United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1963

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

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

God of our fathers, facing tasks that tower above our power to achieve, with a sense of our utter inadequacy when left to our own devices, we bow here in silence for the strengthening benediction of our morning prayer.

As we lift our stewardship into Thy light, keep our goals clear, our hearts pure, and our spirits courageous as we are enmeshed in all the tangled tragedy of our ailing world. By Thy kindly light, as we follow it patiently and obediently, lead us and all men of good will to a realm where peace and concord shall reign, to a kingdom of human rights where mouths shall not cry for bread, where hands and feet shall not be shackled, where speech shall not be silenced, where eyes shall not be bandaged, nor minds darkened by distorting lies which hide the light of truth.

We ask it in the name of the One who declared, "I am come to put at liberty those that are bound." Amen.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of morning business until 12:30 p.m.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 3, 1963, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George I. Cline, of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky.

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles H. Tenney, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

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

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

KNOWLES AND CHINA GARDENS PROJECTS, MONTANA AND IDAHO

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should point out that the failure of the Simpson amendment to delete the Knowles Dam project would have compelled me to vote "nay" had I been present.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the minority views, appearing on page 330, of the report of the Committee on Public Works on Senate bill 3773, Calendar No. 2220, Report No. 2258, 87th Congress, 2d session.

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

MINORITY VIEWS ON THE KNOWLES PROJECT AND THE CHINA GARDENS PROJECT

The undersigned believe the testimony before the committee raised reasonable grounds for further consideration of the Knowles project and the China Gardens project. We believe the two projects should be deleted from this bill.

The Knowles project on the Flathead River in Montana was quite controversial with impressive testimony, as the printed hearings show, raising considerable doubt on the following points:

1. It is an economic detriment to the area.
2. It is not a feasible project.
3. It is not needed for flood control.
4. It would be detrimental to recreation and fish, wildlife and other conservation resources.
5. There are feasible alternative projects available.
6. Treaty rights of the Flathead Indians are jeopardized by the project.

The China Gardens project on the Snake River in Idaho and Oregon would also function as a regulating project for the High Mountain Sheep project upstream. The High Mountain Sheep project has been deferred. Therefore, it seems the China Gardens project should be deferred for further consideration.

A non-Federal entity that has a pending license application with the Federal Power Commission for High Mountain Sheep has committed itself, during hearings before the subcommittee, to undertake the construction of the China Gardens project if a license is issued to it for the High Mountain Sheep project. The question of license should be resolved within a year.

It is evident that no construction funds for China Gardens are to be voted and that none have been or will be requested in the current year.

The non-Federal entity has indicated no objection to Federal construction of China Gardens should a license for High Mountain Sheep be denied to it. Accordingly, nothing is lost by postponing action on China Gardens.

We see no justification for Federal construction of a project where a competent, resourceful, non-Federal body stands ready to build the same project and provide the same public benefits.

J. CALEB BOGGS.
JACK MILLER.
JAMES B. PEARSON.
MAURICE J. MURPHY, Jr.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of title 44, United States Code, section 393A, the Chair

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

reappoints, for a term of 4 years, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission.

COMMISSION ON THE DISPOSITION OF ALCATRAZ ISLAND

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–138, approved August 16, 1963, the Chair appoints the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] as a member of the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, 1964, FOR CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (S. DOC. NO. 45)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1964, in the amount of $210,000, for the Corps of Engineers—Civil—Department of the Army, which, with an accompanying paper was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Youngstown, Ohio, expressing sympathy on the death of the late President John F. Kennedy, ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Louisville Council 2530, Knights of Columbia, of Louisville, Ohio, expressing condolences on the death of the late President John F. Kennedy; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

S. 949. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–736) (Rept. No. 676); and

S. 2213. A bill to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency (Rept. No. 677).

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

S. 692. A bill to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 678).

By Mr. WALTERS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 2218. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 679).

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

S. 1169. A bill to authorize a per capita distribution of $350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (Rept. No. 742); and

H.R. 5945. An act to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico (Rept. No. 681).

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

S. 1757. A bill to ratify certain conveyances of land on the Crow Indian Reservation (Rept. No. 680).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1332. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Leitzel (Rept. No. 693);

S. 1410. A bill for the relief of Pietro Maggio (Rept. No. 694);

S. 1549. A bill for the relief of Hipolito Mora Lorilla (Rept. No. 695);

S. 1760. A bill for the relief of Dr. Margot R. Sobey III (Rept. No. 696);

S. 1781. A bill for the relief of Antonio Credenza (Rept. No. 697);

S. 1822. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Gerontis and his wife, Anatasia (Rept. No. 698);

S. 1829. A bill for the relief of Alva Arlington Garnes (Rept. No. 699);

S. 1943. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William H. Quasha (Rept. No. 700);

S. 1976. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Antero Sanchez (Hernandez) (Rept. No. 701);

S. 2085. A bill for the relief of William Maurer Trayfors (Rept. No. 702);

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Nick Masonich (Rept. No. 703);

H.R. 1271. An act for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang (Rept. No. 704);

H.R. 1273. An act for the relief of Bay Kow Jung (Rept. No. 705);

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jan and Anna Smal (nee Dworzanski) (Rept. No. 706);

H.R. 1432. An act for the relief of Pasquale Marrella (Rept. No. 707);

H.R. 1475. An act for the relief of John William Horling (Rept. No. 708);

H.R. 1495. An act for the relief of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen (Rept. No. 709);

H.R. 1542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy (Rept. No. 710);

H.R. 1545. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force (Rept. No. 711);

H.R. 1566. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto (Rept. No. 712);

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zoltan Friedman (Rept. No. 713);

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Hurley Construction Co. (Rept. No. 714);

H.R. 3366. An act for the relief of Ferenc Molnar (Rept. No. 715);

H.R. 3662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett (Rept. No. 716);

H.R. 3908. An act for the relief of Jeung Sing, also known as Chang Sheng and Rafael Chang Sing (Rept. No. 717);

H.R. 4141. An act for the relief of Smith L. Parrett and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents (Rept. No. 718);

H.R. 4288. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden (Rept. No. 719);

H.R. 4507. An act for the relief of Angeliki Devaris (Rept. No. 720);

H.R. 4760. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin (Rept. No. 721);

H.R. 4862. An act for the relief of Tricia Kim (Rept. No. 722);

H.R. 5083. An act for the relief of John Stewart Murphy (Rept. No. 723);

H.R. 5289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber (Rept. No. 724);

H.R. 5453. An act for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux) (Rept. No. 725);

H.R. 5495. An act for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y. (Rept. No. 726);

H.R. 5753. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (Rept. No. 727);

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Betty Onken Voegelin (Rept. No. 728);

H.R. 6038. An act for the relief of Mariano Carrese and Vinvenzina Ciavattini Restuccia (Rept. No. 729);

H.R. 6316. An act for the relief of Generoso Bucci Cammisa (Rept. No. 730);

H.R. 6624. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Foto Napoli, Salvatore Napoli, Antonina Napoli, and Michela Napoli (Rept. No. 731);

H.R. 6808. An act for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 732);

H.R. 7268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingrid Gudrun Schroder Brown (Rept. No. 733); and

H.R. 7601. An act for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz. (Rept. No. 734).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 633. A bill for the relief of Michelle Su Zehr (Lim Myung Im) (Rept. No. 735);

S. 1518. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake (Rept. No. 736);

S. 1951. A bill for the relief of George Elias NeJame (Noujaim) (Rept. No. 737);

S. 1958. A bill for the relief of Ivanka Pekar (Rept. No. 738); and

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson (Rept. No. 739).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2084. A bill for the relief of Peitrina Del Frate (Rept. No. 740); and

H.R. 1289. An act for the relief of Maria Merghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina) (Rept. No. 741).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week. (Rept. No. 682); and

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week (Rept. No. 683).

By Mr. DODD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1319. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents (Rept. No. 684).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 4766. An act for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co. (Rept. No. 685).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 4157. An act to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 743).

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 776. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying (Rept. No. 686).

By Mr. HRUSKA, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 579. A bill for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova (Rept. No. 687).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2242. A bill for the relief of Livia Sernini (Cucciati) (Rept. No. 688).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2040. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to permit a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 689); and

H.R. 5703. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy (Rept. No. 690).

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1832. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 691); and

H.R. 1213. An act for the relief of World Games, Inc. (Rept. No. 692).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 2357. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2358. A bill to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation of the facts relating to the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2359. A bill for the relief of Roberto Biteranta Mejorada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2360. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2361. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the columns removed from the east central portico of the Capitol in an architecturally appropriate manner in the National Arboretum; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE EULOGIES TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, DELIVERED IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL ON NOVEMBER 24, 1963

Mr. HAYDEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 230), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the eulogies to the late President John F. Kennedy delivered in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol on November 24, 1963, by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Chief Justice Earl Warren, and Speaker of the House John W. McCormack.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five hundred and forty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which one hundred and three thousand shall be for the use of the Senate and four hundred and forty-one thousand for the use of the House of Representatives.

PROPOSED WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a new wheat price support proposal. A companion bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota.

This bill would amend the present wheat certificate law providing a much simpler and more workable domestic parity program for wheat. Unless Congress enacts new wheat legislation, the present certificate program will have to be voted on again by wheat producers in a referendum early next year. Because of many complications and some undesirable features of the present law, it is highly unlikely that it would receive the necessary two-thirds vote in another referendum. This means that price supports would drop to about $1.30 a bushel. It would be utterly impossible for wheat farmers to survive this drastic drop in prices when costs of operation continue to rise year by year. The repercussions of a chaotic wheat price situation would have direct and adverse effects on the prices of most other commodities.

This new proposal would amend the present wheat certificate plan. The improvements proposed would make this a simpler and more workable program. It would be completely voluntary and would contain no marketing penalties. It would assure wheat produces 100 percent of parity for that portion of their crop consumed domestically and world prices for the balance.

Under this proposal the Secretary of Agriculture would determine each year the amount of wheat necessary to meet domestic and export requirements. This could not be less than 1 billion bushels. The Secretary would announce the acreage needed to meet the desired annual production goal. The national allotments and the State, county, and farm allotments would be arrived at in the same manner as allotments are now determined.

Using this formula the national allotment for next year would be about 50 million acres which, it is anticipated, would produce 1.2 billion bushels. If present export levels could be maintained or even increased, as now appears entirely possible, acreage allotments would be much higher. There would be a minimum support level, as provided under existing law, which the Secretary has announced as $1.30 a bushel. The farmer would receive, in addition to this, 100 percent of parity which is currently $2.51 a bushel for that portion of his wheat which is consumed in the United States or approximately 500 million bushels. This would give the farmer a blended price of about $1.80 a bushel for all of his wheat. If the domestic market price were higher than $1.30 a bushel, the farmers would, of course, receive a higher blended price.

In addition to the blended price of approximately $1.80 a bushel, farmers who complied with the program would receive diversion payments for acreage reduction as is now the case under present wheat and feed grain programs.

Under the provisions of this bill, the President of the United States could elect to make payments for wheat certificates through the CCC as similar payments are now being made for both the wheat and feed grain programs; or he could elect to make the program largely self-financing by requiring the domestic processors to purchase the wheat certificates as is the case now under the wheat certificate plan. One of the great savings would be in the elimination of most if not all Government storage payments. There would be very few price support loans taken out by farmers at this much lower price support level.

This bill would repeal wheat marketing quotas and marketing penalties. It would, however, leave in effect the provisions for acreage allotments. Farmers who complied with acreage allotments would be entitled to marketing certificates and price supports. Those who failed to comply with allotments would not get any benefits from the wheat program but would be able to raise all of the wheat they wanted to and sell it free of penalty for whatever it might bring on the open market.

With these and many other simplifications, the program would be a true domestic parity plan, more commonly known as the two-price system. The bill utilizes the mechanics of the present law in allocating marketing certificates. These certificates, however, would be restricted to that portion of the wheat crop needed for domestic food consumption. A major advantage of such a program would be that wheat exporters would not be required to purchase certificates and wheat could move freely into export channels without expensive export subsidies. Presently, there is no restriction on the sale of most farm commodities to Russia and Communist bloc countries. Only wheat, cotton, tobacco, and rice—because of the particular type of price support and the export subsidy involved—have run into trouble. This program would eliminate such problems with wheat, as no export subsidies would be required. Most of the noncertificate wheat would be disposed of on the world market at world prices.

Mr. President, I send this wheat bill to the desk for appropriate reference and ask that it be printed in full as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2357) to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program,

introduced by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and Senators CARLSON and MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

REPEAL OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS

SECTION 1. (a) Sections 332 and 333 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by sections 311 and 312 of Public Law 87–703, are amended to read as follows:

"PRODUCTION OBJECTIVE

"SEC. 332. (a) The production objective for wheat for any marketing year shall be an amount of wheat which the Secretary estimates (i) will be utilized during such marketing year for human consumption in the United States as food, food products, and beverages, composed wholly or partly of wheat, (ii) will be utilized during such marketing year in the United States for seed, (iii) will be exported either in the form of wheat or products thereof, and (iv) as the average amount which was utilized as livestock (including poultry) feed in the marketing years beginning in 1959 and 1960; less (A) an amount of wheat equal to the estimated imports of wheat into the United States during such marketing year and, (B) if the stocks of wheat owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation are determined by the Secretary to be excessive, an amount of wheat determined by the Secretary to be a desirable reduction in such marketing year in such stocks to achieve the policy of the Act: *Provided*, That if the Secretary determines that the total stocks of wheat in the Nation are insufficient to assure an adequate carryover for the next succeeding marketing year, the production objective otherwise determined shall be increased by the amount the Secretary determines to be necessary to assure an adequate carryover: And provided further, That the production objective for wheat for any marketing year shall be not less than one billion bushels.

"(b) If, after the proclamation of the national acreage allotment for any crop of wheat, the Secretary has reason to believe that, because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in the demand for wheat, the production objective should be increased, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether such action is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for wheat. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such action is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding and the amount of any such increase found by him to be necessary and thereupon such production objective shall be so increased. In case any production objective is increased under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide for such increase by increasing acreage allotments established under this part of a uniform percentage.

"NATIONAL ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

"SEC. 333. Not later than April 15 of each calendar year the Secretary shall ascertain and proclaim the national acreage allotment for the crop of wheat produced in the next succeeding calendar year. The amount of the national acreage allotment for any crop of wheat shall be the number of acres which the Secretary determines on the basis of expected yields and expected underplantings of farm acreage allotments will, together with the expected production on the increases in acreage allotments for farms based upon small-farm base acreages pursuant to section 335, make available a supply of wheat equal to the production objective for wheat for such marketing year."

(b) Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting "prior to repeal of authority for marketing quotas" after the words "subsequent year" in the provisos in subsections (a) and (b), and after the words "subsequent years" in the proviso in subsection (c)(1) and in the second sentence of subsection (d).

(c) Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress is repealed, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the following provisions relating to wheat marketing quotas: (1) the sentence in section 334(i), as added by section 313(4) of Public Law 87–703, relating to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress; (2) the words "and marketing quotas for the marketing year therefor" in the second sentence of section 334a; (3) the first and next to last sentences of section 335, as amended by section 315 of Public Law 87–703; (4) sections 336 and 338; (5) the two provisos in clause (3) of section 339(b); (6) "wheat," in section 372(a); and (7) the last two sentences of section 379c(b).

(d) Section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1445a), is amended—

(1) by striking from subsection (2) the following: "if marketing quotas are in effect for wheat";

(2) by striking all of subsection (4);

(3) by striking from subsection (5) the following: "if marketing quotas are in effect for the crop of wheat," and

(4) by striking from subsection (5) the last three sentences thereof.

(e) The following headings contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, are amended as follows:

(1) The heading of subtitle B of title III is amended to read "SUBTITLE B—MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS".

(2) The heading of part III of subtitle B of title III is amended to read "PART III—ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—WHEAT".

(3) The heading of section 335 is amended to read "MINIMUM ALLOTMENT".

FULL PARITY FOR WHEAT FOR DOMESTIC FOOD CONSUMPTION

SEC. 2. (a) Section 107(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1445a), is amended to read as follows:

(1) price support for wheat accompanied by marketing certificates shall be at a level equal to full parity price therefor,".

