE,
Editor and business manager, the Southern Colorado Register, Pueblo, Colo.

DEAR FATHER KANE: I have followed with keen interest your editorials of recent weeks on the matter of the bracero program and agree wholeheartedly that no effort should be spared in the improvement of living conditions and job opportunities for the so-called migrant farm labor force. However, I am beginning to doubt, with all due respect to your sincere intentions and the intentions of your staff, the wisdom of many of your statements and proposals. Here in Colorado, and all Western States as a matter of fact, we are concerned primarily with our citizens of Mexican descent, and it was in light of this fact that I came to analyze your editorials and statements and disagree to the point where I felt it necessary to answer.

Is it a good policy to continually refer to our Spanish-speaking citizens and our migrant labor force? Such a reference to me

simply sets aside a minority group as something special; and when we do this, it further jeopardizes the eventual achievement of equal rights by all of our citizens. What does the average uninformed citizen of our Western States think when he hears a group on a street corner engaged in an antimated discussion in Spanish? He is led to think that they are Mexicans or citizens of Mexican descent, that they are farm laborers or common laborers of some other sort, and that they are capable of performing only the most menial of tasks.

If I were the ambitious son of parents of Mexican descent and migrant farmworkers, I would definitely consider the continual reference to my ancestry and type of work as derogatory and a millstone around my neck. I would note that very seldom do you hear a person of English ancestry referred to as "that Englishman" or of Irish descent as "that Irishman"; but that it is commonplace to hear references to "that Mexican" or to "that Negro." Instead of feeling proud of my ancestry and my ability to speak two languages, I would feel a desire to get away from "my own" in order to advance and fulfill my ambitions.

I often wonder what kind of education I would have gotten had my parents been migrant farmworkers. Why should I bring up such a conjecture at this point? It is because I feel certain that education, or rather the lack of education, is the real reason for our migratory farm labor problem; but we cannot blame the children of a migrant domestic laborer for their lack of interest in school, when they are forced to move on at about the time they are getting started in a different school. Then when they discover that they are a year or more behind others in their age group, it becomes increasingly difficult to hold that enthusiasm for education.

We had better be calling for an end to this nomadic way of life for family groups or doom another generation to be classed by a future annual meeting of the diocesan directors of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference as, "the poorest of the American poor, the migrant farmworkers." We had better be making it mandatory to have at least finished 12 grades of schooling and to make it possible for those duly qualified to continue with higher education. If this means adding more families and individuals to relief or welfare rolls, then it will have to be done; or we will still be butting our heads against a stone wall in 10, 20, and 30 years from now in trying to solve this perplexing problem.

Let Congress repeal Public Law 78, and you will see the most flagrant exploitation of our American labor group since slavery days. There simply won't be nearly enough able and willing workers to perform the necessary stoop labor in the growing and harvesting of certain fruit, vegetable, and other specialized crops. Then I suggest that you visit the Spanish-speaking settlement of some southern Texas city, San Antonio for example, next March or April; and you will see the mad rush by sugar companies, canning companies, fruit and vegetable packers, corporate farms, and the like vying for the workers' favor. Then you will see the Spanish speaking exploit the Spanish speaking because of their generally poor education, low standard of living, and lack of ambition; the recruiter interested only in his fee. Why should he care for the old, the sick, or the young so long as the recruiting fee is paid on each? No doubt he has contacted his Congressman asking repeal of Public Law 78, as such action would certainly put him in tall clover.

Then we must also look to the pitiful waste of certain crops should the extension of Public Law 78 be defeated, and in this regard I haven't the slightest doubt. There not only will be shortage of labor in many areas of the Nation at critical times, but there will be those not physically qualified to perform some of the more strenuous tasks in addition to those refusing to perform this work, the so-called stoop labor.

Please understand, Father, that I speak with a certain amount of experience in this field. I have been an independent farm operator for the past 12 years and have employed both domestic farm labor and Mexican braceros. Prior to this time I was employed by the American Crystal Sugar Co. as an agriculturist out of their Rocky Ford plant, from 1948 to 1951 inclusive. In this capacity much of my duty was concerned with the anticipated need, placement, movement, and utilization of the sugar beet labor force.

In the early spring of 1948 I was sent on a tour of a part of the labor recruiting areas of Texas and New Mexico to meet the company recruiters and to ascertain as nearly as possible the amount of labor that would be available for the Rocky Ford district. In Texas this area starts at about Lubbock and extends south, both east and west, with the heaviest concentration in the lower Rio Grande Valley. In Lubbock I met with a Mr. Sullivan, who was in charge of labor recruiting for the American Crystal Sugar Co. and a Minnesota canning firm, and other company representatives from Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota. I went as far as Eagle Pass with the group as it was intended that I would be in charge of the office there. In New Mexico I was accompanied by Mr. Dan Jaramillo, labor supervisor for the Rocky Ford district, now deceased, and we met with every recruiter employed by the company as well as the one at El Paso, Tex.

During the Second World War, I also had experience with another minority group, as I was assigned for almost 2 years as a commissioned officer with the 1327th Engineer General Service Regiment composed of colored troops. An engineer general service regiment was the pick-and-shovel gang of the army during the war; so I had ample opportunity to note the serious handicap suffered through little or no formal education.

In a democracy such as ours, as I understand it, every citizen is supposed to have equal opportunity to make of himself what he will in accordance with his desire and ability. I want to ask what kind of equal opportunity a migrant farmworker has when he is forced to continually move from job to job because of the seasonal demands of his work? Repeal Public Law 78, and we will doom not only another generation of migrant workers to unequal opportunities but greater numbers each year because of supplying the food requirements of a growing population.

I can think of no better way, and certainly none with so little expenditure of public funds, of presenting our American way of life to the Mexican people than through the bracero program as provided under Public Law 78. Also, I can think of no better deterrent to a communistic takeover in Mexico than through this program, and I understand that here is a real danger. I would wager, on this account, that communistic elements both in this country and in Mexico are subtly lobbying for the repeal of Public Law 78. Please, not to be taken in again as we were in Cuba. Remember the televised picture of the procession of victorious Castroites entering Havana with the statue of our Blessed Lady at its head. We wonder how many millions of Cubans and Americans too, ruefully remember that day, dawning with such a display of splendor and magnificence and then ending with dashed hope, as the crackle of rifle and machinegun fire gave notice to the world the true aim of the revolution as the mass of executions was begun.

I sincerely urge you to work for the extension of Public Law 78 to aid our migrant farmworker and his family, forced to move from place to place as the season demands; to improve our relations with the Mexican Government, and especially with the Mexican people; to produce an abundance of food for a hungry world; and to help insure the independent operator of the family-size farm with a supply of seasonal labor. Then we can look for further improvement by working for an orderly increase in farm labor wages as conditions and profits warrant.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES C. HANAGAN.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, before I conclude, I shall refer to only one further point, namely, the contention by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] that his amendment should be adopted. Earlier this year when the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, and various others testified before the House committee on this bill, they then had under consideration a 2-year extension. I feel that I must comment on this matter, because the Senator from Minnesota has referred to it.

The bill was called up suddenly in the House, immediately after one of the longer vacations this year; and very few Members there knew about it. I think it significant that this time, when they knew the bill was coming up, it was passed by the House by a vote of 173 to 158.

The amendment suggested by the Senator from Minnesota provides for certain things which sound very good; but nowhere in the record or in the reports can one find—no matter how carefully they are examined—even one place where the Secretary of Labor has suggested a possible means by which the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota could be carried out. It could not be carried out.

I realize that probably this bill can never again come before the Senate. I, too, am practical; I know that the barrage and the campaign of slogans about this bill have been conducted in such a way that probably it would be impossible for the bill to be passed by Congress another year. I am not unrealistic in my approach to the bill; but I am sufficiently realistic to know that many Colorado farm people—not corporations—and Colorado small canneries will be affected by this proposal, and ultimately so will the consumers in Colorado, California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona.

Is it possible that some of those in the large population centers in the East have their own personal interest in this matter, and are seeking larger markets for their products, with almost certain knowledge that in the Western States the production of many commodities will thus be reduced, with a consequent increase in price?

There is before the Senate a proposed 1-year extension, which is completely logical. I have said that I have no illusions about the future; but for this 1-year extension it is completely illogical to recommend, as the Senator from Minnesota has done, a workmen's compensation program, for example.

Even if we were considering a 2-year extension, I doubt very much that the Secretary of Labor could devise the nec-

essary regulations and procedures which would have to be gone through in order to provide for the desired result by the end of 2 years.

However, we are considering a 1-year extension. This is a logical extension; and it is logical without the addition of the language proposed by the Senator from Minnesota, which could not possibly have any meaning during the 1-year extension, because the conditions and terms he proposes by means of his amendment could not possibly be put into effect before the latter part of the present year. Anyone familiar with governmental procedures knows that to be true.

There is also a practical difficulty with the Senator's proposal, which on its face would seem to be a very good one. For example, the workmen's compensation laws are handled by the individual States. So if the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota were to be adopted, it would be necessary to turn to the individual States for implementation of such laws.

I appeal to the Senate to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives. I could submit for the RECORD a wealth of material, tables, and figures which support my position. However, I do not presume to judge the conditions which exist in Oregon, New York, Ohio, or Michigan, and I hope other Senators will not engage in the unjustified presumption that they can correctly judge the conditions which exist in Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, about which they know nothing.

Our farmers need this 1-year extension. What they will do after it ends, I do not know. Somehow they will either make the necessary accommodations or will go broke or will have to change to some other kind of farming. But they definitely need this 1-year extension. I do not think those who take a contrary position are less sincere than I am; but, as I have said, I speak of a subject with respect to which I have approximately 33 years of personal knowledge, because I have lived with these people and I know their problems.

Therefore, I hope the Senate will support the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

I yield the floor.

THE OREGON DUNES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Oregonian of November 25, 1963, entitled "Dunes Compromise," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DUNES COMPROMISE

This newspaper has been less than enthusiastic about various proposals, originating with the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger, to set aside a long section of the Oregon coast in a national seashore park.

The bulk of the area between Florence and Reedsport, on the ocean side of U.S. Highway 101, is already in public ownership—U.S. Forest Service and the State of Oregon (the beaches themselves and several parks). The sand dunes to be "saved" are not threatened by private appropriation. The counties involved could zone the lands adjoining the highway to prevent roadside slums if they could get together. The State game commission adequately controls hunting and fishing on the lakes and streams, and would continue to do so under the Federal bills proposed. Public access to the lakes and beaches is assured.

Nevertheless, there is a subtantial body of public feeling that the establishment of an Oregon Dunes National Seashore not only would preserve the playground from commercial encroachment but would attract many thousands of tourists from other States. The dunes are spectacular, though not comparable to some of the scenic resources of national parks. The main result of establishing a national seashore, as we see it, would be the attraction of more visitors because of national park advertising.

If the Oregon Dunes Seashore is to be created under national park auspices (Department of Interior), the bill approved by a Senate Interior Committee appears to be a reasonable compromise, with one exception. Its provisions are closer to those advanced by Representative ROBERT DUNCAN of the Fourth District than those urged by Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER and the Interior Department. But Senator WAYNE MORSE's demand that private properties not be condemned was bypassed when the main committee amended a subcommittee's version Friday. Condemnation power was restored, a threat to 15 residences and 2 commercial properties.

The 30,000 acres of the park, as approved by the Senate subcommittee and included in the Duncan bill, would extend on the west side of the coast highway from Florence to Lakeside, south of Winchester Bay. Thus the dunes area just north of Coos Bay now being tapped for water for industrial uses would not be included. An easement would permit use of Siltcoos and Tahkenitch lakes water by the International Paper Co. at Gardiner. Scenic integrity of a strip east of the highway would be protected by Federal authority in obtaining easements—a provision which may be hotly opposed. Residential property within the seashore's boundaries could be used for 25 years. But no additional building would be permitted. The attraction of the park may be expected, however, to enhance commercial service values in communities near but not within the park.

There has been a running fight on the coast about the desirability or lack of desirability of establishing a Federal seashore. But we have not detected any burning interest among the bulk of Oregon's citizens. Existing State, Federal and county authorities could do a great deal to enhance the already high recreation advantages of the dunes and lakes area. But if a national park is a better answer, the compromise bill comes as close to resolving the basic issues as the disputants may expect.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the editorial states at the beginning:

This newspaper has been less than enthusiastic about various proposals, originating with the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger, to set aside a long section of the Oregon coast in a national seashore park.

The bulk of the area between Florence and Reedsport, on the oceanside of U.S. Highway 101, is already in public ownership—the U.S. Forest Service and the State of Oregon (the beaches themselves and several parks). The sand dunes to be saved are not threatened by private appropriation. The counties involved could zone the lands adjoining the highway to prevent roadside slums if they could get together. The State game commission adequately controls hunting and fishing on the lakes and streams, and would continue to do so under the Federal bills proposed. Public access to the lakes and beaches is assured.

The editorial continues:

If the Oregon Dunes Seashore is to be created under national park auspices (Department of Interior), the bill approved by a Senate Interior Committee appears to be a reasonable compromise, with one exception. Its provisions are closer to those advanced by Representative ROBERT DUNCAN of the Fourth District than those urged by Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER and the Interior Department. But Senator WAYNE MORSE's demand that private properties not be condemned was bypassed when the main committee amended a subcommittee's version Friday. Condemnation power was restored, a threat to 15 residences and 2 commercial properties.

Later in the editorial, the Oregonian states:

There has been a running fight on the coast about the desirability or lack of desirability of establishing a Federal seashore. But we have not detected any burning interest among the bulk of Oregon's citizens.

Mr. President, I feel very bad that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee saw fit to report this bill in the absence of a united Oregon delegation.

As the senior Senator from Oregon, I serve notice tonight that I shall oppose the bill.

I believe the Senate should think a long time before it proposes to subject a State to the establishment of a Federal park under such fact situations as exist in connection with the Oregon Dunes, and particularly when there is not a united delegation, and when the State government also has some interest in the matter.

I have urged the majority leader to give consideration to the postponement of any consideration of the bill for some time until more negotiating can be accomplished at both the Federal and State level.

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

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. I understand that one of the Senator's main objections to the bill revolves around the question of condemnation and the condemnation amendment that was reinserted in the bill. I was not present when the bill was reported. I was occupied in the Appropriations Committee at the time. In view of the land grants that seem to have gone pretty wild and rampant in the past few years with relation to some of the park activities, does the Senator not think that this might be a very good point at which to resolve the policy of the Senate with respect to that subject?

Mr. MORSE. I shall do my best to help the Senate to resolve the policy at this point.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. The question is one of the main policy considerations that we must determine. It is one of the questions that has caused the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a great deal of trouble. Personally I am inclined to the point of view of the Senator from Oregon, though there are times when I think the power of eminent domain must be used.

Mr. MORSE. I do, too.

Mr. ALLOTT. We find in many places a big grab to include large chunks of

land. For example, we find that approach in relation to converting Sleeping Bear into a national park. Then the Government would either use the power of eminent domain as a permanent club over the heads of those who live there, or else take away homes that the people have enjoyed for years. I believe it is time for us to take a hard look at the program. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I agree with his observation.

From time to time I shall speak in some detail in regard to a good many of the legal ramifications of the bill and in regard to a good many of the questions of public policy that are raised by the bill. But tonight in my first comment on the bill, I wish to say that I have heard many Senators compare the situation in Oregon with the dunes situation in Indiana, the Cape Cod situation in New England, and some other park proposals elsewhere in the country. There is little resemblance, if any, between the Oregon situation and the situation in those other States.

The people of my State ought to have every opportunity to speak through a united delegation on this subject and not through a split delegation. I believe that the Governor of my State, as the head of the government of my State, has an official interest in the subject. I happen to be one who believes that he ought to be consulted before action is taken on the dunes bill that was reported by the Senate Interior Committee.

From my desk on the floor of the Senate today I wish to say to the Secretary of the Interior that I am exceedingly displeased by his course of conduct in connection with this issue.

Mr. President, most of the area is publicly owned now, as the editorial in the Oregonian points out. The situation is not similar to the Indiana situation, in which, if we were going to protect the public access to the area and to the water abutting it, we would have to condemn.

I taught the law of eminent domain for a good many years as I served as professor of real property at the University of Oregon School of Law. On the basis of the facts, I am satisfied, as I shall develop in great detail from time to time on the floor of the Senate, that the proposed park does not involve the type of case in which the power of eminent domain should be approved by the Congress.

I have sent to Mr. Udall, the Secretary of the Interior, a letter asking for full details concerning property which is privately owned in every public park in this country under Federal jurisdiction and every piece of private property in other Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. I have also requested similar information of the Forest Service.

Mr. President, we can have a park in the dunes area of Oregon without taking a square foot of private property. We could create an adequate park with public property only. In fact, it is more park than the public would ever use.

Mr. President, if we write into the bill the provision of condemnation we in effect take great property value away from present owners of property. We pull the rug out from under some of the most important aspects of land ownership. We depreciate the value of that property to the tune of large sums of money.

It is that kind of conduct on the part of the Federal Government, acting through the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, that I resent. I shall do what I can, as the senior Senator from Oregon, to protect the private property interests of my constituents involved in this controversy.

Mr. Udall has known this for 2 years. I urged him to try to work out with me an acceptable compromise, and he has never consulted with me about it since I served notice on him of my position. He knows that the only time this matter was ever discussed with me was in my office months ago, with certain members of the Oregon delegation. In that conference I served notice on Mr. Udall that I would not support a bill with the condemnation procedure in it. I also made clear to him that I would be glad to see what could be done to arrive at an acceptable compromise of this matter. He took it upon himself to ignore me and to ignore those people of the State of Oregon who share the viewpoint of their senior Senator with regard to the dunes park. I intend to do whatever I can to protect the rights of those people against the Secretary of the Interior.

That is not the only issue on which I intend to do what I can to protect certain people and interests in my State against certain policies of the Secretary of the Interior. He is going to hear more about those, week after week. They include certain electric power rights which are precious to the people of my State, of the Pacific Northwest, and of the Nation.

Mr. President, I still believe it is possible to draft a dunes bill which will be acceptable to a united Oregon delegation. I stand ready and willing to work to that end. But such a bill cannot include a condemnation procedure against private property in the area, because the requirements of the situation do not call for it, particularly when we consider the importance of private property ownership rights under our system of government.

I understand there is some support for a condemnation provision in the bill affecting the State of Oregon because in another area outside the State of Oregon there is some saloon or joint or some old gold mine property which apparently cannot be reached except by condemnation. If public necessity shows that condemnation in that instance is necessary, let us consider a bill to provide for it. If the facts support it, I will support the bill.

I do not know why we should have the idea that it is necessary to have a uniform program of condemnation; namely, that whenever a bill involves any proposal for a Federal park there must be a condemnation procedure in it. As a legislative body we ought to weigh the conflicting interests—both public and private—and then relate the power of eminent domain to particular facts in specific cases.

I am very unhappy about the bill which has come from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It has raised a controversy which need not have been raised, and which has many ramifications which I believe will be unfortunate.

I intend to continue to pursue my obligation of keeping faith with commitments I have made in my State for years; that I have made up and down the coast of the State of Oregon in the areas affected by the bill. I have told group after group that I would do what I could to protect their interests against condemnation. I intend to do so.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of my remarks on the dunes bill there be printed an amendment to the bill which I now send to the desk and ask to have printed.

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

The amendment submitted by Mr. MORSE to Senate bill 1137 is as follows:

On page 2, line 7, insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 2.".

On page 2, line 14, beginning with "purchase", strike out all through "Secretary" on line 3, page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "donation, or purchase with donated or appropriated funds, such lands, submerged lands, waters, or interests therein, as he considers commensurate with the adaptability of such lands and waters to the purposes of this Act, but in no case shall (1) the Secretary have the authority, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section and section 4(a)(2), to acquire any such lands, waters, or interests for the purposes of this Act by condemnation, and (2) any lands, submerged lands, waters, or interests therein, acquired on or after the date of enactment of this Act by condemnation by anyone be made a part of the seashore established by this Act. The Secretary".

On page 3, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) In any case where the owner and the United States agree, the power of condemnation may be used as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances."

On page 5, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 18, and redesignate succeeding subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

On page 7, line 2, beginning with the colon, strike out all through the period on line 8 and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "except that the Secretary shall have no authority to acquire any such scenic easements or other less-than-fee interests in land by condemnation."