(b) Section 379b of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 379b. Beginning with the marketing year for the 1964 crop, a wheat marketing allocation program shall be in effect as provided in this subtitle. Whenever a wheat marketing allocation program is in effect for any marketing year the Secretary shall determine (1) the wheat marketing allocation for such year which shall be the amount of wheat which in determining the production objective for such marketing year he estimated would be used during such year for human consumption in the United States, as food, food products, and beverages, composed wholly or partly of wheat, and (2) the national allocation percentage which shall be the percentage which the national marketing allocation is of the production objective. Each farm shall receive a wheat marketing allocation for such marketing year equal to the number of bushels obtained by multiplying the number of acres in the farm acreage allotment for wheat by the normal yield of wheat for the farm as determined by the Secretary, and multiplying the resulting number of bushels by the national allocation percentage. If a noncommercial wheat-producing area is established for any marketing year, farms in such area shall be given wheat marketing allocations which are determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in relation to the wheat marketing allocation given producers in the commercial wheat-producing area."

CERTIFICATES FOR PRIOR CROP WHEAT IF CURRENT CROP UNDERPLANTED

SEC. 3. Section 379c (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by amending clause (ii) of the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "(ii) the amount of uncertificated wheat remaining on hand from prior crops".

AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND REQUIREMENT FOR PURCHASE OF CERTIFICATES BY PROCESSORS

SEC. 4. (a) Section 379d (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) All persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products shall, prior to marketing any such product for human food in the United States, acquire marketing certificates equivalent to the number of bushels of wheat contained in such product. Marketing certificates shall be valid to cover only sales made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued, and after being once used to cover a sale of a food product shall be void and shall be disposed of in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions hereof, the Secretary may require marketing certificates issued for any marketing year to be acquired to cover sales made on or after the date during the calendar year in which wheat harvested in such calendar year begins to be marketed as determined by the Secretary even though such wheat is marketed prior to the beginning of the marketing year, and marketing certificates for such marketing year shall be valid to cover sales made on or after the date so determined by the Secretary. The requirements of this subsection may be suspended for any marketing year or other period by the President in whole or to such extent as he deems appropriate, if he determines that such suspension will result in the more effective regulation of commerce and the better effectuation of the purposes of this Act. In the event of such full or partial suspension, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall buy all marketing certificates offered to it in accordance with the regulations prescribed under section 379e."

(b) Section 379d(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "or export".

REPEAL OF MONETARY PENALTIES FOR PRODUCTION ON DIVERTED ACRES

SEC. 5. Section 339(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The producers on any farm (except a new farm receiving an allotment from the reserve for new farms) on which any crop is produced on acreage required to be diverted from the production of wheat shall, except to the extent otherwise prescribed by the Secretary, be ineligible to receive price support on wheat or wheat marketing certificates unless the crop is designated by the Secretary as one which is not in surplus supply and will not be in surplus supply if it is permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage, or as one the production of which will not substantially impair the purpose of the requirements of this section. The acreage required to be diverted from the production of wheat on the farm shall be an acreage of cropland equal to the number of acres determined by multiplying the farm acreage allotment by the diversion factor determined by dividing the number of acres by which the national acreage allotment is reduced below fifty-five million acres by the number of acres in the national acreage allotment."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 6. This Act shall be effective beginning with the 1964 crop of wheat. Subject to adjustment as provided by law, the production objective for the marketing year be-

ginning in 1964 shall be in the same amount as the national marketing quota heretofore proclaimed, and the national, State, county, and farm acreage allotment for the 1964 crop of wheat shall be those heretofore proclaimed and apportioned, without further proclamation or apportionment. The support levels specified in section 107(1) and 107(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by this Act, shall be applicable to the 1964 crop of wheat, notwithstanding the disapproval of marketing quotas for that crop prior to the enactment of this Act.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a brief technical explanation of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF BILL

SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill provides for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program. It would—

1. repeal existing provisions for marketing quotas;

2. provide full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption;

3. permit certificates to be issued for wheat held over from a prior crop where the current crop is underplanted;

4. permit the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates, in which case all certificates would be redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation; and

5. repeal the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat.

Under the bill acreage allotments would be proclaimed every year. The amount of the allotment and its apportionment among States, counties, and farms would be as provided by existing law. Marketing certificates would be utilized as under existing law, except that they would be restricted to the portion of the crop needed for domestic food consumption, and the support level for certificate wheat would be full parity, instead of 65 to 90 percent of parity. The remainder of the crop would be supported at the level now provided for noncertificate wheat, and certificates would not be required for export wheat. The President would determine, in accordance with the objectives of the act, whether processors would be required to obtain certificates for wheat processed for domestic consumption, or whether the wheat for domestic consumption should move at the world price, with the certificate issued to producers being redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill would be applicable to the 1964 crop, the acreage allotments for 1964 being those heretofore apportioned.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

Section 1 repeals the existing provisions for wheat marketing quotas. That is its sole purpose.

Subsection (a) provides that, instead of proclaiming marketing quotas when the supply would otherwise be excessive, the Secretary shall determine a production objective each year and proclaim a national acreage allotment designed to achieve it. The formula for determining the production objective would be the same as the present formula for determining the amount of the marketing quota; the national acreage allotment would be the same as under existing law; and the national acreage allotment would be apportioned to States, counties, and farms as under existing law. Acreage allotments could be increased as under existing law, but the existing provision for termination is deleted.

Subsection (b) deals with the provisions in sections 334 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the existing law for preservation of acreage history where the marketing excess is stored to avoid payment of marketing penalties. Subsection (b) makes purely technical amendments to give recognition to the fact that under the bill there will be no marketing penalties after 1963. History would continue to be preserved, however, where the marketing excess was stored in accordance with the existing provisions during the years 1959 through 1963.

Subsection (c) repeals Public Law 74, 77th Congress, which deals with wheat marketing penalties; and amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 by striking out section 336 which deals with the marketing quota referendum, section 338 which deals with transfers of farm marketing quotas, and provisions in various other sections which have no meaning in the absence of marketing quotas. Paragraphs (8) and (9) of Public Law 74, which deal, respectively, with rice-marketing penalties and support for the 1941 through 1946 crops are obsolete, and their repeal merely strikes out ineffective provisions. Rice-marketing penalty rates are now established by section 356 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Subsection (d) amends section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the price support provisions for wheat, to eliminate references to marketing quotas. Section 107(2) now provides for the support level for noncertificate wheat "if marketing quotas are in effect." Subsection (d) makes section 107(2) applicable every year. Section 107(4) at present provides for the support level when marketing quotas are not in effect. The bill would repeal section 107(4), since a marketing certificate program would be in effect every year, and the support levels for certificate and noncertificate wheat are intended to be governed by sections 107(1) and 107(2) every year. Subsection (d) also amends section 107(5) which now defines "cooperator" differently when marketing quotas are in effect and when they are not in effect. Under the bill there would be only one definition of "cooperator," and various provisions of section 107(5) relating to marketing quotas would be deleted.

Subsection (e) makes changes in headings in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 required by the deletion of quota provisions.

Section 2 provides price support at full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption.

Subsection (a) increases the support level for certificate wheat to full parity (from the 65 to 90 percent of parity now provided for).

Subsection (b) limits the quantity of marketing certificates issued to producers to the quantity of wheat estimated to be needed for domestic food consumption (instead of including such portion of the estimated exports as may be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture as is now provided).

Section 3 would permit marketing certificates to be issued for uncertificated wheat on hand from prior crops, where the normal yield of the planted acreage is less than the farm wheat marketing allocation. The farm wheat marketing allocation is the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment multiplied by the national allocation percentage. Under existing law marketing certificates are to be issued for the farm wheat marketing allocation, but not more than the normal yield of the planted acreage, plus the amount of wheat stored from a previous crop to avoid penalty which is released because of underplanting the allotment. Since the bill repeals marketing quotas, there no longer would be any wheat stored to avoid penalty. The bill would permit certificates to be issued for any wheat stored from a previous crop to make up the amount of the farm wheat marketing allocation.

Section 4 would authorize the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates to cover the amount of wheat processed by them for domestic food consumption. This section also repeals the requirement that exporters acquire marketing certificates for wheat exported by them, since it is the purpose of the bill that the noncertificate wheat move freely into export. The President might suspend the requirement that processors acquire certificates either in whole or in part. If he determined, for instance, that the regulation of commerce would be better served by requiring the processors to acquire certificates for a part of the wheat processed by them, he could so provide. The suspension might be for an entire marketing year or a shorter or longer period, as determined by the President.

Section 5 repeals the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat. Producers would continue, however, to be subject to loss of eligibility for wheat price support and marketing certificates, if they produced crops on such acreage.

Section 6 would make the bill effective with the 1964 crop. The allotments heretofore established for the 1964 crop would be effective without further action, and the support levels provided by the bill would be applicable, notwithstanding the results of the quota referendum heretofore held.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to my friend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota—who in my opinion is one of the outstanding experts not only on wheat but also on farm problems in general throughout the Nation—was good enough, about 10 days ago, to give me an advance copy of the bill which he is now introducing.

Unfortunately, because of the circumstances which occurred, I have not had an opportunity to study the bill, but I wish to assure the Senator that I will read his remarks with great interest and with great respect, as always, because I believe he realizes the difficulties which confront us in the wheat-growing regions and is likely to come up with a sensible proposal to help meet the situation which will confront the wheat ranchers next year.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I greatly appreciate the comments of our distinguished majority leader. He, of course, has long had great interest in agriculture and has always been sympathetic to the programs for wheat and to the needs of all farmers. I wish we had more friends like him in Congress.

QUICK ACTION ASKED ON SUBPENA POWERS FOR PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL COMMISSION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to confer powers of subpena and other compulsory process upon the Commission recently appointed by President Johnson to investigate the facts relating to the assassination of President Kennedy.

This bill is modeled after the statute which granted similar subpena powers to the special Commission appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster. The

Commission which President Johnson appointed last week will exercise an identical function—that is, to ascertain and make public the true facts of a tragic event of great national importance—and it is essential to its task that it be authorized to compel the production of live testimony and documentary evidence—as I am sure they will find and will request. Because, in my judgment, the Commission should embark upon and complete its assignment at the earliest possible time, I am introducing this bill now, in the hope that it can be acted upon with dispatch, both in the Senate and the House, before the end of the present session. Hopefully, it can be done this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2358) to authorize the Commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation of the facts relating to the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, and for other purposes, introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOIL MAPS AND SUBURBS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to strengthen and improve the program of the Soil Conservation Service.

The purpose of the bill is to aid the planning of new suburban growth on what is now rural farmland.

In New Jersey alone, the population will by 1970 have increased by 25 percent to about 7.6 million, which will mean an explosion of new suburban development on what is now rural land.

But at the present time, new suburban development is all too often undertaken without any real knowledge of the soil.

A detailed knowledge of land capabilities has long been a basic requirement for scientific farming. Partially in recognition of this national need for standardized and reliable soil data, Congress many years ago created the Soil Conservation Service within the Department of Agriculture.

Since that time, the SCS has drawn up soil maps of over 20 percent of the acreage in the continental United States, thereby supplying the American farmer with invaluable information concerning the nature of his land.

As Federal programs go, this has not been an expensive effort. Last year, the SCS spent about $17 million on soil mapping activities throughout the country. But the value of soil maps, both through the savings achieved and the opportunities made manifest, has been incalculable.

Although the program was originally undertaken as a purely agricultural venture, many important urban uses for soil maps have been discovered in recent years. By a slight reorientation we can bring the skills and techniques developed in the service of our farming community to bear upon an important cluster of problems confronting our cities and suburbs.

The quest of millions of suburban Americans for a better life, for more pleasant physical surroundings and a more satisfying community environment, is much too well known a phenomenon to require further commentary.

What is not always recognized, however, are the kinds of problems that arise as new suburban developments spring up on land that was previously used for agricultural purposes or not used at all.

Just as the farmer has always known that land is far more than empty space to be occupied and used, the suburbanite in America has learned in recent years that the type, grade and structure of the soil beneath his feet must be taken into account in the formulation of his plans for the future. For the nature of the soil, in many ways not readily apparent, determines the capacity of the land.

Consequently, planning for the development of land in rapidly urbanizing areas would be enormously aided by the availability of soils data. Once completed, a soil map for a region is available for multiple uses by a wide variety of public and private agencies.

Health officials, for example, in many new suburbs are vitally interested in the kind of soil on which new housing developments are erected.

Thousands of new homes are going up every year on land which is miles from main sewer and water lines. As a result, the homeowner must depend on septic tanks for sanitary disposal.

Some kinds of soils, however, are just not suitable for septic systems, and some require larger disposal fields than others. But if this is not known prior to construction, serious sanitation problems will result.

All of which can spell tragedy for the homeowner who sees his dreams of gracious living in a pleasant environment blasted and financial disaster for the developer.

I could cite endless examples of this kind of thing in just my own home State of New Jersey. A recent instance in Bergen County is illustrative.

Individual septic tanks were installed for each of the 50 new homes in a development. But since the soil was already saturated from adjoining seepage, over half the homes immediately had drainage problems, both with their septic tanks and their lawns.

The upshot of the resulting litigation between the borough and the contractor is that it will cost each homeowner between $2,000 and $3,000 to have public sewage installed.

If soil maps were available, unfortunate incidents like this might have been avoided.

Nor is public health the only field in which a knowledge of soils would be extremely helpful. Low-lying lands that have sufficient natural drainage in their wild state often become subject to flooding when developed. Foundation bases for buildings, streets, and highways are affected by soil conditions which in turn determine construction costs. In sum, almost every phase of developing a new community must be done in reference to soils data.

If community leaders, planning commissions, zoning boards, education officials, real estate developers, and others are to make enlightened decisions, they must have at least a basic knowledge about the soils they have to deal with. And the Soil Conservation Service is especially qualified to supply it.

In some communities steps have already been taken. The city of San Antonio, Tex., for example, has realized the value of a soil survey.

San Antonio's city manager, Jack Shelby, has said:

> No official, department, bureau, or agency in San Antonio is now proposing construction without the soil survey as one of their basic tools.

But, unfortunately, San Antonio is not a representative case. Hundreds of other cities and towns that could make equally good use of soil maps do not have access to them.

The reason is quite simple. The Soil Conservation Service has very limited resources and the brunt of its efforts are still oriented toward agricultural needs.

In my own home State of New Jersey, the Service has only eight soil scientists working, and it will take them 15 years to complete mapping the State. Just five more scientists would speed this up more than proportionately, enabling all of the critical areas to be done in 5 years.

This bill would authorize the Soil Conservation Service to take steps to meet these critical needs before time has run out, and it would certainly help to repay States like New Jersey in some measure for all the money they have paid to support the subsidy programs of the Agriculture Department.

I think it is important to say that the Soil Conservation Service has done a fine job under difficult and confusing circumstances. Wherever possible it has been receptive to urban requests for its skills. But the present law leaves it unclear how much authority it has to undertake these projects on a large scale.

The bill would make clear that the Service does in fact have this power.

In view of the magnitude of the problem and the relatively slight cost of setting existing machinery in motion to solve it, I earnestly hope the Senate will give serious and favorable consideration to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2360) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

USE OF CAPITOL COLUMNS AT NATIONAL ARBORETUM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, early in July of this year I announced that

it was my intention to introduce legislation authorizing the use of the historic east front columns of the Capitol in the creation of an open-air pavilion at the National Arboretum.

Today I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the columns removed from the east central portico of the Capitol in an architecturally appropriate manner in the Arboretum. I am hopeful that Senators will give careful consideration to this legislation, for it offers an unusual opportunity for proper disposal of the historic columns in an esthetic and inspring setting.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this project will provide to the average citizen—the native of Washington, D.C., or the visitor to the Nation's Capital—a spot of striking beauty throughout the year.

We have been fortunate in obtaining the services and creative energies of one of America's truly outstanding architects—Edward Durrell Stone.

Mr. Stone has conceived in his plan full utilization of the elements necessary for a meaningful memorial to our historic traditions and also the future enjoyment in a natural setting for generations to come.

Such a project would provide impetus for the millions of visitors who travel to Washington yearly to enjoy and admire one of our newest and least publicized attractions—the National Arboretum.