On page 7, beginning with line 9, strike out all through line 15, and renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

TRIBUTES TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter and a series of telegrams from individuals and chambers of commerce in my State expressing profound sorrow of the shocking, tragic assassination of our late great President, John F. Kennedy. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams may be printed in the RECORD.

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

SALEM, OREG.,
November 25, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

The composition of this telegram was taken considerable hours after which we come to our first conclusion: That the citizens of the United States of America and peoples of the world have lost a dedicated and beloved man. Our heartfelt sympathy to the members of the Kennedy family.

STANLEY GROVE,
Manager, Salem Area Chamber of Commerce.

FLORENCE, OREG.,
November 25, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We know that both yourself and Gov. Mark Hatfield consider that you represent all of us in Oregon in your expressions of sympathy to the Kennedy family and to our Government caused by the loss of this great and good young man. We must reaffirm that ours is a Government of law and that acts of assassination or subversion must be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

HOWARD CAMPBELL,
President, Florence Chamber of Commerce.

EUGENE, OREG.,
November 23, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: As one of your supporters from Eugene, Oreg., we regret the horrible loss of a fine man. Please convey our condolences to the First Lady of the land, and stand by us. We need good men.

A REPUBLICAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
November 23, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Mrs. Hannah and I want to express sorrow and concern at the tragedy which struck our Nation today in the assassination of our President. His death is a personal loss for all of us and the hate which motivated this crime is poisonous sore in our society. More than ever we are grateful for your strength and statesmanship and pray for your good health that the President and our country may continue to have the benefit of your wisdom and courage. May God bless you and our other leaders in this time of trouble.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. HANNAH.

NOVEMBER 23, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations,
Washington, D.C.:

Profoundly consternated please receive retransmit our condolences your coleaders Government in this grave hour which afflicts world.

LUIS GONZALEZ FAMILY.
Senator ALFONSO LARA.
Senator EUGENIO GOMEZ.

LIMA, PERU,
November 23, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Es esta hora de dolor para el mundo democratico presentole profundo pesar.

[Translation]

In this hour of grief for the democratic world, I express to you my profound sorrow.

CELSO PASTOR.

YAKIMA, WASH.,
November 25, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

The climate of the country is such that it needs the comfort of inspiration. Give us the opportunity for which we long to ease the passion in our hearts. Can you not make concrete use of our nobler concepts of democracy by setting up a monument to the man worthy of his breadth and scope to which the peoples and the nations of the world can subscribe.

J. E. KOSTINER.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,
November 22, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

The assassination of our President is the most tragic thing that has ever happened to our country. Mr. MORSE, may I suggest that you do everything in your power to have the portrait of President Kennedy depicted upon the silver dollars which will soon be minted.

C. G. MURRAY, Jr.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a letter from the mayor of the city of Glendale, Oreg., 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:

CITY OF GLENDALE, OREG.,
November 23, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As our Oregon representative, in our U.S. Senate, we as a city, would ask that you relay our condolences and sympathy, to Mrs. Kennedy, during this tragic ordeal.

We realize, that through better chosen words, you will be better able to do this. Also to express the monumental loss, to our Nation, the world, our State and not least of all to our city. What a tragedy that such a brilliant, humanitarian leader's and statesman's life should be lost, while serving his country so well.

You may rest assured that this community's prayers will be with Mrs. Kennedy, yourself and the remainder of our leaders, during this great time of trial and stress, within this great Nation of ours.

Thank you, in advance, for doing this most difficult job, during a most difficult time.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. PLACE,
Mayor.

Mr. MORSE. In part the letter says:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As our Oregon representative in our U.S. Senate, we as a city, would ask that you relay our condolences and sympathy, to Mrs. Kennedy, during this tragic ordeal.

We realize, that through better chosen words, you will be better able to do this. Also to express the monumental loss, to our Nation, the world, our State and least of all to our city. What a tragedy that such a brilliant, humanitarian leader and statesman's life should be lost, while serving his country so well.

I do not know how anyone could use more beautiful, more eloquent language than the mayor used in this letter. I would not attempt to improve upon it. Therefore, when I received the letter, I forwarded it immediately to Mrs. Kennedy.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, turning now to another matter, I am greatly disturbed and concerned by a news report today—which I hope is not accurate—that the President of the United States is urging upon House leaders a compromise appropriation on foreign aid in the amount of $3.4 billion.

Mr. President, a $3.4 billion appropriation for foreign aid cannot be justified. Yet this newspaper story purports to assert that conferences have been held which seek to "button up" an agreement with House leaders and members of the House Appropriations Committee for a commitment to the amount of $3.4 billion.

I am not only concerned about that, but I am concerned about every report I have received to date about the progress being made in connection with the conference that is being held on the authorization bill for foreign aid. If these reports prove to be true, then the result will seem to be a weakening of the position of the Senate in the passage of the authorization bill for foreign aid.

Of course, there will be those of us who will vigorously oppose such a conference report, as we will oppose any appropriation proposal for $3.4 billion.

I want to say most respectfully to the President of the United States and to members of the House Appropriations Committee that if it is true they are seeking to reach a settlement at $3.4 billion, I do not think the American people will go for it. I think, day by day and week by week, increasing thousands of the American taxpayers are recognizing the need for a drastic overhauling of the foreign aid program now—not next year; now.

An appropriation in excess of $3 billion would be unthinkable. An appropriation in the neighborhood of $2,500 million or $2,700 million would be more sensible. An appropriation of $2,500 million or $2,700 million could do a great injustice to the American people and to the foreign aid program if there were not some changes made in policies with respect to the expenditure of that amount of money.

I was very much interested in some of the television comments I listened to over the weekend, including the comment of the Chancellor of West Germany, Mr. Erhard. I wish to go on record as disagreeing with much of what the German Chancellor said. I consider it completely gratuitous on the part of Mr. Erhard to suggest a settlement of differences between De Gaulle and the U.S. Government. When the American people get all the facts in regard to Franco-American relations, they are going to recognize that there is only one settlement that can exist, and that is for the United States to get out of France so far as any aid is concerned. The getting out is long overdue.

When the American people get all the facts in regard to the economic relations between the United States and West Germany, I believe the answer will be that at least five divisions out of the six ought to come out of Germany. I was not at all impressed by Chancellor Erhard's comments concerning the possibility of any reduction in American forces in West Germany.

I want the American people to recognize now that the time has come for them to make clear to our Government what American foreign policy should be, for unless the American people start making clear what that foreign policy should be, and what the foreign aid program should be, I am greatly concerned as to whether or not the best interests of the American people in the field of foreign policy are going to be protected.

We cannot keep this up. I shall, either later this week or next week, as soon as I can complete my research on the subject, make a major speech on U.S.-Latin American policies. My major thesis will be that the United States—and the United States alone—must determine the contributions and the administration of America's contributions to the Alliance for Progress program in Latin America.

I warn the Senate of what is happening in certain offices downtown in AID and State. They must recognize that the debate this year on foreign aid is clear handwriting on the wall that they cannot continue with the policies they have been following. However, it does not follow that they have any desire or intention to change those policies to conform to the criticisms that were uttered on the floor of the Senate in the historic debate that was recently concluded on the foreign aid bill.

I have been briefed in regard to some of the conversations that have taken place downtown since the close of the debate. I am making these comments because I want certain gentlemen downtown to know that I know what they are up to. What they are up to is to devise procedural devices to get around the Congress of the United States. In one of those conferences there was enthusiastic discussion that "What we need to do is commingle the American taxpayer's funds with other funds," as is done in the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Then they will be able to make the arguments, in connection with the Alliance for Progress program, that are made, as I have sat in the Foreign Relations Committee and listened to representatives of the executive branch of the Government say, "After all, these are not our funds alone. These funds are international funds."

It has always had an effect on the Foreign Relations Committee of following a course of action that, in my judgment, does not give to the American taxpayer the protection he is entitled to receive from his Government.

One of the great foreign policy issues that faces the American people is the procedural issue. As I have been heard to say so many times, for so many years, the procedures that are adopted determine the substantive rights of the American people. The procedural "gimmick" that some officials downtown are at work on now, is to get our Alliance for Progress contributions in a procedural position so they will not be administered unilaterally by the United States, but multilaterally by an international commission.

What these bureaucrats downtown want, Mr. President, is to get a lump sum authorization and appropriation, and get that money into the hands of an international commission, and then argue that the Congress should not then attach any strings to the expenditure or administration of those funds.

I warn my administration that the senior Senator from Oregon will discuss that subject matter, if that becomes administration policy, from every platform in this country on which I can stand and tell the American people the great danger that that program presents to them.

In effect we would take away from Congress effective controls that Congress must keep, because Congress has the duty under the Constitution of the United States, indelibly written into that Constitution, to protect the interests of the American taxpayer, in making clear to any Executive at any time that he can spend money only in accordance with the law, based upon appropriations by Congress.

It can be argued that we can give away this precious protection of the American people, but I propose to make very clear to the American people, to the best of my ability, if Congress follows that course of action, who will be responsible. Those who will be responsible will be every Senator and every Representative who votes to transfer this very important check upon foreign policy to some international commission.

I have no doubt what the answer of the American voter will be once he understands it, because if Congress does that, as a Senator and as a citizen I say that every Member of Congress who votes for giving away that check so precious to the American taxpayer should be licked at the polls, Democrats and Republicans alike.

We are dealing with a basic substantive matter in respect to protecting the American people with regard to their rights to ultimate control of American foreign policy.

That is what I say to the bureaucrats downtown who in the last 2 or 3 days have been in conference trying to figure out how they can get around Congress as a result of the debate that has been held here on foreign aid, in which some of us pointed out the shocking inefficiencies and wastes, and have pointed out that foreign aid in many places in the world has been the cause of shocking corruption, to the everlasting discredit of the Nation. As we have brought out these facts we have been greatly handicapped because we had to labor under the muzzle of classified information, which prohibited our telling the American people what we really know are some of the facts about the corruption which has come to honeycomb American foreign aid in many parts of the world.

In spite of that, I am confident that once the American people understand this issue they will share the point of view of those of us who are critical of American foreign aid as it is presently administered.

I hope the new administration will take a long, hard, and thorough look at the administration of foreign aid.

I wish to make one further point. It is always interesting, in a controversial issue such as this, to note how certain stereotypes, certain dogmas, certain emotional sanctions, or slogans develop and are repeated over and over again as substitutes for fact and logic.

One of these dogmas, one of these stereotypes, one of these slogans is that the United States must keep its commitments.

Who says we should not? However, what proof is there that a reform of foreign aid, essential to protect the rights of the American taxpayer, violates any commitments? Who in this administration wants to stand up and say that Congress is committed to continue to waste hundreds of millions of dollars of American taxpayer money? Who in this administration wants to stand up and claim that the United States is committed to carry on the inefficiencies which the Comptroller General's classified reports show honeycomb American foreign aid administration? What do they mean by "commitments"?

Let me also make perfectly clear that no President of the United States has the constitutional authority to make any commitment in regard to the expenditure of American taxpayer dollars that cannot be reviewed and changed by Congress.

We in Congress must never permit the moment to arrive when we will allow a continuation of waste of American taxpayer dollars in any foreign aid program on the basis of a representation that we are committed to continue it.

The time has also come to teach some of these foreign governments the meaning of the American constitutional system.

One of the principles they ought to be taught is that our system consists of three coordinate and coequal branches of Government. Congress is not subordinate to the executive branch of the Government.

Everyone in the executive branch of Government, from the President on down, should have his memory refreshed in regard to that constitutional truism.

I wish tonight, as I shall in much greater detail from time to time in the future, stress the point that there are no commitments to continue wasteful, inefficient, and corrupt foreign aid. What Congress appropriates in one session it can take away in the next, if in the opinion of Congress the interests of the American people call for the exercise of that check.

I would have my bureaucratic friends downtown remember it. I hope when they have their next session to express concern about what was disclosed in the recent debate on foreign aid by some of us, and therefore meet to see what they can do to make a bureaucratic end run play around us, they will remember we are on guard for the interests of the American taxpayer.

I do not intend, on the basis of any argument anyone wishes to make to the effect that one has been made to me in recent hours about unity in the party, party loyalty, and partisan considerations, ever to elevate any of those considerations above the trust that I owe the people of the State of Oregon to do what I can to bring to an end the inefficiency, the waste, and the corruption that has come to characterize so much

of foreign aid under both Republican and Democratic administrations. The issues of foreign aid must not be swept under the rug. We must not stand by silently while political forces go to work in the name of party unity and try to whip up support for a continuation of unsound policies.

I close by saying that any appropriation of $3.4 billion will continue many unsound policies. I register my vote right now against them.

I yield the floor.

CHANGE IN NAME OF ANDREW JOHNSON NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1243.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1243) to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Andrew Johnson National Monument established by Proclamation Numbered 2554 of April 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 1955), pursuant to the Act of August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 958), is hereby redesignated the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may procure with donated or appropriated funds, by donation, or by exchange the following described lands, or interests therein, located in Greeneville, Tennessee, and when so acquired such lands shall become a part of the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site:

Beginning at a point which is the intersection of the east right-of-way line of College Street and the north right-of-way line of Depot Street;

thence continuing along the north right-of-way line of Depot Street south 62¼ degrees east 165 feet to its intersection with the west side of Academy Street;

thence leaving the north right-of-way line of Depot Street and continuing along the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 38 degrees east 93.4 feet to a point;

thence leaving the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 64¾ degrees west 184 feet to a point on the east right-of-way line of College Street;

thence with the east right-of-way line of College Street south 25¾ degrees west 83.7 feet to a point of beginning, containing 0.35 acre, more or less.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $66,000 for acquisition, restoration, and development costs, as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

THE SENATE LEADERSHIP

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on last Wednesday our majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] spoke briefly and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the accomplishments of the Senate this year, and of his concept of the role of the Senate leadership.

It was typical of the majority leader to shorten his oral statement, and place the bulk of his report in the RECORD, rather than to take the time of the Senators to read it in full. The Senate had other business to transact before it could recess for the Thanksgiving holiday. The majority leader quickly disposed of the matter which was of concern to him so that we could complete the day's business as early as possible and get away.

But those Senators who have not read the majority leader's statement would do well to read and study it. It is on pages 22858–22859 of the RECORD for Wednesday, November 27, and deserves the careful attention of all of us.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD is one of the truly democratic leaders of our time with a lowercase "d" in democratic. His philosophy of the equality of Senate Members, the rights of each of our constituencies—of our individual and joint responsibility for making the Senate a great and respected institution, is of the very essence of democracy.

In the body of his unread statement, Mr. MANSFIELD wrote:

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 seeking shortcuts, not in the cracking of nonexistent whips, not in wheeling and dealing, but in the honest facing of the situation and a resolution of it by the Senate itself, by accomodation, by respect for one another, by mutual restraint and, as necessary, adjustment in the procedures of this body.

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.

There is an often repeated statement that:

Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

The majority leader of the U.S. Senate is an outstanding exception to any such dictum.

Before the senior Senator from Montana stated his views on the leadership function, some of us who occupy the back row in the Senate were appreciative that he not only advocates democracy, but practices it. Our majority leader has not deviated in the slightest when potential power was thrust upon him.

Under Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the Senate "club" has been composed of 100 Members, and it has functioned well, at least insofar as the Senate as a whole is concerned.

A measure of the performance of the Senate which the majority leader did not mention, but one which lies on the desk of each Senator, is the Senate Calendar. There is no great backlog of bills. There is no bill on the Senate calendar ready for consideration that has been kept off the floor. We have not recessed or taken long weekends in the face of urgent, unfinished business.

If there are measures that are lagging, critics must look for them at places other than the Senate leader or the calendar.

Mr. President, I think that Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD is doing the Senate and the Nation a great service in his direction of Senate affairs, and that he has prescribed the proper medicine for any ills that may afflict this body:

An honest facing of the situation * * * and, as necessary, adjustment of the procedures.

We do have problems. Not all of the measures have come to the floor which should have come so that the Senate could work its will. Some have failed to reach the Senate in good time. Some adjustments are needed, and we should make them in the democratic manner symbolized by our leadership.

Let me also pay my respects to the minority leader. In the hours immediately following the President's assassination, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in his effort to convey to others something of the humanity of John F. Kennedy, told a little story of Mr. Kennedy insisting that a gift turkey presented by the Senator from Illinois should not be taken away before the children had seen it.

The story told us as much about the teller as it did about the late President. It gave an insight into Senator DIRKSEN's sense of values. To the minority leader, a significant mark of the greatness of this slain world leader was his thoughtfulness for other people, in this instance for the children. Senator DIRKSEN's effort to interpret the President to the people of the Nation—to enhance John F. Kennedy's greatness by this little narrative—mirrored himself. He admired considerateness because he is himself considerate. That is a basic attribute of a true democrat—with a lowercase "d" again, of course.

It is to the great credit of the minority leader that when honest differences were involved, he has opposed the majority vigorously, but he has not used obstructionist tactics whereby a minority might thwart the will of the majority and make our democratic system ineffectual.

My allusion to the minority leader has a second purpose.

As he mirrored his own character—his own values—in his story of President Kennedy, so we mirror ourselves in all that we do.

When we call for leadership that solves all problems for us, gets our work done and lets us go home to rest after the leadership's great exertions, the mirror image is not a flattering one.

Mr. President, I know I speak for many Senators when I congratulate the majority leader on the report he placed in the RECORD last Wednesday. I give him profound thanks for the quality—the profoundly democratic quality—of his leadership.

The late President Kennedy, our beloved and gallant leader, was a man of remarkable courage and personal integrity. He was also a man of moderation and restraint, one who respected the opinions of others. He refused to browbeat Congress or the American people. Those same virtues have marked the leadership of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD.

No realistic observer, including Senator MANSFIELD, has ever contended that the Senate is above criticism. But if reforms are needed, our majority leader has shown us the way that they should be achieved—democratically.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. I commend the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota for the comments he has made this evening. I, too, was impressed by the report of the majority leader which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I associate myself generally with the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota.

However, I should like to add a footnote. In addition to discharging the tremendous duties imposed upon him, the majority leader has continued to serve his constituents from the State of Montana well and faithfully. The eastern part of Montana and the western part of North Dakota are similar in economy and in the makeup of their people. We have common problems. They are problems related to agriculture, water, and other resource developments.

During my tenure in the Senate I have always found MIKE MANSFIELD well able to take care of the interests of his area. I have found that in addition to assuming the burdens of the position of majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD has continued to serve his own constituency well. We have cosponsored much legislation that deals with our areas, and I know he is serving the State of Montana and the people of Montana ably and effectively.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his remarks.

I think the new Members of the Senate are particularly appreciative of the constant courtesies and attention to our needs and all our problems and all our requests that we have received from the majority leader. The fact that he is humble enough to talk at any time to the lowliest Member of this body is one of the marks of the greatness of the majority leader.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am immensely gratified that the Senator from South Dakota has referred to the leadership of my distinguished senior colleague, Mr. MANSFIELD.

I do not think I need remind any Member of the Senate of the respect, affection, and veneration I have for Senator MANSFIELD. He has been a colleague of mine for more than 10 years, both in the other body and in this body, and he has been a wise counselor and guide.

I have been somewhat embarrassed about bringing up this subject matter, because Senator MANSFIELD is so close to me. So I am grateful to the Senator from South Dakota for giving me this opportunity to express my gratitude for the friendship Senator MANSFIELD has shown to me and to all other Senators, including all those in the back row, and to comment on the excellent leadership he has shown.

I feel that Senator MANSFIELD's type of leadership as the majority leader demonstrates, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, true democracy. It has restored to the Senate the leadership of the various committee chairmen; and every Senator feels that he has an opportunity to speak in the course of the debate on the various subjects and controversial issues considered by the Senate. There is never any question of recrimination or reward or punishment. Every subject is debated on the basis of its merits; and each Senator's opinion—regardless of whether he is the most junior Member of this body or is the distinguished President pro tempore, who has served in the Congress for more than 50 years—is respected by the majority leader; and he, in turn, has the respect of all the other Members of the Senate.

As one who works very closely with Senator MANSFIELD, I was glad to hear the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] say that Senator MANSFIELD not only is the majority leader of the U.S. Senate and not only serves on two of the most important Senate committees and is faithful in his attendance at their meetings, but at the same time takes time to work for the most lowly constituent in Montana. Anyone who writes to Senator MANSFIELD—and I know this, because I have worked closely with him—and requests the assistance that a U.S. Senator can give, receives it. Senator MANSFIELD takes time to work for every constituent in Montana, just as he works for the welfare and the benefit of his largest constituency—the U.S. Senate and the Government and all the people of the United States.