Mr. Stone's plan envisions utilization of the 24 columns into an open air pavilion. A 4-tiered arc would be rimmed by the columns, 17 in the first, and 7 alternated in the second row. They would be reflected in an oval pond centered by a cascading fountain.

Mr. President, this bill would provide a breathtaking entrance to our National Arboretum, which borders the west bank of the Anacostia River at M Street and Maryland Avenue NE.

I doubt whether many of our citizens know about the 410 scenic acres whose higher hills overlook the Capitol and the Washington Monument to the south. In the east, the hills break in sudden drops to the Anacostia River.

It is altogether fitting that the project I am proposing will enhance this beautiful, natural setting with a living, vital, and inspiring witness to man's creative energies that can be enjoyed and appreciated by all people.

This project will not be encased in stark, cold slabs of stone. Rather, it will be a living memorial to the early traditions of a struggling democracy fought out in the halls these columns upheld.

Mr. President, I am indebted to those people who are actively supporting this project and to Mr. Stone, who has willingly given his services in the advancement of this new, bold utilization of our historic Capitol columns.

There have been other ideas put forth in the utilization of these columns. But I earnestly ask that my colleagues give their careful consideration to this project and join me in providing to the American people a living memorial that offers a refreshing, inspiring, and relaxing respite from a world of tensions, frustrations, and discord.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill authorizing the use of the Capitol columns at the National Arboretum be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2361) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the columns removed from the east central portico of the Capitol in an architecturally appropriate manner in the National Arboretum, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That jurisdiction and control over the columns removed from the east central portico of the Capitol in 1959 are hereby transferred from the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary is authorized and directed to utilize such columns in an architecturally appropriate manner in the National Arboretum.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed in the aggregate $880,000, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

AMENDMENT TO GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK BILL (AMENDMENT NO. 340)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to the bill, S. 2296, to create the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas. This substitute was prepared in the Department of Interior and accurately describes the exact area intended to be included in the proposed park as well as other provisions for its creation and administration. I approve of the Interior Department bill and introduce this substitute so that action may be expedited.

This proposal for creating a national park in the rugged Guadalupe Mountains of Texas is meeting with great favor in Texas, and approval by the National Parks Advisory Board was widely hailed. I ask unanimous consent to have printed after my remarks two editorials which illustrate this support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the many people who have worked so hard on this proposal to bring it to the stage it is today: The many fine public servants in the National Park Service, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall; Representative at Large Joe Pool, of Texas; and Mr. J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene, Tex., owner of this area, who has worked for years to conserve the area in such a natural state that it is today worthy of national park status.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Nov. 9, 1963]

THE GUADALUPES

Two sizable steps have just been taken toward the creation of a national park in the rugged and scenic Guadalupe Mountains of extreme west Texas.

The advisory board of the National Park Service has recommended the park's creation and Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, has introduced a bill to establish it. A similar bill already had been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman JOE POOL.

Congressional approval would insure that the great region encompassed by the proposal would be preserved for the public in its present wild and beautiful condition. Creation of the park would provide an outdoors recreation area for generations yet to come. The action of the Park Service's Advisory Board is gratifying, and Senator YARBOROUGH deserves commendation for moving the project into the Senate without delay.

[From the San Angelo Standard-Times, Nov. 9, 1963]

GUADALUPE PARK PROPOSAL

Not the least hidden resources of this State are the mountains in the western part—the foothills of the Rockies and in some instances just as scenic.

Right now, the Guadalupe Peak-McKittrick Canyon area is the subject of interest because an advisory committee for the National Park Service has recommendend it as a national recreation area. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has introduced a bill in the National Congress to create a national park in the Guadalupe Mountains.

A 72,000-acre playground there compares with the size of some of the ranches in the area and it wouldn't be a big park in comparison with the Big Bend, for instance. But it has as great scenic value, and it would tie in with the planned approach to link tourist attractions over a wide area. This would provide another point of interest between the historic site at Fort Davis and the border playground on the Rio Grande.

Creation of the park would well double tourist interest in this part of the State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROVIDE PENALTIES FOR ASSASSINATION OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, OR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of November 26, 1963, the names of Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2331) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President, the Vice President, or the Chief Justice of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators) on November 26, 1963.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CONVENTION WITH MEXICO FOR SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM OF THE CHAMIZAL BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold 2 days of public hearings, December 12 and 13, on the Convention with Mexico for Solution of the Problem of the Chamizal—Executive N, 88th Congress, 1st session. Executive branch witnesses will be heard on December 12 and public witnesses on December 13. Both meetings will begin at 10 a.m. in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

All individuals or organizations desiring to appear should get in touch with the committee clerk.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE BILL 1912

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to announce that a public hearing will be held in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m. on Thursday, December 12, 1963.

The hearing will be on S. 1912, a bill proposed by the administration and introduced by the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by request, to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; and on H.R. 7381, the administration measure which has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in an amended form.

Those wishing to testify on this legislation may arrange to do so by calling Capitol 4-3121, extension 5451.

MARGARET SANGER, A RESPECTED PROPHET IN HER OWN TIME

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Parade magazine of December 1, 1963, contained an article describing the crusade Margaret Sanger initiated 51 years ago when she advocated birth control.

The story is entitled "Margaret Sanger 50 Years of Crusading." Author Lloyd Shearer has chosen his words well. The tribute to this remarkable women is long overdue. I commend Parade for bringing this article to the attention of its many readers.

Today, Margaret Sanger has the rare opportunity to watch her countrymen and those of other lands discuss publicly the dilemma she recognized half a century earlier. Fifty years, of course, is barely a wink in the age of our planet, so I shall not be unseemingly critical of the reluctance then to discuss the population problem. Happily, today we can discuss it without being jailed or threatened.

Author Shearer describes Mrs. Sanger as "a respected prophet in her own time" in many eyes. He is correct. Her life has been a profile in courage. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Parade article appear at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Is it respectable and responsible to discuss birth control or the population problems which confront the world? Of course.

The American Assembly of Columbia University discussed the population dilemma at its 23d session at Arden House in Harriman, N.Y., last May. Participants came from throughout the land. Their recommendations were positive. It is pertinent to observe the conclusion:

> The vast majority of the people of the world, including a large proportion of the people of the United States, do not yet recognize the full implications of present population trends. The 23d American assembly cannot emphasize too strongly that time is running out for the formulation and implementation of world and national population policy.
>
> To continue to ignore world and U.S. population problems is to ignore the welfare and security of all peoples. We must not remain complacent in the face of a major threat to world peace and survival.

Implementing these words, the George Washington University American Forum on "The Population Dilemma" was held November 14–17 at Airlie House, in Warrenton, Va. Its participants came from many parts of the eastern United States. They represented numerous professions and interests. Many had vast knowledge of the population problem. Many frankly admitted they did not know, and said they had accepted the invitation to participate so they could learn.

The final report of the George Washington University American Assembly on "The Population Dilemma" should please Margaret Sanger. Consider the first sentence:

> The condition of mankind is such that there have never been so many hungry people on this globe.

And the second paragraph:

> The relationship of the earth's population to its natural resources and its man-made institutions, is a crucial matter if mankind is not to abandon the future to the brutal laws of nature and chance. The impact of accelerating population growth on peace and well-being presents a clear and present danger.

The report is a 1963 testimonial to the courageous struggle Margaret Sanger made earlier this century. In two of its recommendations the assembly suggested that there be:

> Wide dissemination of information about birth control at low or no cost for those who desire it, with full recognition that the right to decide what steps to take and methods to use belongs to the individual, and should not be abridged by local law or restriction.

And the assembly recommended:

> That medically approved methods of birth control, including effective contraceptive devices, be made available at low or no cost to all those who request them, and that they be provided at public expense by public health clinics and health centers.

I want to report that in another recommendation the assembly endorsed Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, introduced earlier this year by my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], of which I am a cosponsor. It relates to the population dilemma.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE POPULATION DILEMMA

(NOTE.—The George Washington University American Assembly final report on the "Population Dilemma," as adopted by the participants in plenary session, Sunday, November 17, 1963. This report does not include everything that was discussed, nor does it reflect ideas presented in only one of the four panels. It is not the practice of the American Assembly for participants to affix their signatures, and it should not be assumed that every participant necessarily subscribes to every recommendation.)

The condition of mankind is such that there have never been so many hungry people on this globe. A continuing high birth rate and a falling death rate have created an acceleration in the rate of population growth. The process has reached a point at which no authoritative prediction of population warrants indifference or apathy.

The relationship of the earth's population to its natural resources and its man-made institutions, is a crucial matter if mankind is not to abandon the future to the brutal laws of nature and chance. The impact of accelerating population growth on peace and well-being presents a clear and present danger.

This George Washington University American Assembly believes that—

(a) Man's present inability to deal with the basic needs of nearly two-thirds of the world's population suggests that a dampening of the rate of world population growth is imperative. The estimated present rate of worldwide population increase is approximately 2 percent per year. We believe that this rate should be reduced by at least a half.

(b) Efforts to deal with problems of economic development without regard for the rate of population growth are absurd and wasteful. Present concepts of economic growth, particularly as applied to less developed areas of the world, indicate the desirability of considering the impact of population growth on economic development. At the best these two forces may cancel each other. At the worst the planes of living will be lowered.

(c) Present efforts to study and understand the consequences of accelerating population growth, although far from adequate, are indicative of a growing worldwide concern. Present support for the concept of planning family size and responsibly controlling births comes from divergent sources that are surprisingly close in their analysis of the problem. In method of population limitation, the disagreement is still wide. The problem involves, for many people, moral issues and deep personal convictions. It requires and demands cooperation and good will.

(d) The world has achieved a phenomenal improvement in death control; the next step must be the achievement of a corresponding improvement in birth control.

(e) Family size is fundamentally a matter of personal choice by parents. Such choice ought to be based on knowledge of the consequences to the family and to society, and with knowledge of the means of effective family planning. Since reliance on voluntary self-regulation may permit those who are uninformed, irresponsible or indifferent to continue to procreate at an

undesirable rate, strong efforts must be made to encourage everyone to deal responsibly with this problem.

I. POPULATION AND WORLD AFFAIRS

The consequences of the present population explosion are destructive to the achievement of rising expectations in the low income countries. Where the present gap between hope and reality is broadest, it is possible that the introduction of modern techniques of health care and sanitation can so suddenly transform the ratio of births to deaths that the prospect of raising the standard of living gives way in face of a tidal wave of people in need of food, housing, education, and other necessities of life.

This assembly does not believe that efforts at population control are the exclusive answer to these problems. The complexities of sound economic and social development and reform go beyond population size, but cannot go far without serious consideration of this essential factor. Economic measures—liberalization of international trade, investment, and access to and development of natural resources—may be an effective means of raising world income per capita and reducing income disparities. These economic results are desirable in mitigating international frictions.

The days of mass migration in search of a better life are over. Migration will not be adequate in face of the probable rate of world population growth, although it may reduce pressures temporarily in a given local area. Basic solutions must be found elsewhere.

Our concern for the impact of burgeoning population on world affairs leads us to recommend:

1. The expansion of the activities of the United Nations and its specialized agencies in making effective information regarding the techniques of birth control widely available for those who request it.

2. Increased support be given to the collection of improved population and other demographic statistics; to continuing analysis and projection of these data; to analysis of the interrelationship between demographic and socio-economic variables; and to the dissemination of this information.

3. That U.S. aid will be most effective in those cases in which the recipient countries have developed effective and comprehensive plans which include attention to population problems as well as to fiscal, monetary, natural resource, public administration, industrial development, and other questions of importance to the development of the country. It is our position that U.S. aid should also be directed to help low per capita income countries to develop effective and comprehensive plans related to population control.

4. That those agencies, public and private, giving assistance to countries in the planning of development should take particular care to call attention to the implications of the population growth of such countries.

5. The population explosion is not only a concern of governments and international political organizations, but also of the international, nongovernmental scientific community. We recommend that these groups undertake research and disseminate information about population problems, birth control, and the nature of the reproductive process.

6. Since most advocates of birth regulation stress the privacy of the decisions that must be made to achieve responsible parenthood, and since the motivation of the individual is involved in any voluntary program of birth control, we urge the great religious and other private organizations to take leadership in motivating people to accept the basic concept of responsible family planning. The influence of many of these private international organizations transcends national boundaries and rises above the exigencies of rapid political change and economic fluctuation. Some of these deal directly and intimately with the individual and his conscience, where the personal decisions must be made in the area of voluntary population regulation.

II. POPULATION AND NATIONAL AFFAIRS

This assembly is aware that there are current national problems which are related to the rapid population growth of recent years. We are equally aware that every responsible demographic authority predicts a substantial expansion of our national population without regard to our success in finding solutions for current problems of urban congestion, transportation, air pollution, educational facilities and personnel, and depletion of water, timber, and other resources. We have unused productive capacity; we have not approached the maximum population which our resources can maintain. But optimism without regard to the present facts of population growth and the widely disseminated projections of population could lead us to the very position we wish to avoid—one which sees social and economic progress retarded by excessive and badly distributed population growth. We also feel that there is no economic justification for the oversimplified idea that population growth automatically creates new markets which in turn support a growing labor force.

Our concern for the impact of burgeoning population on our social, cultural, economic, and political institutions leads us to recommend:

1. Immediate and extensive efforts be made to inform the people of this country of the projections of population growth and of the enormous problems inherent therein. This should be undertaken by the political, educational, civic, and religious leaders at all levels, as well as by the media of mass communication. Moreover, our political leadership should encourage, through the United Nations, a stepped-up program of awakening world leadership to this problem.

2. Increased and intensified research and investigation of the impact on our society of population trends; such research and investigation to be supported by both public and private financial grants. This problem, we believe, should be assigned a high priority.

3. Increased and intensified research and investigation of the biological and medical aspects of human reproduction in order that a variety of techniques and procedures to control reproduction may be developed.

4. Efforts to promote responsible parenthood require more information about the role of social and cultural factors as they relate to family size. This assembly urges the expansion of applied research in the social and behavioral sciences to provide more information in this field.

5. Wide dissemination of information about birth control at low or no cost for those who desire it, with full recognition that the right to decide what steps to take and methods to use belongs to the individual, and should not be abridged by local law or restriction. Such laws and restrictions, now seldom rigorously enforced, should be replaced by the concept of individual responsibility.

6. That medically approved methods of birth control, including effective contraceptive devices, be made available at low or no cost to all those who request them, and that they be provided at public expense by public health clinics and health centers.

7. Honoring the requests of fertile individuals for sterilization when there is no violation of the patient's or the physician's moral convictions.

8. That revision of present policy and programs related to family and child welfare which seek to minimize unwanted and rejected offspring be carefully examined lest efforts to deal with irresponsible parents lead to harm to innocent children.

9. The appointment of a Presidential Commission on Population as suggested by Senators CLARK and GRUENING in Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, and the substantially increased programs of research within the NIH as called for in the same resolution.

10. Continued efforts to accelerate economic growth, broaden employment opportunities, and revise and expand vocational training programs, together with assurances that these will be available to all segments of the population without prejudicial discrimination.

11. Comprehensive programs of natural resource conservation which become increasingly important as population growth trends become realities.

12. The introduction of information concerning responsible family planning into the programs of schools and religious organizations, and particularly into the media of mass communication. The subject should receive attention in publicly supported adult education programs and local social agencies.

13. All the above suggestions for short- and long-range national and international action demand qualified professional personnel beyond our present supply. Educational facilities must be expanded in all these fields and efforts made to attract qualified people to the professions needed.

These recommendations, if put into effect widely, will have their own side effects with which society will have to deal. This assembly recognizes that some of our recommendations may create new problems. We feel that study and research, experiment and action, are very much the order of the day.

The first steps are underway, supported by a changed attitude on the part of responsible churchmen of virtually all major faiths, a new courage on the part of some political leaders, a real breakthrough in effectiveness by agencies which have been privately organized to deal with the problems of population growth—of which the Planned Parenthood Federation and the Population Council are outstanding examples. The great foundations have declared their interest and already devoted extensive funds to population problems.

This George Washington University American Assembly believes that the facts justify not panic, but confident action.

The choices here are hard ones. Population growth almost inevitably leads to multiplication of state controls, even in our free society. Yet control of population increases also involves some state action in a field of rights peculiarly private. For a free society there is here a true dilemma.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, 41 years ago Mrs. Sanger asked that I comment on the birth-control problem in her publication "The Birth Control Review." In that particular issue of July 1922, Mrs. Sanger asked:

Would not the legal dissemination of scientific birth control information through the medium of clinics by the medical profession be the most logical method of checking the problem of overpopulation?