Again I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his remarks.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as the Senator has said, I think it is interesting that Senator MANSFIELD has so remarkable an appreciation of the problems of his own State and also of the problems which face the other Members of the Senate, and also that he has so keen an insight into the international problems which face us today.

Mr. METCALF. He is one of the great experts in this body on international affairs.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree. I have found his insight and understanding of foreign relations to be equal to his great grasp of our domestic problems.

I think one of the reasons why many Senators have been reluctant to speak out on this subject is that we have felt that Senator MANSFIELD needed no defense, in that his brilliant record speaks for itself.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I now move that, in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, December 3 (legislative day of November 29), 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, O21739, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army), in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Carson A. Roberts, U.S. Marine Corps, to have the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in the Marine Corps, effective from the date of his retirement.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senator Mundt's Statement on Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the House Ways and Means Committee hearings last month on the proposed medical care for the aged through social security, I called to the attention of that committee the obstacles and barriers which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has placed in the path of the State of South Dakota in its efforts to implement Public Law 86-778, the Kerr-Mills Act for the people of that State. Because I think my statement will contribute to the solution of this matter, I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

My primary purpose in testifying today is to call to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee barriers and obstacles which have been placed in the path of implementing the Kerr-Mills program, Public Law 86-778, in my State of South Dakota and in other areas as well. I think your contem-

plation of this situation is vital because of the testimony that will likely be presented during these hearings that Kerr-Mills has not met the problem of providing medical assistance to the older citizens of this country who have need for such assistance. I am convinced that when full implementation of Kerr-Mills is completed and each of the several States has had the experience of several years of administering and improving their programs with the full and vigorous assistance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which agency is charged with the execution of the act, then and only then can the final determination of success or failure be applied. Any such judgment before that time is highly premature.

South Dakota's legislature began studying the possibility of implementing the Federal law in its 1961 session only a few months after the enactment of the Federal act. The legislature initiated a study through its Legislative Research Council to determine the need and scope for the program in the State. This cautious approach approved particularly valid because of experiences in other predominantly rural States which initiated extensive programs only to face difficulty later in working out scope and financial support.

I was pleased to cooperate with the South Dakota Legislature in 1963 when they decided to adopt their rather unique approach in solving the problem of providing medical assistance to our elder citizens. The implementing legislation provided for a "pilot" program to determine within a short time, the number of needy persons, the extent of their need, and a more accurate determination of the cost of the full program. The State department of public welfare was empowered to enter into a contract for the purchase of prepaid health coverage for eligible individuals. The law includes a provision that their insurance carrier must operate without profit or loss. The prepayment aspect of the plan and the "pilot" program will curtail high administrative costs of this medical assistance plan. The State legislature acted on the belief that it is conforming with the Kerr-Mills Act, Public Law 87–778 as amended by section 122 of Public Law 87–543.

The high regard I have for the Kerr-Mills approach in solving the problem brings me to the recent report of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly to the Senate Special Committee on Aging. Frankly, gentlemen, I am disturbed at what I consider the erroneous conclusions drawn by the majority in that report. For just a few minutes, I should like to dwell on several points in that report.

The Senate special committee report acknowledges and admits that the Department of HEW should attempt to help the successful implementation of Kerr-Mills program at the State level. In fact, on page 17, section 3, it is stated, "The Department clearly has responsibility to assist the States in implementing the enabling legislation." It goes on to state, "All evidence available indicates that the Department has accepted and fulfilled that responsibility to the extent possible."

Gentlemen, it is my contention that this last statement is inaccurate. It is my intention to point out that while the Congress clearly obligated the Department of HEW in administering this public law, to provide constructive assistance to the States, the exact opposite was attempted in many instances by various members of Department staff.

The Senate committee report accuses the States of "distortion of congressional intent" in some of the medical aid for the aged programs which have been implemented. I say the Department is guilty of failing to carry out congressional intent by a program of deliberate sabotage of an act passed by this Congress and signed by the President.

First, instead of disseminating helpful and constructive information to the public about this law, staff members of the Department have, on many occasions, made public statements and written articles in which the Kerr-Mills law was maligned, ridiculed, and described in half-truths and false generalities.

For instance, Donald Kent, Ph. D., of the Department staff made the following statements in a meeting in Springfield, Ill., on April 7, 1962: "Kerr-Mills is just the same old relief program * * *. Relief is too expensive. * * * I believe we are facing the same tired old proposition that some people are more important than others and that we shouldn't worry too much about the less important ones."

On April 17, 1962, Mr. Ivan Nestingen, Under Secretary of the Department, told the Nashville, Tenn., Sertoma Club that the Kerr-Mills program was not working; it could not do the job, but could only supplement the King bill. He said "90 percent of the funds being spent are being spent in the three States with smallest population."

In Madison, Wis., on March 31, 1962, Mr. Wilbur Cohen stated at a meeting of the Wisconsin Committee on Health Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security, "There is a great deal more to fear from the Kerr-Mills bill because by definition it is socialized medicine with a vengeance."

Mr. Phillip H. DesMarais, Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW addressed a group in Hartford, Conn., on March 26, 1962, and passed out literature which stated, "Kerr-Mills does not adequately take care of the near needy or even many of the very needy.

"Means-test medicine in many cases does not let you choose your own hospital and doctor.

"Means-test medicine can mean danger to health and safety."

Mr. DesMarais also spoke to at least one other group on the same subject. That was in Chapel Hill, N.C., on April 13, 1962.

On March 19, in Houston, Tex., Mr. Nicholas Zumas, Assistant Under Secretary, held a similar meeting.

In my own State, in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a workshop conference was held on April 6, 1962, at which Mr. Dean Coston, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary, was the featured speaker. The important feature of this meeting, which drew only about 30 people, was that it was open only to persons who opposed Kerr-Mills and supported King-Anderson. Although Mr. Coston was appearing at taxpayers' expense, the chairman of the conference stated in a letter dated April 2, 1962, that no organization could send a representative unless the organization supported King-Anderson.

And on April 25, 1963, Mr. Ivan Nestingen spent approximately 6 or 8 minutes of a 20- to 25-minute talk before the Chattanooga, Tenn., Rotary Club deriding Kerr-Mills, using such phrases as "administrative monstrosity," "optical illusions," and "not a program which a great Nation like ours can be proud of."

Gentlemen, in these stated instances, we have public servants, paid with public funds, traveling at public expense, going about the country trying to destroy public confidence in a law enacted by this committee and the Congress. Not only do I question the legality of such use of Government funds, but I believe they have deliberately distorted the intent of this committee and this Congress.

Now let me turn to more specific attempts by HEW personnel to sabotage Kerr-Mills. This is at the State legislative level and one instance occurred in my neighboring State of Iowa.

Iowa has had enabling legislation for medical aid for the aged since 1961, but at the time the bill passed, no funds were appropriated. In 1963, a new bill was introduced in the legislature providing that those eligible for old-age assistance benefits would not be eligible for medical aid for the aged. Before this bill could be acted upon, HEW wired the Governor's office saying the provision to exclude old-age assistance recipients "is not acceptable."

Gentlemen, I call your attention again to the section of the Senate special committee report which accuses the States of "distortion of congressional intent" by transferring old-age assistance recipients to medical aid for the aged. How can the majority report of the Senate committee condemn this practice and HEW at the same time uphold it by refusing to accept a medical aid for the aged program which seeks to prevent the action? In fact, HEW in a later telegram to the Iowa legislature again stated that approval could not be given to a program which denied assistance to persons because they had received old-age assistance benefits.

The story of HEW's contradictory statements to Iowa is a long one and many other examples such as the ones just mentioned can be documented for this committee if it wishes. Suffice it to say that HEW has not carried out its responsibility of assisting in the implementation of Kerr-Mills in Iowa.

This brings me to a similar set of circumstances in my own State.

The story of HEW delay in South Dakota's case is most distressing. The plan submitted by the South Dakota Department of Public Welfare provided that the State would purchase insurance contracts for persons over age 65 who were eligible under the standards established by State law. The purpose of the insurance approach is to provide for eligible recipients a program most similar to what persons with greater income would secure for themselves. Public Law 86–778 provides for the insurance mechanism but it becomes obvious that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been most reluctant to see it used.

Chronologically, the South Dakota story goes like this:

During both the 1961 and the 1963 legislative sessions, Mr. Alfred Poe, Kansas City Regional Office, HEW, met with State welfare department officials, legislators, and representatives of the vendors of health services. He was appraised of every draft of the bill, its amendments, and its final wording. On February 11, he sat in on a joint meeting of the State senate and house committees on health and welfare, the welfare commission, and the Governor, and made statements to the effect that major changes would have to be made in the program before Federal approval would be forthcoming.[1] Under questioning by Governor Gubbrud, he admitted that there was actually nothing in the South Dakota law that would cause it to be turned down but there were questionable areas that would require elaboration.

The bill was signed into law March 11, 1963, and a plan submitted by the State welfare department to the regional HEW office on June 10. According to a statement made by the State director of public welfare at a welfare commission meeting in Yankton, S. Dak., on August 29, the plan was mailed from Kansas City to Washington on June 17. On June 28, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association was told at a meeting of HEW personnel that the plan had not as yet been seen in Washington.

In August, a letter was transmitted from the Washington office of HEW to Kansas City, indicating that the questions posed by Mr. Poe in his letter of transmittal of the plan to Washington should be answered before the plan was approved. The questions put to the South Dakota department were basically the same points already discussed on the previous occasion. After the questions

[1] Associated Press dispatch, Feb. 12, 1963.

were answered by the State department of public welfare in early September, no further word of plan approval or disapproval was evidenced by HEW.

On October 18, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association, and the State director of public welfare met with HEW officials in Washington at which time they were told that one more statement was needed from the South Dakota attorney general before approval could be given. This information was secured and relayed to proper personnel in the Bureau of Family Affairs, HEW, on October 24, at which time the medical association representative was told that the plan would go to the Commissioner for decision without delay. It seemed that this timetable would be followed when information was given to Congressman BEN REIFEL, on October 25 that the plan would receive a decision "this week."[2] On November 6, Mr. REIFEL's office was told that the material was in the hands of general counsel and would go to the Commissioner soon for a decision. To date, no decision has been made.

To the elderly in South Dakota who may have need of such a program, the Department of HEW has withheld care for a period of 6 months which, in fact, will mean a longer delay because of the time involved in setting up the mechanics of the program after approval.

Can any other conclusion be reached than that the Department has been deliberately delaying approval because the program might well prove a workable design for the rest of the Nation to emulate thereby weakening the argument for H.R. 3920?

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

I would also like to refer to a portion of the report of the subcommittee that charges excessive administrative costs in the operation of some of the Kerr-Mills programs.

The point may be well taken that Government administrative costs are high. This does not exclude Federal Government administrative costs as contemplated in the social security approach. This is precisely the reason that the South Dakota Legislature wanted the claims paying function, the statistical function, and liaison with the vendors of care maintained by nongovernmental agencies trained and equipped to do such administration. The State welfare department's contract with Blue Cross and Blue Shield obtains the services of two organizations which have combined administrative costs in acting as fiscal agents for South Dakota's old-age assistance program of less than 3 percent.

It is my understanding that Kansas Blue Cross and Blue Shield offered to administer that State's OAA and MAA programs at one-half of 1 percent. This is a striking illustration of the need to give the South Dakota plan an opportunity to prove itself.

CONCLUSION

It has been said before this committee and in countless other places that Kerr-Mills is not a perfect program for providing the Nation's elderly with health care. I have attempted to show why. It is the victim of a planned program of interference on the part of the Department of HEW, King-Anderson supporters in the Congress, and welfare workers and officials at the State and county level. These people, many in places of immense power, have used every means at their disposal to discredit Kerr-Mills in the eyes of the public, to confuse State legislatures in their attempts to enact proper programs, and to demean potential recipients of MAA benefits with meaningless redtape used under the guise of the means test. How could any program work perfectly with this kind of hamstringing at every turn?

Given a reasonable chance Kerr-Mills can and will develop into a mechanism which will answer the health care problem for every needy aged person in this country. But time must be allowed. Since the act was passed in 1960, only 3 years ago, 28 States and 3 other jurisdictions have implemented the act and have it in operation. Ten other States have enacted laws which will become effective shortly or which are awaiting approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of the 12 States which have not passed cooperating legislation, 5 will meet in regular session early next year with the opportunity of acting. In the State of Texas, the electorate voted on the 9th of this month to remove constitutional barriers so the legislature can act in its next session to implement Kerr-Mills in that State. As a matter of record, only 3 of the 50 States have done nothing at all. This is a highly enviable record when it is realized that since 1960 Congress has always had legislation pending which would establish the social security oriented program and the possibility has thus existed that any State medical assistance program with its committed State funds might quickly be superseded.

I urge the committee to consider this problem carefully before enacting a compulsory program of compulsory health insurance attached to the social security program. "Medicare" is a gross misnomer for this approach because it provides no medical care at all. It is simply a very inadequate and partial program of hospital insurance and certain other limited services and does not give the aged or the needy the kind of care that they require. The Kerr-Mills Act, on the other hand, recognizes that after retirement one may have a variety of ailments and so it provides for doctors and surgeons and hospitalization and nursing and drugs and dental benefits.

The reason Kerr-Mills can give a more adequate protection against a compulsory universal program is simple. This Medicare program, being compulsory, requires that it be available to everybody so it is available to the wealthy as well as to those who don't need it at all instead of limiting it to those people who require assistance at the time of an ailment in old age.

Another reason the compulsory Medicare concept is wrong is that it does nothing whatsoever to protect the young family during its working years. It requires them to pay a tax sometimes as long as 45 years on the gamble that maybe after age 65 they will need some health benefits and on the improbable hope that nothing will happen to the family until that time.

In addition, past history assures us that social security taxes will continue to rise sharply. No one can foretell with any degree of accuracy the upper limits of that increase.

Originally, the social security tax was set at 1 percent each on the employer and the employee on the first $3,000 of annual wages. Now it is 3⅝ percent each on income up to $4,800. The tax on the self-employed has risen during the same period from 2¼ percent of the first $3,600 of income to 5.4 percent on the first $4,800. For many taxpayers, the social security tax already takes a bigger bite out of income than the Federal income tax. Even without the enactment of Medicare, the tax rate must be increased to provide for an actuarially sound trust account. By 1968, the employee-employer total tax will be 9.25 percent. Estimates based on actual claim experience of insurance companies indicate that within 6 years the estimated cost of the program will require a joint tax on a $5,000 income of 11 percent. This estimate is based on present benefits provided by the pending legislation. Once enacted there is little question that pressures would be engendered to expand the scope of the program, increase the benefits, provide for longer periods of time, and to lower the age limit. All this would of course substantially increase the wage tax and the employers tax for all American workers.

There is another feature of the compulsory wage tax and the corresponding tax upon employers for the limited health services proposed by the King-Anderson bill which I strongly dislike. That is the fact that this would be a system of regressive taxation for health purposes entirely violating the concepts of progressive taxation which have so long served us so well in the field of income taxes. In short, the health tax would entirely ignore and violate the ability to pay concept of taxation. It would in fact tax the very poor and the very rich at precisely the same tax rates on that first important segment of their annual income which serves as the tax base. For some Americans, for example, their entire income would be subject to this new tax grab while for the wealthy and the well-to-do by far the larger percentage of their income would be exempt from any health-tax assessments or payments. In many ways this proposed Federal health tax is far more unjust to those with marginal incomes than would be a Federal sales tax which some are now proposing in lieu of Federal income taxes.

Another important consideration which seems to me to argue against the compulsory social security approach is that in establishing such a program we are taking an irreversible step. I say irreversible because we will be requiring people to pay taxes to a program from which they cannot benefit until age 65 so, once started, it would be exceedingly difficult to discontinue. To take such a step at this stage strikes me as very unwise. We are venturing into an entirely new area so far as the Government is concerned. We cannot predict with accuracy at this point what problems and difficulties will be encountered. This being the case it seems to me that any program established should be highly flexible so that it can be easily modified to meet unexpected problems which are bound to arise. From this standpoint the pending proposal would be most unsatisfactory.

I urge the committee to ponder well this extremely important and far-reaching and irreversible decision and I strongly urge sufficient time for the Kerr-Mills Act to be tested in the laboratory of life so that its true worth can be examined and evaluated. Until that is done, I strongly urge this committee and the Congress not to take the irreversible step of meeting the King-Anderson bill.

[2] Associated Press story dated Oct. 29, 1963.

Radio and Television Coverage of Recent Sad Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I believe that recognition should be given to the television and radio networks for their coverage of the death of our esteemed President, John F. Kennedy, his burial, the transition of Government, and the meeting of the world leaders with President Johnson. In paying tributes to the networks, we should also recognize the part that the independent radio and television stations played in giving the people of the United States the factual

story. They all completely disregarded their commercial obligations and assumed the tremendous cost involved. I also noticed that the networks made all of their programs available to stations that are not ordinarily associated with them.

A serious crisis was averted by their report of the transition of Government. We must remember that the majority of our people had just viewed a shocking, tragic event—one that had not occurred before in the lifetime of the great majority. They needed to know that ours was a continuing Government—that the Constitution was to be upheld—that in time of great crisis that there were no political parties—that we were as one in the support of the new President in his conduct of international affairs.

This they saw with their own eyes when upon the landing of the Presidential plane in Washington, President Johnson was met by the Republican and Democratic leaders of the Congress and immediately assured of their complete support.

We must remember that these pictures were flashed around the world. This was a most needful thing. Many of the foreign countries believe that the assassination of a national leader is a signal for opposition political parties to seize control of the reins of Government. There are even those who might have wished to take advantage of the confusion that they would have believed to have followed such an action.

You may be certain that every foreign embassy was following every action and reporting on it to their governments. They saw a rapid and most orderly transfer of Government. The possibility of any adverse movements was completely averted.

The American people had immediate knowledge of the security of our Government—the leaders of the foreign nations of the world had immediate knowledge that our new President was the spokesman for all of the people.

The radio and television networks and the individual stations recognized their responsibility to the Nation. They well earned the title of a great American institution—one to be saluted by all of us.

Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt, Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Roy Arthur Hunt, of Pittsburgh, Pa., has been one of America's most talented and eminent women. Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt has received signal honors from many quarters for her accomplishments in horticulture and botany, as a master craftsman and designer in the execution of fine bindings of beautiful books, and as a highly respected authority on the medieval and renaissance literature about plants and gardens. We in Pittsburgh lost a true and generous friend of our city in her passing on February 22, 1963, and America has lost a true genius of the highest renaissance level, accomplished and outstanding in many fields.

Mrs. Hunt, the wife of Roy Arthur Hunt, chairman of the executive committee of the Aluminum Co. of America, was born at Turtle Creek, Pa., June 30, 1882. She was the daughter of Mortimer and Rachel McMasters Miller and attended Thurston School in Pittsburgh and Miss Mittleburger's School in Cleveland.

She was instrumental in founding numerous organizations in the fields of horticulture and literature. She was honorary vice president of the American Horticultural Society in 1956, was active in the Distinguished Daughters of Pennsylvania, the National Society of Colonial Dames of America, and had held many chairs in the national offices of the Garden Club of America. She was one of the founders of the Garden Club of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, Pa. She served for many years as an elected trustee of the associates of the Yale Medical Library, and of the John Carter Brown Library of Brown University. She was the first woman ever to be invited to speak before the erudite membership of the Grolier Club in New York City.

It has been in recognition of her achievements that she was awarded the Bulkley Gold Medal of the Garden Club of America and later its Distinguished Service Award of the New York Botanical Garden, the Gold Medal of Honor from the Herb Society of America, and a special certificate of meritorious service from the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society. In 1961 she received the Gold Medal from the Distinguished Daughters of America, and 3 years previously had been named Woman of the Year by the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce.

Mrs. Hunt was the author of many books and scores of papers in the fields of horticulture and literature. Most notable of the former was her monographic study of "William Penn and Horticulture." She was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of legal letters by the University of Pittsburgh in 1954 and the honorary degree of humane letters by Carnegie Institute of Technology in 1960.

Without question, Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt's greatest contribution has been the assemblage over a half century of collecting of what was the most important and largest private library of botanical and horticultural books in America. This highly specialized library was given by her and her husband to Carnegie Institute of Technology, together with funds for the fine new modern building which houses it, in 1961. As the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library, it represents today the world's only center devoted exclusively to the bibliographical research of botanical and horticultural literature and to the rendering of service to the public and scholars alike who are concerned with these fields.

Rachel Hunt was not a mere collector of books. She knew the books she acquired. She read French, Latin, and Italian easily and concentrated on the collection of books in those languages as well as those in English.