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my response to that question and to three others asked by Mrs. Sanger be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BIRTH CONTROL: IS IT MORAL?

(Dr. ERNEST GRUENING'S answers to Mrs. Sanger's four questions)

1. "Is not overpopulation a menace to the peace of the world?"

Answer. A great menace. There are altogether too many people in the world. Quality, not quantity, should be the desideratum. If men and women are really superior to beasts, it is in their ability not to breed like rabbits or to spawn like jellyfish and turn their offspring into the ruthless jungle existence of tooth and claw, but to bring wanted, carefully nurtured, loved children into the world endowed with all the strength and fineness and potentiality for a happy existence which the planning and devotion of thinking beings can encompass. The overpopulation of the world has already borne the bitter fruit of war. Germany's congested multitudes were taught to believe that they were surrounded by enemies, that the open spaces of the world had been preempted and that Germany had to expand forcibly in order not to perish. However false this assumption, the fact remains that the Germans believed it, and it was a potent factor in producing the catastrophe of 1914–18. Japan's problems are similar—her overcrowding and inability to overflow into other lands underlies the present tense Far Eastern situation. Overpopulation is responsible for the fierce economic struggle all over the world. The changed conditions in the United States in the last 20 years, the repressions of the present day, the development of class consciousness and the intensification of the industrial conflict are merely manifestations of the patent fact that our country has at last filled up and has become overpopulated. Unemployment, an acute symptom of this condition, means nothing less from an economic standpoint than that there are too many people for our present system to support. A still graver symptom are the famines which regularly afflict sections of the earth, notably China, which we then belatedly and ineffectively try to relieve by feeble palliative measures.

2. "Would not the legal dissemination of scientific birth control information through the medium of clinics by the medical profession be the most logical method of checking the problem of overpopulation?"

Answer. It would. It is essentially the duty of the medical profession to accept full responsibility for the therapeutic phases of this problem. The new spirit in medicine demands that diseases be prevented wherever possible. The old adage is particularly applicable to matters of health that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

3. "Would knowledge of birth control change the moral attitude of men and women toward the marriage bond or lower the moral standards of the youth of the country?"

Answer. Neither. On the contrary insofar as it would tend to eliminate for all time the crime of abortion, its effect would be distinctly moral.

4. "Do you believe that knowledge which enables parents to limit their families will make for human happiness and raise the moral, social and intellectual standards of the population?"

Answer. I believe that no single reform capable of such immediate and widespread application would so greatly add to the happiness of the human race. There are no panaceas, but birth control properly established would go further to eliminate poverty, sickness, insanity, crime, with all that these scourges imply, than any other remedy proposed.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the world owes much to Margaret Sanger and to others who are pioneers in the birth-control field. The world likewise owes much to the men who have made possible the American Assembly university forums established in 1950 by Dwight David Eisenhower, then president of Columbia University. The American Assembly is a national, nonpartisan, educational institution, incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. Its assemblies are designed to illuminate issues of U.S. policy.

And we owe much to our late President, who did not let his personal beliefs interfere with the common good. Under his direction, our Government took important steps nationally and internationally in the unknown, unexplored, and controversial field of human fertility.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy's pioneering and his work for all men in this area must not be wasted.

Here in the Nation's Capital, Georgetown University has taken an active, positive lead in studying the population problem.

Last July, the Georgetown University population study center opened officially. The center will benefit all mankind as it explores the population problem and as it works toward the perfection of the rhythm system. Its director is Dr. Benedict J. Duffy. A pioneer in the population field, the late Dr. Donald J. O'Connor, good friend of Dr. Duffy and of mine, first brought the need of such a center to the attention of the Reverend Edward B. Bunn, president of Georgetown University, several years ago.

Dr. O'Connor was an economist of established reputation. Don O'Connor did not falter in his quest for a reasonable answer to the population problem which he had seen illustrated in Puerto Rico which would be acceptable to all, including the members of his own Catholic Church. His death delayed establishment of the center, but today his dream is being realized.

The progressive role of the Catholic Church as it relates to the world's population problem is heartening. I am pleased to report that I have received and accepted an invitation to speak at a session of the Institute of Social Ethics at Georgetown University when a course in population will be held June 17 through July 21, 1964. The institute is sponsoring an interdisciplinary course on the moral and social effects of the population problem. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter signed by the Reverend Francis X. Quinn, S.J., be printed in the RECORD.

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

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,
Washington, D.C., November 22, 1963.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: From June 17 to July 21 the Institute of Social Ethics at Georgetown University will sponsor an interdisciplinary course on the moral and social effects of the population problem.

By assembling demographers, sociologists, economists and clergy, educators and men in professional life, we will attempt to pinpoint some of the problems posed by the accelerating rate of population growth. The topics treated will include world population growth, world resources and technology, the current status of fertility control, birth control and public policy, family size, rhythm and the "pill."

We would like you to participate. Can you be with us on July 1 and discuss "Population Growth and the American Economy." We will be glad to have you as our guest at the University. We would appreciate any suggestions.

Hopefully,

Rev. FRANCIS X. QUINN, S.J.,
Institute of Social Ethics.

P.S.—I may be reached at Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.

EXHIBIT 1

MARGARET SANGER—FIFTY YEARS OF CRUSADING

(By Lloyd Shearer)

TUCSON, ARIZ.—Here, in a small, secluded sanitarium aptly called House by the Side of the Road, one of the world's most controversial women is approaching the end of her life's journey.

Her name: Margaret Sanger. Her achievement: Founding the birth control movement in America.

This year, on September 14, Margaret Sanger reached the age of 85. Her birthday passed relatively unnoticed, except by close friends and her two sons, Stuart and Grant. Both are physicians, one an internist in Tucson, the other a surgeon in New York.

Bedridden for the past 3 years with a heart weakened by recurring occlusions and a bloodstream that manufactures too many white blood corpuscles, this little, strong-willed woman, no larger than a minute, still retains the spirit which drove her to found a movement which many people consider one of the most important in the world.

FATHER'S OPPOSITION

"Fifty years ago," Margaret Sanger told me as her son Stuart and I sat with her recently in her sanitarium room, "I realized what was coming—the population explosion we hear so much about today, women having more and more babies until there's neither food nor room for them on earth. And I tried to do something about it. Now I have thousands of people all over the world aware of that problem and its only possible solution—family limitation and planned parenthood. But 50 years ago"—she breathed deeply and tossed her head—"what opposition I had: the law, the police, the government, even my own father. He was the most broad-minded Irishman I ever knew—Michael Higgins was his name. But he kept saying, 'Margaret. Get out of it. Get out of it. The kind of nursing you're doing, the kind of project you're involved in—that's no life for a girl.' "

In 1912, after she had been married 12 years to Architect William Sanger and had borne two sons and a daughter, Margaret Sanger from Corning, N.Y., 1 of 11 children, a feminist if ever there was one and a graduate nurse, wrote a series of articles for the New York Call entitled, "What Every Girl Should Know." In simple, understandable language she described the problems of puberty and adolescence, the cause and prevention of social disease, the parts and functions of the female anatomy.

These articles outraged a ruthless, fanatical intolerant named Anthony Comstock, who in 1873 had managed to push through Congress a censorship law bearing his name. It authorized him, as a special agent of the Post Office Department, to open any letter, package, pamphlet or book going through the mails and to rule personally on what was indecent or obscene.

According to Comstock, anything dealing with contraception or venereal disease was indecent, so that druggists, doctors, hospital administrators and scientists were afraid to use the mails to receive or dispense such information. They feared prosecution and imprisonment.

Comstock was a detestable man with a twisted mind. One time he ordered two of

his female decoys to write a kindhearted midwestern doctor, begging the physician for contraceptive information on the grounds that they were married to insane husbands. When the good doctor replied to the women, telling them what they might do, Comstock had him arrested and sent to Leavenworth for 10 years.

Comstock tried to do the same to Margaret Sanger. In 1913 this wisp of a woman was indicted by the U.S. Government on nine counts with a possible prison sentence of 45 years because she had insisted over and over again: "No woman can call herself free who does not own and control her body. No woman can call herself free until she can choose consciously whether she will or will not be a mother."

What inspired Margaret Sanger to write her articles and to found the birth control movement was the misery, the poverty, the degradation which met her eyes when, in the first decades of this century, she labored as a nurse on New York City's East Side.

"I can still see them," she says, closing her eyes and recalling the past, "those poor, weak, wasted, frail women, pregnant year after year like so many automatic breeding machines. Those poor women, crying, pleading, begging, 'Please tell me, Mrs. Sanger. You know the secret of not having babies. Please tell me. If I have another baby, I'm going to die.'

"You can't imagine what it was like," she continues, "what these hopeless women would do to prevent their continued pregnancies. They were poor. Their husbands couldn't support the families they already had. They sent their children out into the labor market at 7, 8, and 9 years.

"These pitiful women went to local abortionists, to butchers in many cases, and after illegal operations they bled to death. Others turned to drinking turpentine mixed with sugar, mustard mixed with teas. They threw themselves down flights of stairs to incur miscarriages. It was horrible, horrible—and all because there was no one, no person, no agency to tell them about contraception.

"I KNEW I WAS RIGHT"

"Seeing all this misery year after year, this needless death, and realizing that there was no one, no man on the scene, no doctor, no nurse, no social worker who would help them, I resolved that women should have some knowledge of their own bodies, some knowledge of contraception, that they should be rescued from their sex servitude. You ask me how I could face all the persecution, the martyrdom, the opposition. I'll tell you how. I knew I was right. It was as simple as that. I knew I was right."

Before Margaret Sanger went on trial for violating the Comstock Law, a powerful New York corporation lawyer, Samuel Untermeyer, undertook to defend her. "Listen," he told her one day, "I've spoken to the district attorney. All he wants you to do is not to break the law. You send me a letter with such a promise, and you won't go to jail."

Margaret Sanger jumped to her feet. "I'm not worried about jail. That has nothing to do with it. The question is whether I have done something obscene. If I have not, I cannot plead guilty."

"But the law," Untermeyer insisted, "says that to disseminate information on birth control is obscene."

"Then," said Margaret Sanger, "the law is wrong, and the law will have to change, not I."

Margaret Sanger went to jail for 30 days, but her imprisonment aroused the conscience of the Nation's womanhood. Women from every station in society rallied to her side in such numbers that they made possible the founding of planned parenthood clinics throughout the Nation. In 1937 the American Medical Association voted to give birth control its recognition and support, and the Federal courts ruled that it was neither illegal nor obscene for contraceptive materials to be sent through the mails. Margaret Sanger had succeeded in changing the law.

Like that of many women who fiercely dedicate their lives to career or cause, Margaret Sanger's private life suffered in the process. While she was in England studying with Havelock Ellis and while researching birth control on the continent, her husband was imprisoned for distributing her series of articles. When she returned to New York, her only daughter, Peggy, to whom she was deeply attached, came down with pneumonia and died. Her two sons, sent off to boarding schools, saw less of their crusading mother than they might have under other circumstances. Eventually Margaret Sanger and her husband were divorced. In 1922 she was married again, this time to J. Noah H. Slee, president of the 3-in-1 Oil Co. He died in 1943, leaving her with many fond memories of their work together and a picturesque home in Tucson.

Constitutionally incapable of rest or retirement, Margaret Sanger organized in 1948 the Cheltenham Congress on World Population and Resources. Delegates came from 15 countries. Mrs. Sanger graphically pointed out that death rates, because of discoveries in medicine, were going down and birth rates were going up. She prophesied that unless population growth was controlled, it would neutralize any economic or social gains. Frequently, she said, it would lead to war. She emphasized that the growing population explosion was a problem the world could not shunt aside.

Invited to speak in Japan and India, she lectured so convincingly and with such incontrovertible expertise that both countries came out in favor of birth control and instituted programs for planned parenthood. Today, Margaret Sanger's prophesies have come true. The world rate of population growth has doubled since 1945 and is increasing steadily. In 35 years the population of the United States will reach 300 million, and the world population of 3 billion will double to 6 billion. In the last 3 years the population of the world has increased by 185 million—or as many people as there are in the United States today.

RATE OF GROWTH

The earth's land space is fixed and inexpandable. Population grows geometrically: 2-4-8-16-32, etc. Since World War II, the world population has been increasing at 2 percent. This means that the total population will double every 34.6 years. Birth rates are highest in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, on which continents live roughly two-thirds of the world's population. Unless the birth rate is controlled, the earth will not have enough resources—water, fuel, food, and wildlife—to support humanity.

Margaret Sanger's movement was for years a source of controversy. Many sincere people opposed the dissemination of birth control information, both in this country and abroad. But nowadays all major churches recognize that the problem of population explosion must be met. As the Reverend John A. O'Brien, research professor of Theology at Notre Dame, points out: "Catholics, Protestants, and Jews are in agreement over the objectives of family planning, but disagree over the methods to be used." One church approves the rhythm method and abstinence, another condones "the use of the gifts of science for conscientious family limitation." A third approves the use of medical contraception only by the wife, for health reasons.

His Holiness Pope Pius XII, in 1951, explicitly approved the rhythm system for Roman Catholics as a means of spacing children. He also called upon science to perfect the system so that it might be made more sure and reliable.

Fifty years ago Margaret Sanger told the world: "The greatest issue is to raise the question of birth control out of the gutter of obscenity * * * and get it into the light of intelligence and human understanding."

Today, with two-thirds of the world rapidly approaching its biological bursting point, she is happy to note the changing tide of international opinion, the respectability and importance given family limitation. It is a source of deep satisfaction to her that the administration in Washington now is willing to give birth control information to those oversea nations who request it, that currently the population explosion is recognized by statesmen everywhere as second in importance only to the problem of preventing nuclear war.

"But we still have lots to do," Mrs. Sanger warns. "I believe no girl should get married and start bearing children before she's 18. One of the big troubles in China, with 730 million people, and India, with 461 million, is that girls there are married off at 12 and 13 and bear on the average of 6 to 8 children. Married people must contribute to the continuation of the human race, but they are entitled to some freedom of choice in the matter."

"At this moment," she states, "one-third of the world's people have a freedom of choice, but over 2 billion do not, simply because they don't know that it's possible to limit births. We've got to get the message through to these people, or in a hundred years humanity will drown in the ocean of overpopulation."

"I think that here in this country," she avers, "an ideal age for a girl to marry is 21."

Margaret Sanger, still irrepressibly pedagogic at 85, has spent most of her life battling segments of the state, the church, the schools, the press, and society. She has fearlessly faced imprisonment, condemnation, and ostracism. To many persons, both her name and her views are still objectionable. But in the eyes of many she has lived to become a respected prophet in her own time.

DAVID LAWRENCE EDITORIAL ON PRAYER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Americans continuing to ponder the legality of public prayer, in the light of recent Supreme Court decisions, were heartened somewhat by official statements uttered in observance of Thanksgiving.

The distinguished writer and philosopher, David Lawrence, has commented on this confusion regarding public prayer in an editorial published in the December 2d issue of the Washington Star:

> The American people have been puzzled as to whether anyone in the Government of the United States may * * * ask people to pray to God—

Said Mr. Lawrence.

> It was therefore, rather significant to note the frequent references to prayers to God which have been made in public speeches these last few days.

In his column, the writer quoted extensively from a Thanksgiving Proclamation prepared by President Kennedy, as well as from President Johnson's November 27 address delivered before the joint session of Congress. Both statements were replete with reference to God and deity and our obeisance to the omnipotent power which controls the destiny of all of us.

Even the Supreme Court's Chief Justice implored God to "protect our Nation

in this hour of crisis," in commenting on the assassination of President Kennedy.

Writer Lawrence concluded, and I certainly concur in his observance, "that these numerous references to prayer and to the deity are bound to be regarded by many people as proof that to mention God or to refer in public speeches to prayer is not to be construed as 'an establishment of religion' in a sense in which the Constitution uses the phrase."

Let us pray to God that such is the case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this most heartwarming and scholarly article printed in the RECORD at this point, with my remarks. I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues and to the broad cross section of the American public which daily receives the RECORD.