Rachel Hunt collected and studied illustrations as well as the extensive writings in these fields. She endeavored to bring together representations of the original paintings and drawings by botanical artists and illustrators that had been reproduced in the books of this subject area. On her passing she had brought together more than 3,000 water colors, several hundred black and white drawings, and in excess of 2,500 prints of botanical portraits and garden scenes. The greater part of these are works that were produced prior to 1850 and the oldest go back as early as 1540. The world's greatest botanical artists are represented and her collection of works by the great Belgian artist, Pierre-Joseph Redouté—1759–1840—is considered to be the most representative and complete available in America—surpassed only by the great collections once held by French royalty and now in the archives of various museums in Paris. Students today may consult these works at the Hunt Botanical Library and study with them the files of correspondence by both the artists and the authors concerned. Here are to be found more than 16,000 pieces of manuscript and autographed letters written by the men who contributed to the development of botanical or horticultural science during the 17th to 19th centuries.

Not content to have a library only of books, paintings, prints, letters, and manuscripts, Rachel Hunt also sought and brought together the finest collection of botanical portraiture available on this side of the Atlantic. Here are to be found the engraved likenesses of more than 300 botanists of the 16th to 18th centuries. Portraits in oil were also collected. Included is the only painting known to have been made from life of the great English herbalist and physician, John Parkinson. Also included is the only painting—a miniature—known to have been made from life of the renowned 18th century French naturalist, Michel Adanson.

No facet of botanical literature received greater attention and affection from Rachel Hunt than did that represented by the herbals: those early works of medical botany which dealt with plants then believed important for their properties of curing or alleviating human illness. Her collection of these is certainly the finest held privately in this country and includes many rare items of the incunabula period, those books published from the time of the Gutenberg Bible's printing in 1454 to the end of that century. More than 120 volumes are in this collection, six are the only copies known in America and two are the only copies known anywhere. It is a collection that matches favorably today with the great collections that have been assembled at the National Medical Library, the combined libraries at Harvard, and the fine collection at the Missouri Botanical Garden in St. Louis.

As a student of bibliography, and one to recognize the importance of adequate documentation of rare books, Rachel Hunt was the first person anywhere to promote and produce a catalog of her works (now being completed) that has been recognized and acclaimed as the finest bibliographical production in the field of biological science of all time. Her sponsorship and production of this fine work, both as to content and design, is a monument to her penchant for high scholarship and perfectionism. For the excellence of its content it has received the cherished Oberley Award for works in bibliography. For the excellence of its typographical design, its second volume was chosen as one of the Fifty Books of the Year for 1962.

Rachel Hunt was a woman small in physical size, but mighty in intelligence, the vigor and charm of her personality, in the height of her standards of excellence, and in her capacity to achieve her goals and objectives through undaunted determination and hard work.

In addition to her husband Roy Hunt, who participated with her in her wide interests, she is survived by 4 sons and 11 grandchildren. Not only has the field of botany and horticulture been enriched by her accomplishments, but all who are in any way associated with these two fields throughout the world will continue to be enriched by the fruits of her planning and foresight in the establishment and perpetuation of the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library at Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh.

Rachel Hunt is a glowing example of the tremendous influence on our U.S. culture and progress, that a dedicated American woman can have, in her goodly heritage that she has given to all of us in Pittsburgh, in Pennsylvania, and our good country.

Speeches by Hon. Wayne L. Hays and Hon. Leslie C. Arends, Before NATO Parliamentarians Conference, November 7, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the current and continuing concern over the future of the NATO alliance. It is a concern which will and must occupy the attention of the new administration and the Congress in the coming months for it is a matter of supreme priority to make certain that the free world's position is not weakened.

As we in the Congress consider these problems, I feel it would be well to have the principal speeches made at the recent annual NATO Parliamentarians Conference on November 7, 1963, by Representatives WAYNE HAYS, chairman of the House delegation, and Representative LES ARENDS, ranking minority member of the House delegation, readily available for further reference and I, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, am placing the statements in the RECORD today.

As a member of the House delegation, I found their statements to be important contributions to the work of the Conference and able expressions of the American position; and certainly ones which should not go unnoticed and unread here at home. The statements follow:

STATEMENT BY HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

We of the U.S. delegation welcome questions on the military and political value of a multilateral force. This force is now under study on a noncommitment basis by a seven nation working group meeting here in Paris. It will come into existence only if (a) it proves to make military as well as political sense, and (b) if enough members of the European side of the Alliance want it.

As for the military value of a multilateral force, the U.S. Navy, as Vice Admiral Ricketts, Deputy Chief of Operations, has told many of your civilian and service military chiefs, is convinced that the multilateral surface missile fleet would not only be feasible but also a militarily effective and powerful deterrent force.

The multilateral force, as our Navy envisages it, would have the latest version of the Polaris missile, would be deployed and operated in European waters in such a way as to give it high survivability, and would thus be a force the Soviets would have to respect. It would not be simply a "first strike" force. Indeed, we contemplate it would be put at the disposition of SACEUR for use against targets selected by him which directly threaten Europe or support any Soviet attack.

Those are the conclusions of our military authorities. We do not put them up on a "take it or leave it" basis. These conclusions are now undergoing multinational examination in a military subgroup in Washington. There, military men of seven NATO countries are now conducting a war game designed to test just these conclusions as to survivability and military value of a multilateral force.

We often get the question why, if an MLF is so good, the United States has not already invested in surface missile ships of this type. One conclusive reason lies in the United States geographic situation. Our Polaris submarines must operate worldwide from home bases in the United States, removed by thousands of miles from the European and Pacific theaters. The necessary range of these nuclear submarines is bought at considerable cost. The MLF would operate in European waters from a European base and would obtain the necessary survivability by dispersion, the method of operation of the warships, and the characteristics of the warships.

Let me digress here for a moment and say that these would be warships and there would be no attempt to have them seem anything else, except that on a radar screen they would look like merchant ships. To give you some idea of the difficulty the enemy would have in identifying these ships, let me recall to your mind our own experience when a group of rebels captured a Portuguese merchant vessel and sailed it through American waters for a week. There was considerable comment that the American Navy could not find it. Well, it is not generally known but it is a fact that the American Navy had to fly down and literally read the name on the bows of 400 ships before they found the one they were looking for. This gives you some idea, in the waters of Europe where there are literally thousands of merchant ships, of the difficulty the Russians would have in pinpointing each and every one of these ships of a multilateral force. Our people have concluded that it would be an absolute impossibility.

The additional substantial costs of nuclear submarines as carriers of the missiles would not be needed and would not add significantly to the military value of a European-based force. Furthermore, the surface warships would facilitate the indispensable factor of mixed manning.

The U.S. authorities do believe in the military value of an MLF. That is why they have gone on the basis that, if enough of our European allies want the MLF, the United States would envisage putting up something like one-third of the cost.

The President and the Secretary of Defense would not be contemplating that if this were a second-rate military ineffective political force. In other words, we just would not be spending one-third of the cost for something we did not think would be useful militarily.

The U.S. view of the MLF is not that it would be a frill, an extra or even superfluous addition to an already adequate alliance nuclear deterrent. If it comes into existence, it will be programed, like U.S. Polaris submarines and United Kingdom V-bombers, as a basic part of alliance nuclear strike forces.

The question arises, should European members of NATO want the MLF? That is for them to say. Many of us in the United States can understand a feeling that the burden of maintaining the nuclear deterrent of the alliance should not be left only to the United States. Certainly, this feeling has already been strong enough to lead two NATO members to the great effort of developing their own independent force de frappe. If our European allies do want to participate in the nuclear deterrent, we do believe that the MLF is one of the best ways to do it. They would then be part of a militarily first-rate, modern force, without oppressive costs for anyone of them, and in a way which would strengthen rather than go against the integration of the alliance.

The question arises, would MLF costs be excessive and be paid at the expense of needed conventional forces? We in the United States believe that strengthening of NATO conventional forces and thus improving the balance of NATO nuclear and conventional forces is necessary and is within the capability of our allies. As for the MLF, however, the multilateral approach which is inherent in it would make participation in the nuclear deterrent feasible without undergoing the level of costs which burden countries going it alone in the strategic nuclear field. To use some figures which would not be too far off of estimated costs, if the MLF cost $3 billion over a 10-year period, a 10-percent share would be $30 million a year. Many of our allies could afford one or more shares with that price tag—and without encroaching on required defense outlays in other fields, taking into account the rate at which national income is rising here and the gap between what many of our European allies allot to defense as compared with U.S. defense allocations.

As for the U.S. veto, let me put the question back to my colleagues here: would it not be only right that substantial contributors to an MLF will want a voice in decisions as to its use? The United States is no different from others. Furthermore, would you want nuclear war to be launched unless the United States—whose nuclear

forces would continue to be the major element of Alliance nuclear power—were joining in without any delay or doubt? The indivisibility of management of nuclear war is indispensable, here as elsewhere, for the effectiveness of the deterrent and for the solidarity of the alliance.

The MLF at this time is an idea put forward for discussion. It has not been considered, let alone adopted, by the Congress of the United States. What it is designed to do is to provide for fuller sharing of the burdens and responsibilities of nuclear defense in the alliance, in a way which will unite rather than divide the alliance. If there are other ways of achieving these purposes, we certainly hope that our allies will put them forward for consideration, which they will surely receive on the United States side.

Let me say further that I am known in the American Congress as a long-time friend of France. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee—a previous chairman—once jokingly called me his representative from France on the committee. I was the first to speak up in the Congress and defend General de Gaulle, but this does not necessarily mean that friends must always be in agreement. I would say to France that if she develops her force de frappe she will not be alone. She does not need to expect that she alone in Europe, outside Russia, will be able to have this weapon, without Germany and without other nations developing it too; perhaps not as soon but inevitably they will.

I would like to say also to those who have at least raised the suspicion that the United States would not consider an attack on Hamburg or an attack on Copenhagen or an attack on Brussels as a reason for going to war, that the United States would consider an attack on any one of those cities exactly as it would consider an attack on New York.