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

TRAGEDY AND PUBLIC PRAYERS—NEED SEEN TO IMBUE SCHOOLCHILDREN MORE DEEPLY WITH THE GOLDEN RULE

(By David Lawrence)

For several months now, the American people have been puzzled as to whether anyone in the Government of the United States may, on a formal or official occasion, ask people to pray to God. In fact, ever since the Supreme Court's decision which ruled that public school teachers could not be directed by State or local governmental authorities to use a particular prayer in the classroom, there has been a question as to what mention of the Supreme Being would be permissible in official functions.

It is known, of course, that atheists have been insisting that there should be no semblance of religious worship in the public schools, but many citizens who do believe in God have assumed that the Supreme Court sooner or later would clarify its position and permit voluntary prayers in public schools.

It was, therefore, rather significant to note the frequent references to prayers to God which have been made in public speeches these last few days.

In the address, for instance, which President Lyndon Johnson delivered before the joint session of Congress on November 27, he said:

"On this Thanksgiving eve, as we gather together to ask the Lord's blessing and give Him our thanks, let us unite in those familiar and cherished words: 'America, America, God shed His grace on thee, and crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea.'"

In the Thanksgiving proclamation which had been issued on November 4 to the American people, the late President Kennedy said:

"Over three centuries ago our forefathers in Virginia and in Massachusetts far from home in a lonely wilderness set aside a time for Thanksgiving. On the appointed day, they gave reverent thanks for their safety, for the health of their children, for the fertility of their fields, for the laws which bound them together and for the faith which united them under their God.

"So, too, when the Colonies achieved their independence, our first President in the first year of his first administration proclaimed November 26, 1789, as 'a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God' and called upon the people of the new Republic to 'beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions * * * to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue * * * and generally to grant unto all mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as He alone knows to be best.'

* * * * *

"On that day (November 28) let us gather in sanctuaries dedicated to worship and in homes blessed by family affection to express our gratitude for the glorious gifts of God; and let us earnestly and humbly pray that He will continue to guide and sustain us in the great unfinished tasks of achieving peace, justice, and understanding among all men and all nations and of ending misery and suffering wherever they exist."

On Thanksgiving Day, President Johnson spoke over radio and television to the American people. He referred to Mr. Kennedy's proclamation and said:

"Tonight, on this Thanksgiving, I come before you to ask your help, to ask your strength, to ask your prayers that God may guard this Republic and guide my every labor.

* * * * *

"On this Thanksgiving Day, as we gather in the warmth of our families, in the mutual love and respect which we have for one another, and as we bow our heads in submission to divine providence, let us also thank God for the years that He gave us inspiration through His servant, John F. Kennedy.

"Let us today renew our dedication to the ideals that are American. Let us pray for His divine wisdom in banishing from our land any injustice or intolerance or oppression to any of our fellow Americans, whatever their opinions, whatever the color of their skins—for God made all of us, not some of us, in His image. All of us, not just some of us, are His children.

"And, finally, to you as your President, I ask that you remember your country and remember me each day in your prayers, and I pledge to you the best within me to work 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."

These numerous references to prayer and to the Deity, coming as they do from the highest official in the Government of the United States, are bound to be regarded by many people as proof that to mention God or to refer in public speeches to prayer is not to be construed as "an establishment of religion" in the sense in which the Constitution uses the phrase. Indeed, there are many citizens who feel that while prayers of any kind can, of course, be said in the home or in churches or in public meetings, the recent trend which would banish any religious exercises in the public schools can only, in the long run, mean that opportunities will be missed to teach public school students the foundations of morality and good behavior.

Chief Justice Warren, in his comment on the assassination of President Kennedy, declared it was "a result of the hatred and bitterness that has been injected into the life of our Nation by bigots." And he said in conclusion, "May God protect our Nation in this hour of crisis."

But while people generally will wish to see hatred and bigotry eliminated from community life, they will also recognize that such a utopian mood will not come about unless schoolchildren, as well as grownups, are more deeply imbued with the golden rule mentioned in the Bible and the spirit of conciliation which is so necessary to solve the troublous problems of a free republic.

STATE DEPARTMENT CONFIRMS KEATING REPORT ON FRENCH AND BRITISH ACTIVITY IN CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several months ago I asked the Department of State for a report on the activity of French firms in Cuba. Informally, my office was informed that the Department of State had "no evidence" of French activity in Cuba. In order to be of assistance to them and make the information I had available to other Government sources, I supplied the Department with the name and address of the firm and asked what confirmation the Department had of these activities. Now, over 2 months later, the Department of State confirms my original statement, first made September 10, and offers some additional information as to French and British activities in Cuba.

In the light of continued Cuban terrorist activities, particularly in Venezuela, and in the light of continuing Castroite efforts to destroy the political stability of Latin America, I believe these reports will be of interest to the American people. There seems little doubt that the people of Latin America, when presented with a free and rational choice, will not choose communism. But the aim of Castro and those who are influenced and encouraged by his example is to deprive the people of that choice and to drive them by violence and deceit into the arms of communism, just as the Cuban people were driven. It should be a matter of serious concern—and I believe it is—to the United States when our allies contribute, in any way at all, to the economic potential of the Castro regime.

I believe it is increasingly important for the United States and also those Latin American countries directly affected to make their views known to other free world nations. It is increasingly important to tighten the boycott and isolation of Cuba and to discourage our allies, above all, from sales or activities that could strengthen Castro's position and prolong his rule in Cuba.

French willingness to sell equipment that can chemically process waste sugarcane into yeast should be a disturbing consideration, not only in the United States, but also throughout Latin America, where Castro continues, directly and indirectly, to menace economic progress and stable political development.

What is more, I am also reliably informed that another French company, in addition to those referred to earlier by me and now by the Department of State, is also active in Cuba, the Compania European Importacion & Exportacion and that French construction firms which had previously participated in tunnel-building activities are also looking for additional construction work in Cuba.

Moreover, the latest shipping reports released by the Maritime Administration show that, on an average, through 1963 more than one ship per day arrived in Cuba registered under the flag of free world nations. The number ranged from 12 in January to 45 in July. The current figure is just about one free world ship daily.

In my view, it is strongly in the interest of the United States and the whole hemisphere to have accurate and up-to-date reports on the activities of other free world nations in Cuba. The diplomatic tendency to conceal or to play down such moves only strengthens Castro's hand, as he tries, on the one

hand to undermine free nations and on the other hand, to get all he can from them. What is needed is a full and forceful account of the dealings between Castro's regime and other governments and businesses and determined pressure once again from our own Government to cut down still further free world trade and shipping with Cuba and to make it even more difficult than it is today for Castro to win recruits and foment violence in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks, the text of this correspondence.

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

SEPTEMBER 10, 1963.

Hon. FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DUTTON: Several usually reliable reports have come to my attention indicating the interest of French firms in establishing sugar-waste processing plants in Cuba, an interest which I understand has not been discouraged by the French Government.

I should appreciate a full report on this matter and any other information that may be available on the extent of current West European economic activity in Cuba.

Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH B. KEATING.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1963.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand from conversations with officials in the Department that as of now you have no evidence of any French firm that is planning to construct a sugar-waste processing plant in Cuba.

My information is that the name of the French firm is Societé Pour Equipement des Industries Chemique, 14 Rue La Boetie, Paris VIII ieme (S.P.E.I. Chim.). I am informed that this firm is planning to sell the equipment for the factory but as yet does not have plans to operate it themselves. I would appreciate your looking specifically into this report.

Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH B. KEATING.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 27, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Thank you for your letters of September 10 and 24 regarding the interest of French firms in establishing sugar waste processing plants in Cuba. I refer also to my letter of September 26 promising you further information on this subject. I regret the delay which this investigation has caused.

We understand that the Societé Pour l'Equipment des Industries Chimiques (Speichim) will supply a yeast plant to Cuba under a contract negotiated in early 1962. A representative of this company is now in Cuba discussing with Cuba officials financial matters relating to construction of the plant. This transaction reportedly does not need the approval of the French Government since it is of a nonstrategic nature. We understand that no credit was granted Speichim by the French Government.

In addition to equipment for the yeast plant reported above, two French firms contracted in 1961 to supply plant equipment: Carbonization Entreprise et Ceramique is reportedly supplying $228,000 worth of equipment for a gas plant at Puentes Grandes, Marianao, and the Compagnie Generale d'Entreprise Electrique has supplied a turbogenerator for a powerplant in Matanzas Province, in a reportedly cash transaction.

One British firm, James Mackie & Sons of Northern Ireland, sold $2,500,000 worth of equipment in 1961, to establish a kenaf bag plant at Santa Clara, under a contract that was signed in 1958.

We remain keenly interested in the question of the extent of Western European commerce with Cuba. The matter has been kept under review by the Department and remains a basis for continuing discussions with our allies at all diplomatic levels.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in a recent speech to the American Friends of the Hebrew University, David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of RCA, outlined the kind of scientific advances we can expect in the years to come. Paying well-deserved tribute to Prof. Milton Handler of Columbia Law School, one of our most distinguished scholars and practitioners in the field of antitrust law, and the latest recipient of the Scopus Award of the American Friends of the Hebrew University, Mr. Sarnoff dramatically depicted a future of challenge and opportunity. From the days of his arrival in the United States to the present, Mr. Sarnoff has been alert to the new horizons opening before us, and even more, he has himself contributed time and again to the opening of those horizons, and to the progress of science bringing new gains to the entire human race.

Mr. President, no one is better qualified to speculate on and explore the potentialities of science than David Sarnoff, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the text of his illuminating and exciting address to the American Friends of the Hebrew University.

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

THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE UPON SOCIETY

(Speech by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America, to the American Friends of the Hebrew University, New York City, December 1, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, Professor Handler, ladies and gentlemen, few occasions are as rich in meaning as the one which brings us together tonight, and I am grateful for this opportunity to pay tribute to a distinguished American and to the cause which commands his devoted support.

I first met Milton Handler about a quarter of a century ago when he was a young professor of law at Columbia University and I was managing the enterprise that still employs me. Milton, at least, has come a long way since then. He has become one of the Nation's outstanding legal scholars and practitioners, and an expert in antitrust law. Even as layman I have had some acquaintance—at the receiving end—with this branch of the law. While it is a complex subject for lawyers to teach, it can sometimes be even more complicated for laymen to understand. Milton Handler performs a vital task in his dedication to clarifying the basic principles of these laws, so necessary to the preservation of our competitive system and our cherished free economy.

Beyond his legal and scholastic attainments, Professor Handler has distinguished himself through his devotion to a vision—a vision of Hebrew University as an educational beacon in the ancient lands of the Levant, illuminating new paths of understanding for Israel, for her neighbors and indeed for all of the civilized world. I congratulate him most heartily on being this year's recipient of the Scopus Award of the American Friends of the Hebrew University and your organization on its wise choice.

Today, under the capable guidance of a distinguished diplomat, statesman, scholar, and my good friend, Eliahu Elath, Hebrew University is effectively fulfilling its mission. It is truly becoming, as Chaim Weizmann hoped it would, Israel's "spiritual dreadnaught." And it is both fortunate and deserving in the support it is receiving across the world, as exemplified by this occasion.

The rising generation that you are helping to educate faces vast new dimensions of change, stimulated by advances in science and technology on a scale and at a pace exceeding all previous experience. The world of your lifetime and mine is being changed politically, economically, socially, technically, even geographically, by epoch-making scientific breakthroughs. There is not a man alive today who is unaffected by the new scientific discoveries and their applications.

All of us, of course, have had countless foreshadowings of the changes to come. I remember arriving here, in the year 1900, as a boy of nine and my astonishment at the marvels I saw for the first time in my life. At the port of Libau, in Latvia, enroute to Liverpool, I beheld a ship, an unbelievable mass of smoke and steel moving on the water. And then in Liverpool there was another wonder to gape at—a trolley car that moved without horses.

It took one unending month to sail from Libau to Montreal. Perhaps I should explain that this voyage was in the steerage of a commercial vessel and not a leisurely cruise on a private yacht. When my family landed in America, there were further marvels to behold—the horseless carriage, the phonograph, the telephone and the electric light. While early models of these new wonders could be seen, they were not yet in general use. There were virtually no automobiles on the streets, and no subways underground; no electric refrigerators and air-conditioners in the homes; no movies and of course no talkies.

Marconi had not yet flashed his first wireless telegraph signal across the Atlantic and wireless transmission of the human voice was only a fantastic dream. Radio broadcasting was still 20 years, and television 40 years, in the future. The Wright brothers and their flying machine had not yet appeared in the skies.

In the intervening years, the wonders of my childhood have paled into the commonplace as the impact of science upon society has become progressively more pronounced. Now, we talk by telephone to friends or business associates at opposite sides of the world. We breakfast in London, dine in New York, and retire in Los Angeles. We hear and see on a television screen astronauts in global orbit. The world shares through television the happiness of the inauguration of the President of the United States; and it also shares through television the sadness of the funeral of that same beloved and martyred President.

In recent decades the products of the research laboratory and drawing board have poured forth at a bewildering pace. There has in fact been more progress in discovery and development of scientific knowledge and in modification of our environment since the beginning of the present century, than in all the prior millenia of recorded history.

Even at that—and this is a fact not fully appreciated—we are only at the bottom rung

of scientific achievement. There are many more scientists and physicists alive and at work today than the total number of those who lived in all the years of the past. The concerted application of their brainpower holds the promise of breakthroughs to new concepts and higher human levels. These opportunities are so great that Barbara Ward, the British writer, recently suggested that "only now is neolithic society being left behind."

What we have done in the past half century is to delineate the major areas of scientific conquest and to sketch their potentialities. Their fullest development is still to come.

It is likely that before the present century ends we will have the means to eliminate hunger. This will come not only through the extension of advanced agricultural techniques already available in the West—it is also probable that two major new sources of food will have been added. One is in the seas where the yield of food could be greatly increased through better knowledge of marine biology. The other is in the creation of synthetic foods, possibly at a cost low enough to eliminate all scarcity.

The essential nutrients man requires are basically chemicals whose formulas are well known and most of them can be synthesized in the laboratory. Eventually we can expect a flow of manmade foods that will compete in price, palatability, and nutritive value with the products of the farm. In addition to chemical and biological developments, it is well within the realm of the possible that germination and growth of foods may be accelerated by electronic means.

Man has always been the victim of disease and untimely death. Already medical science has extended average American life expectancy beyond the biblical threescore years and ten. In the not-too-distant future, birthdays celebrating the first 100 years will no longer rate press headlines.

One of the tiniest particles in the universe—the electron—has become a mighty weapon in the arsenal of medicine. An electronic device imbedded under the skin and known as the pacemaker, is now used to regulate the human heartbeat. By the end of this century, ultraminiature electronic devices implanted in the body will regulate human organs whose functions have become impaired—the lungs, kidneys, heart—or replace them entirely. The concept of electronic spare parts for the human machine will thus be realized. Already we have practical evidence of this possibility in the successful use of the artificial kidney.

People who die today because of the temporary impairment of some vital organ will be kept alive over extended periods by electronic and mechanical instruments until more permanent recovery is possible. Individuals who have lost an arm or leg will have their functions restored through electronic substitutes.

Our children and grandchildren will see electronics replacing defective nerve circuits, and even taking over some routine functions of the brain canceled out by strokes. Blindness, deafness, dumbness are disabilities that science will greatly reduce and ultimately eliminate. We will learn how to use electronics to serve as eyes, ears, and tongues for the afflicted. The body's own electricity can generate sufficient current to operate many of these devices indefinitely.

One of the most promising electronic medical potentials for the future is represented by lasers. These devices produce light beams so powerful and so concentrated as to illuminate an area on the moon only 2 miles in diameter; and so intense as to burn through a diamond at temperatures far hotter than the surface of the sun. Yet these pencil-thin beams are sufficiently delicate to cauterize a tumor out of the eye and to reconnect a detached retina. Recently, a medical electronics team also demonstrated their prospective value in arresting skin cancer.

By the end of the century we will very likely see laser beams within needle-thin tubes inserted into the body to perform clean, swift microsurgery on internal malignancies and other abnormalities. Indeed, with the electronic techniques in being or on the horizon, today's surgery will probably seem as antiquated 40 years from now as was the old practice of trying to cure disease by leeches.

Science is learning how life's hereditary patterns are transferred from generation to generation. In the nucleic structure of the living cell is the genetic code which determines those qualities and characteristics that pass from parent to child. Before the present century comes to a close, it seems likely that we will be able to decipher this code and thereby to alter many hereditary traits, to eliminate human diseases and defects, even to amend the behavior of cancer cells and so achieve its ultimate cure.

In the field of energy and power, man has historically been handicapped. This has been true even with the addition of coal, oil, and gas. But, this too will change, now that the secrets of the atom are being unlocked. One pound of uranium the size of a golf ball has the energy equivalent of 3 million pounds of coal, and the world's nuclear resources are far greater than coal, gas, and petroleum combined.

We will learn how to use atomic energy to blast harbors; to unfreeze icebound ports; to create reservoirs beneath the world's deserts to trap and hold water; and to provide low-cost power to desalinize the ocean's waters. Electric powerplants will be nuclear, and atomic energy will be a major power source, particularly in the developing areas of the world.

Suitcase-size atomic generators, similar to the one lofted into space this past September, will operate remote installations for years without refueling. Fuel cells, converting energy directly to electricity, will light, heat and cool our homes and operate the household appliances.

Atomic energy will power moving vehicles and revolutionize our present modes of transportation on land, sea, and in the air. The great cities of the world will be only a few hours apart, and many within commuting distance. Though the very words nuclear missiles today mean destruction, nuclear carriers will one day be used to transport mail and freight all over the world.

There is, finally, the universe around us. Manned interplanetary exploration will, in time, become an accomplished fact. If life exists on other planets, we may find solutions for some of the problems that persist on mother earth.

Around earth itself will be a network of weather satellites scanning the atmospheric sheath. Linked to computer systems, they will predict with increasing accuracy next season's floods and droughts, extremes of heat and excesses of cold. In shorter terms they will note any turbulence of sky and seas—typhoons, tornadoes, hurricanes—in ample time to be diverted or dissipated before they reach dangerous intensity. Indeed, the control and correction of weather is not outside the bounds of possibility.

In the field of communications, too, we are just at the beginning of most promising developments. Our grandchildren's world will be one in which it will be possible to communicate with anyone, anywhere, at any time, by voice, sight, or written message, separately or as a combination of all three.

Manned satellites weighing up to 150 tons and hovering over fixed points on earth will serve as switchboards in space to route telephone, radio and television, and other information, from country to country, continent to continent, and from earth to space vehicles and the planets beyond. Participants will sit in their homes or offices, in full sight and hearing of each other through small desk instruments and a color TV screen on the wall.

Within the next 10 to 20 years, it is more than probable that satellite television will be able to transmit on a worldwide basis, directly to the home, without the need of intermediate ground stations. This holds enormous significance for people everywhere in entertainment, information, and education. Audiences of a billion people may be watching the same program at the same time, with automatic language translators providing instant comprehension of the program's content.

"Ultimate" is a hazardous word to use in describing the future of any branch of science. If it has any application in the science of communications, it will probably arrive when an individual carrying a vest pocket transmitter-receiver will connect by radio with a nearby switchboard and be able to see and speak via satellite with any similarly equipped individual anywhere on this or other planets.

Ultrahigh and microwave radio frequencies, and the laser beams I mentioned earlier, can provide the billions of channels necessary for such personal communications. Private frequencies will then be assigned in much the same manner that an individual today receives his personal telephone number.

The developments I have mentioned—and others sure to emerge in the years ahead—are not merely further technological advances. They are so fundamental that they will alter the very structure of society and compel each of us to readjust some of our traditional concepts.

For example: We can expect that in time, science and technology will make it possible for our people to produce in 2 to 4 hours a day, what is necessary to supply our own needs.

However, beyond these, there will be other growing needs: to expand world trade; to adjust to the inevitable growth of automation, at home and abroad; to occupy the additional leisure hours usefully. These are problems that will challenge our imagination and command our best efforts.

But, these problems need not dismay us. On the contrary, they should be regarded as God-given opportunities for further progress that can add meaning, grace, and dignity to life for all mankind.

Since man's earliest groupings by family and clan, a basic cause of conflict has been lack of knowledge—an ignorance of strange people and strange things and the fears that it breeds. In primitive tongues, the word "stranger" was synonymous with "enemy." Other causes were disparity of resources and greed for their possession—haves against have-nots; neighbor coveting neighbor's goods. Today, the gifts of abundance inherent in science and technology, if used wisely, can bring relief and new hope to the have-not countries which have known only hunger, poverty, disease, and despair. It can thus remove one of the major causes of human friction and war.

I do not suggest that scientific maturity will suddenly transform mankind. Technological progress will inevitably create new problems, and the scientist alone cannot be expected to provide all the solutions. To adapt the words of Clemenceau that "war is much too serious a matter to be left to the generals," science is much too serious a matter to be left to the scientists. It involves the critical questions of disarmament and controls, peace or war; the size and purpose of the national budget; the sources of our livelihood and our manner of living; indeed the destiny of our civilization.

Not to recognize the basic forces of science and their titanic impact upon society, is to invite comparison with Aristotle's response when he was asked how much educated men were superior to the uneducated. "As much," he said, "as the living are to the dead."

At the meeting of the board of governors of Hebrew University in Jerusalem last year, Abba Eban, now Israel's distinguished Deputy Prime Minister, pleaded for "inventiveness and innovation in the search for the complete man, who is not humanistically illiterate, and a humanist for whom scientific truth is not a closed world." I join my plea to Minister Eban's.

Modern man—especially the would-be leader in society—has to be a culturally integrated individual, familiar with the sciences as well as the humanities. There cannot be two isolated cultures for the simple reason that there is only one society in which to live.

The statesman should have a better understanding of the sciences in order better to comprehend the problems that confront him across the conference table—problems that will become increasingly technological in nature.

The lawyer has need of education in the sciences because they have become a force in the lives of both government and citizen, forging new relationships between them. Lawmakers and the courts that interpret and apply the laws, likewise have need for an understanding of the scientific forces shaping our world.

Artists and musicians will find in science new dimensions of space, sound, and theme.

Science is also a proper study for the theologian, for religious revelation must be interpreted in the light of enormously broadened perspectives.

The ordinary citizen must know at least something of science if he is to serve himself and his country effectively, and not find himself an alien in a changed world.

I would propose that scientific and cultural education begin with the earliest school years and extend without interruption through college and into the professional schools. Specifically, courses in the social sciences and humanities should be related to the physical sciences. It seems to me highly desirable that science itself should be studied as a social phenomenon because of the great impact it has upon society.

In some areas, the process of scientific integration already is well underway. We see it at various levels of government, where the scientist has become as familiar a figure as the economist and the military specialist.

It would have been highly improbable 45 years ago to find a scientist by the side of Woodrow Wilson or Lloyd George. Yet in World War II, Prime Minister Churchill turned constantly to Lord Cherwell for scientific advice, and only a few weeks ago, Lord Hailsham, Minister of Science, was a prominent candidate for Prime Minister of Great Britain.

President Franklin Roosevelt had such distinguished scientific consultants as James B. Conant, Vannevar Bush, and Karl Compton. President Eisenhower created a post of Special Presidential Assistant for Science and Technology, and our late and distinguished President Kennedy wisely continued to man that post.

I have no more than suggested the possible shape of some of the things to come. Of this we can be certain: scientific realities of tomorrow will surpass our vision of today. The great challenge before all of us, is to make sure that the new knowledge and new instrumentalities shall be used constructively and not destructively. The powers of science and technology are neither good nor evil in themselves. Their capacity for good or evil lies in the use we make of them.

The crux of man's dilemma as he faces the future of change is this: While rapidly learning how to master nature, he is not making comparable progress in learning how to master himself.

Forty years ago Justice Louis Brandeis wrote: "If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold." Forty years from now, if our children and grandchildren are to reap the benefits of science, we of this generation must reasonably evaluate the new forces at our disposal, boldly implement them, and guide them wisely.

The Proverbs tell us: "Wisdom is the principal thing, therefore get wisdom, and with all thy getting, get understanding." In the context of the multiple revolutions promised by science, these words have never seemed more valid and more pertinent.

And in the indispensable search for wisdom the great universities of the world will play a crucial role. The Hebrew University assuredly is in this select company of institutions. Whether in the humanities or in the sciences, it draws upon an ethical heritage in which virtue is the central good, and peace with justice the highest virtue. That is why I consider it a high privilege to take part in the enterprise that has brought us here tonight, heightened by the personal satisfaction of seeing my friend Milton Handler honored as he so richly deserves.

FEDERAL AID TO FEDERALLY IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I wish again to call to the attention of the Senate the grave problem which confronts a very substantial number of Kansas school districts as a result of the failure of the Congress to approve legislation extending Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 providing Federal aid for federally impacted school districts.

The Senate will recall that the extension of Federal impacted aid for school districts is currently included in the vocational education bill, H.R. 4955, now in conference committee. Agreement on this bill does not appear imminent. Another version of extension of this Federal program is currently tied up in the House Rules Committee with no immediate prospects for House action.

Kansas schools face a unique and difficult problem because of the delay in the extension of Public Law 874 in particular. Our local governments, including our school districts, operate under what is known as a "cash basis law." This law, which was passed in 1933, prohibits a governmental jurisdiction from spending money which has not been budgeted and from creating an indebtedness in excess of the amount of funds actually on hand in the treasury.

Some 177 Kansas school districts have budgeted over $6 million in Federal impacted aid for their 1963–64 school year. Their funds on hand from other sources are reaching a low point and in a number of cases will soon be exhausted. Their school operations are in danger of having to be severely restricted. Other State and local funds will be forthcoming next year, but this does not relieve the immediate problem which has been created by the failure to receive impacted aid on its normal schedule.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point several communications from Kansas school districts and one from the Kansas State Superintendent of Public Instruction setting forth both the statewide and the local problems created by the delay in action on Public Law 874.

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

KANSAS STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Topeka, Kans., November 26, 1963.

The Honorable JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PEARSON: In behalf of the State of Kansas, I want to commend you for assisting in sponsorship of the Tower-Pearson bill S. 2304, providing for a 3-year extension of the impacted areas assistance program.

We are especially anxious in Kansas for the extension of Public Law 874, as amended, for the following reasons:

1. The Kansas Legislature in 1933 passed a cash basis law for all municipalities (G.S. 1963 supp., 10–1101—10–1122), a portion of 10–1114 states, "it shall be unlawful after May 1, 1933, for any member of any governing body of any municipality to knowingly vote for or in any manner aid or promote the passage or adoption of any order, motion, ordinance, resolution, legislation or other act of said governing body, creating an indebtedness in excess of the amount of funds actually on hand in the treasury of such municipality at the time for such purpose, or to knowingly vote for the drawing of any order, warrant or check, or other evidence of such indebtedness on the treasury of said municipality, in payment of such indebtedness, in excess of the amount of funds actually on hand in the treasury at the time for such purpose."

2. The 177 Kansas public schools, which last year filed applications for financial assistance for current expenditures for public schools in areas affected by Federal activities under Public Law 874 (81st Cong.), as amended, are under the Kansas cash basis law and many of these school districts have estimated the Federal funds as a portion of their budget. Unless this law is extended in the near future, a number of school districts such as Leavenworth, Junction City, Salina, Wichita, Derby, Washburn Rural High School, and Pauline Common School District will be facing financial shortages in the operational funds.

3. It has been estimated in Kansas, based on the application, filed by the federally affected schools, that their entitlements for the school year 1962–63 will be $6,173,421.43.

Unless Public Law 874 is extended in the near future and money appropriated to provide financial assistance for those local educational agencies upon which the United States has placed financial burdens, some of these schools will of necessity need to change their program and thus shortchange the students attending those schools.

Sincerely yours,
ADEL F. THROCKMORTON,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

SALINA, KANS.,
November 23, 1963.

Senator JAMES PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Salina Board of Education strongly endorses Senate bill 2304 which we understand provides for an extension of House bill 874 for 3 years. As you well know Kansas operates under the cash basis law. In the budget for the present school year 1963–64 the Salina School District anticipated receiving $450,000 for operating expenses under the

provisions of Public Law 874. Unless these funds are forthcoming as anticipated the Salina School District will face a critical financial situation. We are certain that many other federally impacted school districts will face similar critical financial positions unless this important legislation is enacted before many more days. We appreciate very much the assistance of you and Senator CARLSON in this tremendously important legislation.

KENNETH RYAN,
President, Board of Education.
W. M. OSTENBERG,
Superintendent of Schools.

JUNCTION CITY SCHOOLS,
Junction City, Kans., November 27, 1963.
Senator JAMES PEARSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PEARSON: The copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 14, 1963, showing your remarks concerning S. 2304 has reached my office.

You have stated expertly the budget and cash problems which our school and Kansas Federal impact schools face because of the delay in extension of Public Law 874 and delay in appropriations thereto.

We do so appreciate your taking this step. We trust that enactment of this bill can come quickly.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD DEEVER,
Superintendent of Schools.

JUNCTION CITY, KANS.,
November 23. 1963.
Senator JAMES PEARSON,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your support of S. 2302. Our budget is crippled due the uncertainty of the Federal impact revenue. We will soon be at the desperation point for cash on hand. Although we have survived the low cash plight to this date we are in a severe condition budgetwise until passage of the extension of Public Law 874.

HAROLD DEEVERS,
Superintendent of Schools.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I would urge that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare proceed with consideration of the impacted aid legislation in order that the Senate might act on it immediately. Last week, a number of Members of the Senate joined in the sponsoring of S. 2304, which would serve this purpose. While I joined in cosponsoring this bill, I am not wedded to it specifically if the committee desires to use some other vehicle. I would simply urge that some action be taken as quickly as possible.

CUBA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to join in the plea made yesterday to the emergency meeting of the Organization of American States in the name of President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela calling for more drastic action on Cuba than has heretofore been taken in the Western Hemisphere. This is the act which people who have my point of view have been waiting for—in short, collective action by the nations of the Western Hemisphere with respect to Cuba in essential self-defense, which the events in Venezuela have shown are completely justified against Premier Castro and the Communist regime in Cuba.

I hope that Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, and Mexico—the countries which continue to maintain diplomatic relations with Cuba—may now see clearly that they are out of step with the demands of security and with the position of the overwhelming majority of the nations in the Organization of American States.

Let us remember that the Organization of American States may act, under the respective treaties to which the United States is a party and to which all the Latin American countries are parties, by authority of 75 percent of its membership; and may take any action, including a military and naval blockade, in terms of securing the peace of the Western Hemisphere.

I have urged before, and I urge again, that President Johnson give consideration to throwing the United States behind this policy. Though we like to see the other countries in the Americas carry the ball, I believe this is a case in which we know quite well that if any action such as President Betancourt recommends is to be taken it will depend heavily on us.

I believe that the Soviet Union, which has heretofore made threats with respect to similar action on Cuba, will understand the meaning of self-defense and security, if the facts prove it necessary—and they are clearly indicated, for Castro has been engaged in actually seeking to subvert by force the nations of the Americas.

So for the first time, the door is open for collective American action, which is the way it can and should be done, fully in the tradition of the Americas and of the American system.

My colleague [Mr. KEATING] spoke on this subject today. It is a subject in which he has taken an outstanding and distinguished leadership. What has ensued in this situation now bears out a great deal of what has been debated, discussed, and proposed to our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for people of a liberal point of view in international affairs, like myself, the door is now open to collective American action with respect to the threat of Cuba to the security of Americans. I hope our President and our Nation will keep the door open, will go through it, and fully support what President Betancourt has asked; and that the other nations of the Americas will finally rally in terms of their own security and interest to the need for this type of action. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks the report by Henry Raymont entitled "OAS To Examine Caracas Charges Against Havana," which appeared in the New York Times, December 4.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 4, 1963]

OAS TO EXAMINE CARACAS CHARGES AGAINST HAVANA—INQUIRY ON ACCUSATION THAT CUBA FOMENTS TERRORISM IS VOTED BY 16 TO 0—BETANCOURT ASKS CURB—HEMISPHERE ACTION AGAINST SUBVERSION FAVORED AT EMERGENCY MEETING

(By Henry Raymont)

WASHINGTON, December 3.—The Organization of American States voted today to investigate charges that Cuba had smuggled arms into Venezuela to foster terrorism as part of a campaign to subvert democracy in Latin America.