I further say to you that, if any of you doubt that, you have only to recall to your memory what happened only a year ago. As I said in the Political Committee, when the Russians had missiles in Cuba which were operative and which were coming into operation, which would reach every city in the United States except Seattle, Wash., the American Government made the decision to face them down and transmit word to Moscow that either the missiles had to go or we were prepared to go to war with nuclear weapons and to take the consequences. I would think that you would think that if Brussels or Copenhagen or Luxembourg were destroyed the United States would consider this just the same as if New York were destroyed. We are realists in the United States and we would know that if Russia made an all-out decision to attack any one of these cities or Paris or London or Rome, they anticipated a worldwide nuclear war and that they would get exactly what they were anticipating.

I want to say one further word, and again I think my French friends should think about this: There seems to be some difficulty economically in Europe and—I said this to a group of visiting Germans the other day, and I said the same thing to a group of visiting French that I spoke to in Washington—it is inconceivable to me to believe that Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Belgium, and the Netherlands are going to put up 65 percent of the capital for an economic cooperation and let France have 65 percent of the directors. I think this inevitably is going to fail. I am hoping that the French Government will reconsider its position and decide to join with the rest of the free world in an economic alliance that really has some substance and that will really do the job. I would say to them that I think we in the United States are willing to do our share in that kind of a partnership.

I have one final word, Mr. Lord President, and then I have finished. I should just like to throw out one word of counsel to my friends of the Labor party in the British Delegation. If they should come to power in England—and we have read in the papers that they well may—I think they may find that the path of doing business with Moscow is not going to be strewn with roses, and that the difficulties of doing business with Moscow are going to be just as great for a labor government as they are for a conservative government, or as they were for a Republican Government in the United States and as they have been for a Democratic Government. I think you always have to keep in mind that if there is a detente it is because Mr. Khrushchev thinks at that moment it is good for Russia. Whatever decision he makes, whatever agreement he comes to, I think you always have to keep in mind that he is not interested in what good it does for Great Britain or the United States; but his primary interest is what advantage does this give to Russia. If it does not give Russia a clear advantage, is it worth going forward with? I think this has to be kept in mind at all times. I am not one of those—and there are some in my country—who think that we ought not to talk with Russia, that we ought not to sell them wheat, that we ought not to do business with them. On the contrary, I think I was the first in Congress to speak up in favor of the wheat deal. I said I was for it for three reasons: one, it will help our gold problem a little; two, it will get rid of a little bit of our surplus; three, and most important, it shows to the world that Russia with its vast agricultural regions under its communistic system is not able to produce the food for its own people, whereas the United States under free enterprise system is able not only to produce the highest standard of living in the world for its own people, but is able to sell food to 50 other countries and help to feed the Russians besides. I would not like you to think that I am against everything Russian, everything which has the word Russian in it. I am a realist and I know that Russia is here, that Russia exists in the world. We cannot bury our head in the sand and ignore it. However, I would again advise my friends in Great Britain that it is not the easiest thing in the world to do business with the Russians.

STATEMENT BY HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

We have listened to our NATO parliamentarian colleagues with great interest as regards the problem of sharing responsibility for the nuclear deterrent of the alliance.

With respect to the distinguished speakers, we first wonder whether the representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Walker, is speaking for his Government, or his party, or for himself personally. Mr. Walker has said we face a definite choice between the required buildup of conventional forces or the establishment of a multilateral force. Should we assume that this constitutes a promise by the United Kingdom representative to build up British conventional forces and augment the BAOR to fulfill SACEUR's requirements? Immediately, let me say we would welcome this declaration, for we believe all NATO members should meet their NATO commitments and, we believe, there should be an equitable sharing of the burden for our common defense.

The United States, I am proud to say, has for long fulfilled its NATO commitments, and it does so today, even in spite of current balance of payments difficulties, which in large measure derive from America's effort to bolster the free world's defenses and hopes for a better economic future. In fact, some of our congressional colleagues cannot be here today because they had to remain in Washington to take part in the great debate on our foreign military and economic assistance program. Naturally the U.S. efforts directly relate to the problem of the sharing of the burden which should be the common obligation of all members of our great Atlantic alliance.

The United States wants to do its utmost to build a strong NATO; we only ask that others do their part. The United States looks upon our defense as interdependent. Again and again we have stated—and I state it now as a Member of Congress—that we would regard an attack on any part of the NATO area as an attack upon us. The United States wants to insure that the alliance realistically has the means to deter such an enemy attack and, if unfortunately deterrents fail, that the alliance has the defence forces to deal with an aggressor. The United States believes that we together in this Atlantic alliance can do what is necessary. Under the protection of the defensive shield of NATO over the past 16 years we have seen both Europe and America become more prosperous and our economic and social life greatly improved. Surely we can pay the costs of our defense insurance. The United States does not believe that we confront a choice in economic terms between adequate conventional forces and adequate nuclear forces, nor between SACEUR's conventional force requirement or SACEUR's nuclear force requirement. Economically we can afford to do both, if politically we have the will. So far there has not been a choice; it has been neither or nor; neither adequate conventional forces nor a shared burden with respect to nuclear forces. We have a time-honored American expression: he that has a glass house should not be the first to throw stones. So, over the years while America has fulfilled its NATO commitments, the NATO conventional defence requirements have not been fully fulfilled by our partners, although we are still waiting with faith. Meanwhile, in the nuclear area members of the alliance have been pulling away from each other and the cardinal principle of interdependence has been weakened. We believe that the alliance ought to pull together in the whole spectrum of our defensive deterrent and this responsibility should be shared.

Just as we seek to share the burden in the area of our conventional defense, the U.S. Government seeks to find a way to share responsibility, and even ownership, in the area of our nuclear deterrent. The U.S. administrations since 1960 have made a far-reaching proposal in this regard. They have offered one conception—full nuclear consultation and an Atlantic multilateral force—and nobody else has yet suggested any other. We, as American parliamentarians, may have various views on the American Government's proposal, and we are considering them among ourselves in our Congress. We are specifically awaiting the outcome of the studies now being made among seven countries—Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States—in Paris in the MLF working group and in Washington in a military subgroup. We think all of us should await the completion of these studies and if our governments recommend the establishment of an MLF we shall want, in our national legislatures, thoroughly to study the recommendation in all its aspects; at the time we could then also appropriately consider such recommendations in the NATO Parliamentarian Conference.

Meanwhile, it might be appropriate for me to state, if only in a general way, what the U.S. administration has in mind as a concept. The United States seeks to provide a means for every member of NATO who desires to share in the responsibility for the absolute weapon which constitutes the principal element of our alliance deterrent, and

this without causing the national proliferation of nuclear weapons. The U.S. administration seeks this in order that the Atlantic alliance might be more cohesive and united in common purpose and effort; it seeks the mutual recognition of our interdependence; and it seeks a practical way to further common responsibility and knowledge about the alliance's nuclear deterrent. To do this it has suggested the possibility of establishing an Atlantic force, multilaterally owned and manned, which would be an addition to any arrangement for deeper consultation and exchange of information in the nuclear field, and would be an addition to the necessary effort that must be taken to provide appropriate conventional defense. We all know SACEUR has declared there is a requirement for MRBM to deal with targets that especially threaten Europe. Obviously, the multilateral force would go far to meet SACEUR's stated requirements, especially as the missiles of such a force would, I understand, be assigned to SACEUR for targeting and would help fulfill his strike plan.

We think that we parliamentarians should debate this subject further when we have the completed studies being prepared here in the NATO building by representatives of our governments, and I hope we shall have a chance to discuss the matter in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

Our American Heritage—Birthplace of Thomas Alva Edison, Milan, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Alva Edison, his name, his accomplishments, his awards, are known to every schoolboy and schoolgirl.

Many are familiar with his home at Glenmont, Llewellyn Park, West Orange, N.J., now a museum operated by the National Park Service. However, not many are aware of the home built in 1840 by Edison's father, where Thomas was born in 1847. The attractive town of Milan, Ohio, where the birthplace of the great inventor, Thomas Alva Edison stands, is located 12 miles south of Sandusky on Lake Erie in the area known as Ohio's vacation land.

The red brick house, built by the inventor's father was restored by his wife and daughter, Madeleine (Mrs. John Eyre Sloane). Mrs. Sloane is president of the Edison Birthplace Association, Inc., and the major contributions for its support have been made by her. Mrs. Sloane deeded the birthplace and land to the association and she and her brother, Charles Edison, deeded to the association the house next door and an area of land going down to the old Canal Basin and the Huron River.

For several years I have been honored to be one of the trustees of the Edison Birthplace Association, Inc., a nonprofit organization formed in 1950. In order to insure its permanent preservation the Edison Birthplace Association, was formed with a board of trustees and provision for contributing memberships. This association now owns and maintains the museum. Memberships are used to provide a living endowment fund for its preservation and development.

It is important that the National Park Service recognize this historic shrine for future generations by designating it as a National Historic Landmark under their National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings in their subtheme study "Inventions and Scientific Discoveries." This is presently under consideration.

Lest we forget the incredible contribution Thomas Alva Edison made to our lives, I am listing below his principal inventions and discoveries:

PRINCIPAL INVENTIONS AND DISCOVERIES OF THOMAS ALVA EDISON

In 1868: Electrical vote recorder.

In 1869: Universal stock ticker and unison.

In 1872: Motograph, automatic telegraph system, duplex, quadruplex, sextuplex, and multiplex telegraph systems and paraffin paper and carbon rheostat.

In 1875: Discovered "Etheric force," an electrical phenomenon that is the foundation of wireless telegraphy.

In 1876: Electric pen used for first mimeographs.

In 1877: Carbon telephone transmitter, making telephony commercially practical. This included the microphone used in radio.

In 1877: Phonograph.

In 1879: Incandescent light. Radically improved dynamos and generators. System of distribution, regulation, and measurement of electric current—switches, fuses, sockets, meters, etc.

In 1880: Magnetic ore separator.

In 1883: Discovered the "Edison effect," the fundamental principle of electronics.

In 1885: System of wireless induction telegraph between moving trains and stations. Patented similar system for ship-to-shore.

In 1891: Motion picture camera.

In 1896: Fluoroscope. Fluorescent electric lamp.

In 1900: Nickel-iron-alkaline storage battery.

In 1914: Electric safety miner's lamp. Process for manufacturing synthetic carbolic acid.

Recognition as an historic landmark, without cost to the Government, will help insure preservation of the birthplace for future generations. Since it opened in 1947 the annual attendance has increased to some 16,000 persons and over the years, 166,165 people have visited it. Needless to say, a great number of the visitors are schoolchildren who obtain from it the inspiration to emulate Thomas Alva Edison's contributions to humanity.