The Organization's council, at an emergency session, decided by a 16-to-0 vote, with one abstention, to set in motion the machinery of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance to deal with the Venezuelan accusation.

Under the pact, known as the Rio Treaty, a country guilty of aggressive intervention in the affairs of a member state can be subjected to far-ranging collective sanctions, including the use of armed force.

FEAR OF EAST-WEST CONFLICT

Although the immediate issue was alleged Cuban arms shipments to Venezuelan terrorists, several delegates served notice during the 2-hour meeting that they wanted firm action against the broader threat of subversion instigated by the regime of Premier Fidel Castro.

[In Caracas, President Romulo Betancourt called for a partial air and naval blockade of Cuba to prevent arms exports.]

Mexico, indicating that inter-American measures against Cuba at this time might set off a new East-West confrontation and imperil world peace, cast the lone abstaining vote.

Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay, which like Mexico still have diplomatic relations with Cuba, voted in favor of considering the charges after stressing that they were not passing judgment on the merits. Bolivia and Haiti were absent.

As a first step after voting to invoke the treaty, the Council met as an organ of consultation on behalf of the Western Hemisphere's foreign ministers.

In this capacity, it designated an inter-American commission to study Venezuela's evidence. The vote on the commission again was 16 in favor, with Mexico abstaining.

Brazil voted in favor of the inquiry after demanding assurances that Cuba be given an opportunity to present her case.

The Cuban Government, although it has openly praised the Venezuelan terrorists, denied having shipped arms to them. In a communique issued last night, Cuba's Foreign Minister, Ral Roa, charged that the arms cache, discovered some weeks ago on a Venezulean beach, had been placed there by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

Ilmar Penna Marinho, of Brazil, emphasizing the gravity of the Venezuelan charges, suggested that the factfinding commission be admitted to Cuba as well as Venezuela.

The proposal caused considerable surprise since the Castro regime has rejected every attempt at international inspection either by the United Nations or by the Organization of American States which excluded Cuba because of her Communist ties in January 1962.

Some diplomats here believed that an outright Cuban refusal to cooperate in the inquiry would make it easier for Brazil to justify for home consumption severing her ties with the Castro regime should such

action be requested by the inter-American body.

Enrique Tejera, the Venezuelan delegate, suggested that diplomatic and economic sanctions would be the least his Government would demand if the investigation confirmed the evidence of Cuban intervention.

IMPARTIAL INQUIRY URGED

Tapping his desk with a pencil to emphasize his words and speaking in a slow, grave voice, he declared:

"We want the Commission to carry out an impartial, unhurried investigation. We agree with Brazil that the other party must be heard. But once all the evidence is in, Venezuela will demand a clear and heavy judgment, for it is no longer possible to allow a member of the system of nations to conspire against juridical institutions and to plot criminal acts of violence."

Mr. Tejera displayed 21 photographs he said were taken of the weapons. He also offered laboratory evidence of partly erased Cuban Army markings.

The envoy repeated his Government's charges that 3 tons of arms were found on an abandoned beach on Paraguana Peninsula, in northern Venezuela. Repeatedly he likened the cache to the terrorist methods used by the late Dominican dictator, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, that led to precedent-setting sanctions against the Dominican Republic in 1960.

Ward P. Allen, the acting U.S. representative, told the Council that his Government's technicians had verified the Cuban origin of the arms found in Venezuela.

He warned that the Castro regime could be expected to increase its subversive efforts as it faced increasing difficulties at home. But he suggested that only on the basis of the inter-American inquiry could the Council decide "whether additional steps should be taken" to increase the hemisphere's vigilance against Cuba.

USE OF FORCE DOUBTED

Other North Americans discouraged speculation about any imminent use of force against the Cuban regime. They conveyed the impression that President Johnson would hardly welcome another world crisis over Cuba at the outset of his administration.

The U.S. officials were also cool to Venezuelan suggestions that military measures should be contemplated. Their feeling, shared by most Latin American delegates, was that the factfinding committee should complete its investigation before such steps were considered.

The Mexican delegate, in a brief statement, urged the Council to be mindful that "the principal mission of every regional organism is the contribution to the maintenance of peace."

A report tonight that President Betancourt had proposed a sea and air blockade came as a surprise to OAS delegates. They believed that, despite today's show of unity, the Council would vote against the measure if it came up before the investigating Commission completed its mission.

The Commission, appointed immediately after the meeting by the new Chairman, Juan Bautista de la Valle of Peru, will be made up of Argentina, Colombia, Costa Rica, the United States, and Uruguay.

The Commission is expected to leave for Venezuela this week.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 4, 1963]

BLOCKADE OF 1962 RECALLED

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, December 3.—President Betancourt said today that he would seek a partial naval and air blockade of Cuba to prevent the export of arms to Latin America.

This was the strongest of the measures the Venezuelan President said he was asking of the hemisphere meeting in Washington.

He compared his proposal, which would involve the participation of members of the Organization of American States, to the blockade laid around Cuba in October 1962, to force the dismantling of the Soviet missile bases.

Mr. Betancourt, who spoke quietly and with apparent weariness, said foreign correspondents here for the election Sunday had overemphasized terrorism.

In response to a question he denied that the government had political prisoners. There are 200 to 400 Communist activists in preventive detention, a constitutional procedure, he said.

There are also "perhaps 100 terrorists caught with bombs and self-confessed slayers of policemen and military rebels serving sentences in jail," he added.

"You cannot speak of political prisoners here," he said.

President Betancourt said he lamented the kidnaping of Col. James K. Chenault, deputy chief of the U.S. military mission. He said that the police were searching for him. Colonel Chenault was kidnaped 6 days ago by leftists terrorists.

REVISED PROCEDURES FOR CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO STATE OF HAWAII

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 655, S. 2275.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2275) 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.

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 (a) (i) whenever after August 21, 1964, any of the public lands and other public property as defined in section 5(g) of Public Law 86-3 (73 Stat. 4, 6), or any lands acquired by the Territory of Hawaii and its subdivisions, which are the property of the United States pursuant to section 5(c) or become the property of the United States pursuant to section 5(d) of Public Law 86-3, except the lands administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, and (ii) whenever any of the lands of the United States on Sand Island, including the reef lands in connection therewith, in the city and county of Honolulu, are determined to be surplus property by the Administrator of General Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") with the concurrence of the head of the department or agency exercising administration or control over such lands and property, they shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii by the Administrator subject to the provisions of this Act.

(b) Such lands and property shall be conveyed without monetary consideration, but subject to such other terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe: *Provided,* That, as a condition precedent to the conveyance of such lands, the Administrator shall require payment by the State of Hawaii of the estimated fair market value, as determined by the Administrator, of any buildings, structures, and other improvements erected and made on such lands after they were set aside. In the event that the State of Hawaii does not agree to any payment prescribed by the Administrator, he may remove, relocate, and otherwise dispose of any such buildings, structures, and other improvements under other applicable laws, or if the Administrator determines that they cannot be removed without substantial damage to them or the lands containing them, he may dispose of them and the lands involved under other applicable laws, but, in such cases he shall pay to the State of Hawaii that portion of any proceeds from such disposal which he estimates to be equal to the value of the lands involved. Nothing in this section shall prevent the disposal by the Administrator under other applicable laws of the lands subject to conveyance to the State of Hawaii under this section if the State of Hawaii so chooses.

SEC. 2. Any lands, property, improvements, and proceeds conveyed or paid to the State of Hawaii under section 1 of this Act shall be considered a part of public trust established by section 5(f) of Public Law 86-3, and shall be subject to the terms and conditions of that trust.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Senate action today augurs well for the economic future of the State of Hawaii.

The speedy action testifies to the able arguments presented by the State administration, the democratic delegation to Congress, and administration representatives from the Federal Bureau of the Budget.

I thank the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], with whom I worked closely, and the Public Lands Subcommittee of which he is chairman, for this most expeditious handling of the bill.

I know that I speak for Governor Burns and Representatives Matsunaga and Gill when I express my deepest thanks to Dr. Harold Seidman and Mr. Howard Schnoor of the Bureau of the Budget. These two provided expert technical counsel which materially aided our cause in the Senate hearings.

All of the people of the State of Hawaii should feel extremely grateful for the timely Senate passage, which eventually will mean widened economic opportunities for all with the development of Sand Island and the continued return of surplus ceded land so crucially needed in the islands.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LAST SPEECHES IN TEXAS, NOVEMBER 21 AND 22, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on the last journey into Texas by the late President of the United States, the beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a series of five major addresses were planned by President Kennedy. Two brief, unscheduled addresses were also delivered.

The first address was delivered at dedication ceremonies for the Aerospace Medical Health Center at San Antonio, Tex., on Thursday afternoon, November 21. The second address was made in Houston later Thursday, in the early evening before the League of United Latin American Citizens at the Rice Hotel. It was brief and had not been on the original schedule. The third address was also in Houston at a testimonial banquet for Representative ALBERT THOMAS at the Coliseum Thursday night, November 21. The great appreciation banquet was in honor of Representative ALBERT THOMAS for his 27 years of effective service in the U.S. Congress.

On Friday morning, November 22, the President made another short, unscheduled address to a large crowd in an open square in front of the Texas Hotel at Fort Worth, followed by his main address at a breakfast in Fort Worth sponsored by the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce. All of these five speeches were attended by thousands.

The speech that President Kennedy had prepared for delivery for Friday noon, November 22, at the vast Trade Mart in Dallas was undelivered, as the assassin's bullets snuffed out the President's life while the President's automobile in which he was traveling with Mrs. Kennedy was about 4 minutes away in time from the Trade Mart. The Dallas meeting was sponsored by three nonpartisan groups.

The only political meeting as such that President Kennedy was to address in Texas was a banquet sponsored by the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee, to have been held Friday night, November 22, in my home city of Austin, the State capital. A great welcome awaited President Kennedy in Austin, a welcome denied the people of Texas as well as President and Mrs. Kennedy, by the heartless acts of a murderous assassin.

Mr. President, it was my honor and privilege to travel to Texas with the President and Mrs. Kennedy on the Presidential jet on November 21 and 22 and to travel in all the motorcades. The Vice President—now President—and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson traveled on another jet, but took part in all of the meetings and motorcades.

At San Antonio, President and Mrs. Kennedy went by motorcade from the International Airport to the School of Aerospace Medicine, through the heart of San Antonio, and then on to Kelly Field by motorcade, a total distance of about 22 miles.

President Kennedy was seen by more people than ever received any other parade for a person in San Antonio. At Houston, the motorcade went from the International Airport to the Rice Hotel. Thursday night, on arrival at Carswell Air Force Base, President and Mrs. Kennedy again led an open motorcade the 15 miles to downtown Fort Worth. Though this was about 11 o'clock at night, many thousands of people met the President's plane at Carswell, many thousands more lined the roads and streets the 15 miles to Fort Worth. Thousands more stood outside the Texas Hotel at Fort Worth or jammed the corridors and main lobby to see the President.

On Friday morning, the 22d, many additional thousands came out to line the streets and roads to cheer the President and Mrs. Kennedy on their 15-mile motorcade route back to Carswell Air Force Base. At Dallas at noon, hundreds of thousands of friendly people massed in dense throngs on every street to show their love and affection for the President and Mrs. Kennedy. The President had passed through all the downtown tall building area and passed the last high-rise building on the parade route, only to be cut down from behind by rifle fire by an assassin lurking in a dark corner of the fifth floor of the last high-rise building.

Mr. President, in the six motorcade rides in four Texas cities on November 21 and 22, President Kennedy had been seen by more than 10 percent of the entire population of the State. It was a warm, friendly enthusiastic greeting. I rode in each of those motorcades. I saw the people exulting, cheering, waving, calling to the beloved and esteemed President. More people in Texas had seen President Kennedy in these 2 days than had ever seen any one man on a similar visit to Texas before. President and Mrs. Kennedy had traveled more than 65 miles in open motorcade in Texas.

Mr. President, because of the governmental messages they carry, and the historic interest in these last speeches by President Kennedy, I ask unanimous consent that the series of seven speeches by President Kennedy including both Fort Worth speeches, and the speeches prepared but undelivered at Dallas and Austin be inserted at this point in the RECORD, in the following order:

First. Remarks of the President at dedication ceremonies, Aerospace Medical Center, Brooks Air Force Base, Tex., November 21, 1963—as actually delivered. Remarks of the President at same ceremony as prepared for delivery.

Second. Remarks of the President before the League of United Latin American Citizens, the Rice Hotel, Houston, Tex., November 21, 1963.

Third. Remarks of the President at testimonial dinner for Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, the Coliseum, Houston, Tex., November 21, 1963.

Fourth. Remarks of the President before a citizens rally in front of the Texas Hotel, Fort Worth, Tex., November 22, 1963.

Fifth. Remarks of the President before the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, Texas Hotel, Fort Worth, Tex., November 22, 1963.

Sixth. Remarks by the President as prepared for delivery to the Dallas Citizens Council, the Dallas Assembly, and the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, Trade Mart, Dallas, Tex., November 22, 1963.

Seventh. Remarks of the President as prepared for delivery to the Texas Democratic State Committee, the Municipal Auditorium, Austin, Tex., November 22, 1963.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES, AEROSPACE MEDICAL HEALTH CENTER, BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEX., NOVEMBER 21, 1963 (AS ACTUALLY DELIVERED)

Mr. Secretary, Governor, Mr. Vice President, Senator, Members of the Congress, members of the military, ladies and gentlemen, for more than 3 years I have spoken about the New Frontier. This is not a partisan term, and it is not the exclusive property of Republicans or Democrats. It refers, instead, to this Nation's place in history, to the fact that we do stand on the edge of a great new era, with both crisis and opportunity, an era to be characterized by achievement and by challenge. It is an era which calls for action and for the best efforts of all those who would test the unknown, and the uncertain in phases of human endeavor. It is the time for pathfinders and pioneers.

I have come to Texas today to salute an outstanding group of pioneers, the men who man the Brooks Air Force Base School of Aerospace Medicine and the Aerospace Medical Center. It is fitting that San Antonio should be the site of this center and this school as we gather to dedicate this complex of buildings. For this city has long been the home of the pioneers in the air. It was here that Sidney Brooks, whose memory we honor today, was born and raised. It was here that Charles Lindbergh and Claire Chennault, and a host of others, who, in World War I and World War II and Korea, and even today, have helped demonstrate American mastery of the skies, trained at Kelly Field and Randolph Field, which form a major part of aviation history. And in the New Frontier of outer space, while headlines may be made by others in other places, history is being made every day by the men and women of the Aerospace Medical Center, without whom there could be no history.

Many Americans make the mistake of assuming that space research has no values here on earth. Nothing could be further from the truth. Just as the wartime development of radar gave us the transistor, and all that it made possible, so research in space medicine holds the promise of substantial benefit for those of us who are earthbound, for our effort in space is not as some have suggested, a competitor for the natural resources that we need to develop the earth. It is a working partner and a coproducer of these resources. And nothing makes this clearer than the fact that medicine in space is going to make our lives healthier and happier here on earth.

I give you three examples: First, medical space research may open up new understanding of man's relation to his environment. Examples of the astronaut's physical, and mental, and emotional reactions teach us more about the differences between normal and abnormal—about the causes and effects of disorientation—in metabolism which could result in extending the lifespan. When you study effects on our astronauts of exhaust gases which can contaminate their environment, you seek ways to alter these gases so as to reduce their toxity, you are working on problems similar to those we face in our great urban centers which themselves are being corrupted by gases and which must be clear. And second, medical space research may revolutionize the technology and the techniques of modern medicine. Whatever new devices are created, for example, to monitor our astronauts, to measure their heart activity, their breathing, their brain waves, their eye motion, at great distances, and under difficult conditions, will also represent a major advance in general medical instrumentation. Heart patients may even be able to wear a light monitor

which will sound a warning if their activity exceeds certain limits. An instrument recently developed to record automatically the impact of acceleration upon an astronaut's eyes will also be of help to small children who are suffering miserably from eye defects, but are unable to describe their impairment. And also by the use of instruments similar to those used in Project Mercury, this Nation's private as well as public nursing services are being improved, enabling one nurse now to give more critically ill patients greater attention than they ever could in the past.

And third, medical space research may lead to new safeguards against hazards common to many environments. Specifically, our astronauts will need fundamentally new devices to protect them from the ill effects of radiation which can have a profound influence upon medicine and man's relations to our present environment.

Here at this Center we have the laboratories, the talent, the resources to give new impetus to vital research in the life centers. I am not suggesting that the entire space program is justified alone by what is done in medicine. The space program stands on its own as a contribution to national strength. And last Saturday at Cape Canaveral I saw our new Saturn C-1 rocket booster, which, with its payload, when it rises in December of this year, will be, for the first time, the largest booster in the world, carrying into space the largest payload that any country in the world has ever sent into space. That is what I consider.

I think the United States should be a leader. A country as rich, and powerful as this which bears so many burdens and responsibilities, which has so many opportunities, should be second to none. And in December, while I do not regard our mastery of space as anywhere near complete, while I recognize that there are still areas where we are behind, at least in one area, the size of the booster, this year I hope the United States will be ahead. And I am for it. We have a long way to go. Many weeks and months and years of long, tedious work lies ahead. There wil be setbacks and frustrations, disappointments. There will be, as there always are, pressures in this country to do less in this area as in so many others, and temptations to do something else that is perhaps easier. But this research here must go on. This space effort must go on. The conquest of space must and will go ahead. That much we know. That much we can say with confidence and conviction.

Frank O'Connor, the Irish writer, tells in one of his books how, as a boy, he and his friends would make their way across the countryside and when they came to an orchard wall that seemed too high and too doubtful to try and too difficult to permit their voyage to continue, they took off their hats and tossed them over the wall—and then they had no choice but to follow them. This Nation has tossed its cap over the wall of space, and we have no choice but to follow it. Whatever the difficulties, they will be overcome; whatever the hazards, they must be guarded against. With the vital help of this Aerospace Medical Center, with the help of all those who labor in the space endeavor, with the help and support of all Americans, we will climb this wall with safety and speed, and we shall then explore the wonders on the other side. Thank you.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES, AEROSPACE MEDICAL HEALTH CENTER, BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEX., NOVEMBER 21, 1963 (AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY)

For more than 3 years, I have spoken to the American people in terms of the New Frontier. That is not a partisan term. It is not the exclusive property of either Democrats or Republicans. It refers instead to this Nation's position in history today—to the fact that we stand on the edge of a great new era, filled with both crises and opportunities, an era to be characterized by both grim challenges and historic achievements. It is an age which calls for doing and daring, and for the best efforts of all who are willing to explore the unknown and test the uncertain, in every phase of human endeavor. It is a time for pathfinders and pioneers.

I have come to Texas today to salute an outstanding group of pioneers—the men who man the Brooks Air Force Base School of Aerospace Medicine and the Aerospace Medical Center. The trails which they blaze and the paths which they open hold the key to man's success in the environment above—the key to further progress in aerial flight and to further exploration of space.

It is fitting that San Antonio should be the site of this Center and school, at which we gather today to dedicate this complex of buildings. For this city has long been the home of the pioneers of areonautics. It was here that Aviator Sidney Brooks, in whose memory this base was named, was born and raised. It was here that Charles Lindbergh and Claire Chennault and so many other heroes of pioneer aviation received their early training.

The tales and memories of Kelly Field and Randolph Field form a major part of aviation history. And in the new frontier of outer space—while more headlines may be made by other men in other areas—history is being made every day by the unsung heroes of this Aerospace Medical Center, without whom there could be no headlines.

But too many Americans make the mistake of assuming that space research has no values here on earth. Nothing could be further from the truth. Just as the wartime development of radar gave us the transistor and all the products it made possible, so research in space medicine holds the promise of substantial benefits for those of us who are earthbound. For our effort in space is not, as some have suggested, a competitor for the national resources needed to improve our living standards. It is instead a working partner and coproducer of those resources. And nothing illustrates this point better than the fact that almost every field of medicine may profit in some way from aerospace medical research. Permit me to cite three examples, familiar to all of you but not fully realized by all Americans.

First, medical space research may open new avenues of understanding of man's relation to his environment. Examinations of the astronauts' physical, mental and emotional reactions can teach us more about the differences between normal and abnormal—about the causes and effects of disorientation—about changes in metabolism which could result in extending the life span. When you study the effects on our astronauts of toxic gases which can contaminate their environment, and seek ways to alter these gases to reduce their toxity, you are working on problems similar to those we face in the pollution of the air in our urban centers. Already air pollution is contaminating 7,300 communities in the Nation, in which lives 60 percent of our population—and aeromedical research into atmospheric conditions offers some hope of assistance in our efforts to control this menace.

Second, medical space research may revolutionize the technology and techniques of modern medicine. Whatever new devices are created, for example, to monitor our astronauts—to measure their heart activity, their breathing, their brain waves and their eye motion, at great distances and under different or difficult circumstances—will also represent a major advance in general medical instrumentation. Physical examinations under conditions of stress and activity will then be possible, permitting an earlier detection of danger signals. Heart patients may even be able to wear a light monitor that will sound a warning if their activity exceeds certain limits. An instrument recently developed to record automatically the impact of acceleration upon an astronaut's eyes will also be of help to small children who are suffering miserably from eye defects but are unable to describe their impairment. Also, by the use of instruments similar to those used in Project Mercury, this Nation's private as well as public nursing services are being improved, enabling one nurse now to give more and better attention to critically ill patients than several nurses could formerly do in the absence of these instruments.

Third, medical space research may lead to new safeguards against hazards common to many environments. Specifically our astronauts will need fundamentally new devices to protect them from the ill effects of radiation. Those devices will be equally available here on earth—not, we hope, for purposes of civil defense but for safeguarding the increasing use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Also, new sterilization techniques—developed to prevent the contamination of other planets by men traveling from our infected and infested earth—may be used here on earth to protect our food from botulisms.

These are but a few examples of the benefits we can hope to obtain through this one vital part of space research. Albert Einstein once said that the life sciences must keep pace with the physical sciences, or else all mankind is in jeopardy. And here at this Center we have the laboratories, the talent, and the resources to give impetus to vital research in the life sciences. For the formidable engineering and medical task of launching and sustaining a man in space provides a useful and commanding focus for the development and coordination of the most advanced concepts of both engineering and medical research; and I believe that the new information and techniques to be produced will provide enormous benefits for us all.

I do not say that we know with any precision how and where space medicine will contribute to medicine here at home. It is the nature of scientific research and exploration that we cannot know—any more than we could have known that research related to radar would eventually lead to the transistor. But what we do know is that fundamental research has always led to new and vital applications—that our whole modern technological society was formed from such unpredictable applications—and that we have every reason to believe that space research, including medical research, will continue that unbroken pattern.

Nor am I suggesting that the entire space program is justified as a means of advancing medical research. The space program stands on its own as a part of our national strength. But I am confident—and the history of scientific endeavor justifies this confidence—that as a valuable byproduct this effort in space medicine will benefit in scores of ways our everyday lives here on earth.

Space medicine is still an infant science—but no other frontier of medicine is more exciting. In determining the need and role of various human parts, their creation and their possible substitution, you shall be probing the origins of life itself. And thus both the ancient past and the distant future—both the beginning and the end of this world and others—may be viewed under the microscopic eye of this and similar schools.

Let us not be carried away with the grandeur of our vision. Many weeks and months and years of long, hard tedious work lie ahead. There will be setbacks and frustrations and disappointments. There will be

pressures for our country to do less and temptations to do something else. But this research must and will go on. The conquest of space must and will go ahead. That much we know. That much we can say with confidence and conviction.

Frank O'Connor, the Irish writer, tells in one of his books how, as a boy, he and his friends would make their way across the countryside; and when they came to an orchard wall that seemed too high to climb, too doubtful to try, too difficult to permit their journey to continue, they took off their caps and tossed them over the wall—and then they had no choice but to follow them.

My friends, this Nation has tossed its cap over the wall of space—and we have no choice but to follow it. Whatever the difficulties, they must be overcome. Whatever the hazards, they must be guarded against. With the vital help of this Aerospace Medical Center, with the help of all who labor in this space endeavor, with the help and support of all Americans, we will climb this wall with both safety and speed—and we shall then explore all the wonders and treasures that lie on the other side.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS, THE RICE HOTEL, HOUSTON, TEX.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Johnson, ladies and gentlemen, my wife and I are very proud to come to this meeting. This organization has done a good deal for this State and for our country, and I am particularly glad that it emphasizes not only the opportunity for all Americans, a chance to develop their talents, education for boys and girls, so that they can pursue those talents to the very end of their ability, but also because you remind Americans of the very important links that we have with our sister republics in this hemisphere.

One of the things which I have taken the greatest interest in has been attempting to pursue an example which was long neglected, and that was the one set by President Franklin Roosevelt to emphasize that the United States is not only good neighbors, which we were in the 1930's, but also friends and associates in a great effort to build in this hemisphere an alliance for progress, an effort to prove that this hemisphere, from top to bottom, and all of the countries, whether they be Latin or North American, there is a common commitment to freedom, to equality of opportunity, a chance for all to prove that prosperity can be the handmaiden of freedom, and to show to the world a very bright star here in this country and, indeed, in the entire hemisphere. So I am glad to be here today.

In order that my words will be even clearer, I am going to ask my wife to say a few words to you also.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR CONGRESSMAN ALBERT THOMAS, THE COLISEUM, HOUSTON, TEX.

Congressman and Mrs. Thomas, Mr. Vice President, Governor Connally, Senator Yarborough, Congressman Casey and the congressional delegation of Texas, ladies and gentlemen, when I came to the House of Representatives in 1947 as a fairly young Congressman from Massachusetts, I heard the old saying that you spend the first 6 months in the House of Representatives wondering how you got there, and the next 6 months wondering how everybody else got there.

I spent the first 6 months as expected, but I must say that I never wondered how Congressman THOMAS got there. It has always been clear to me. When I read the report that Congressman THOMAS was thinking of resigning, I called him up on the phone and asked him to stay as long as I stayed. I didn't know how long that would be, but I wanted him to stay because I thought that he not only represented this district with distinction, but also he served the United States.

The Presidency has been called a good many names, and Presidents have been also, but no President can do anything without the help of friends, and I must say in the 3 years that I have been in this office, the 3 years really since I was here in Houston that night in this hall, I don't know anyone who has been a greater help in trying to get the job done, not just for Houston and not just for Texas, but for the entire United States than ALBERT THOMAS, and I am glad to be with his friends here tonight. He may not be so well-known outside of this district in Texas and Washington, but I can tell you that when he rises to speak in the House of Representatives they listen, so do some Senators, and so do we down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

He has one of the longest records of seniority in the Senate, in the House one of the shortest biographies. He has been consistently loyal to his party, but he has always stayed above partisan rancor. His record serves his constituents, but it serves the United States. He has helped steer this country to its present eminence in space. Next month when the United States of America fires the largest booster in the history of the world into space for the first time giving us the lead, fires the largest payroll—payload—into space giving us the lead. It will be the largest payroll, too. And who should know that better than Houston. We put a little of it right in here.

But in any case, the United States next month will have a leadership in space which it wouldn't have without ALBERT THOMAS. And so will this city. He has been a stickler for efficiency in Government, but he has also been for progress and growth.

He is 65 years of age this month, but has a young man's interest in the future and a young man's hope for his country, for he has lived with change and he has sought to channel its force instead of combating it. He understands, as any Texan does, the meaning and importance of growth, for he has served one of the fastest growing countries and States and cities in the Nation. And those who oppose progress should look at Houston and look at Texas.

When he went to the U.S. Congress in 1936, some 27 years ago this month, this city had less than 200,000 people. But ALBERT THOMAS had a vision of a modern Houston which now has a million people, and is growing stronger every day. He was not satisfied, nor the people of this city, with a channel which carried less than 30 million tons a year. He foresaw that this city, despite the fact that it is located 50 miles from the sea—and I come from a city that is on the sea—yet this city today ships second to the city of New York around the world. And that is in part because of ALBERT THOMAS. And he and you were not content with an airport serving a handful of passengers and an industry of less than 300 planes carrying passengers of less than a half billion revenue miles. He foresaw that that industry would provide 6 times as many planes, employ 19 times as many people, and serve more than 33 billion passenger miles a year. Here in Houston the number of passengers who go through your great International Airport have quadrupled in the last 15 years. This city has looked forward with hope and commitment, and those who say "No" in Houston or in Texas or in the United States are on the wrong side in 1963.

Finally when Congressman THOMAS went to the House of Representatives in 1936 he did not confine his sight to a Texas of less than 6 million people, a Texas doing less than $500 million of manufacturing, a Texas in which 37 percent of its population lived on the farm. By 1963, that population had dropped to 7 percent, the population of this State exceeds 10 million, the value of your manufacturing has climbed to $6 million, and Texas today is 1 of the 10 most highly industrialized States in the Union.

Many of the products and employers of this State and city were wholly unknown when ALBERT THOMAS went to the House—electronic machinery, sophisticated instruments, and preparations for the exploration of space. But those are the industries which helped this State reach its highest peak of prosperity in 1962, except for 1 year—1963. In Texas and the Nation, change has been the law of life. Growth has meant new opportunities for this State. Progress has meant new achievements. And men such as ALBERT THOMAS, who recognize the value of growth and progress, have enabled this city and this State to rise with the tides of change instead of being swept aside and left behind.

There were in 1936, as there are today, those who are opposed to growth and change, who prefer to defy them, who look back instead of forward. But ALBERT THOMAS and those who work with him did not heed that view in the midthirties, and this city, this State, and this country are glad that they did not. And we dare not look back now, if 27 years from now, in the year 1990 a new generation of Americans is to say that we, too, looked forward.

In 1990, for example, this Nation will need three times as much electric power as it has today, four times as much water, and that is why we are developing the Canadian River and the San Angelo, and the Columbus Bend, and other Texas river projects, and seeking at Freeport to find an economical way to get fresh water from salt, and building antipollution plants throughout this State and Nation, in a new and expanded program. In 1990 the need for national and State parks and recreation areas will triple, reaching a total very nearly the size of Indiana. That is why we are creating Padre Island Seashore, and adding refuge.

In 1990 your sons, daughters, grandsons, and grandchildren will be applying to the colleges of this State in a number three times what they do today. Our airports will serve five times as many passenger miles. We will need housing for a hundred million more people, and many times more doctors and engineers, and technicians, than we are presently producing. That is why we are trying to do more in these areas, as in the thirties, ALBERT THOMAS and Franklin Roosevelt and others did those things which make it possible for not only Texas but the entire United States to prosper and grow, as we do in the 1960's.

In 1990 the age of space will be entering its second phase, and our hopes in it to preserve the peace, to make sure that in this great new sea, as on earth, the United States is second to none. And that is why I salute ALBERT THOMAS and those Texans who you sent to Washington in his time and since then, who recognize the needs and the trends today in the 1960's so that when some meet here in 1990 they will look back on what we did and say that we made the right and wise decisions. "Your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions," the Bible tells us; and "where there is no vision, the people perish."

ALBERT THOMAS is old enough to dream dreams, and old enough to see visions. He sees an America of the future, in the lifetime of us all; with 300 million people living in this country with a $2 trillion economy which will happen in this century. Even more important, he sees an America, as do we all, strong in science and in space, in health and in learning, in the respect of its neighbors and all nations, an America that is both powerful and peaceful, with a people that are both prosperous and just. With that vision, we shall not perish, and we cannot fail.

Behind the Speaker's desk in the House of Representatives there are words from a great speech by a great citizen of my State, Senator Daniel Webster. It says, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its industry, develop its resources, and see whether we also in our time and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

ALBERT THOMAS didn't need to read those words. He has performed something worthy to be remembered.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE A CITIZENS' RALLY IN FRONT OF THE TEXAS HOTEL, FORT WORTH, TEX.

Mr. Vice President, Jim Wright, Governor, Senator Yarborough, Mr. Buck, ladies and gentlemen, there are no faint hearts in Fort Worth, and I appreciate your being here this morning. Mrs. Kennedy is organizing herself. It takes longer, but, of course, she looks better than we do when she does it. But we appreciate your welcome.

This city has been a great Western city, the defense of the West, cattle, oil and all the rest. It has believed in strength in this city and strength in this State, and strength in this country.

What we are trying to do in this country and what we are trying to do around the world I believe is quite simple, and that is to build a military structure which will defend the vital interests of the United States; and in that great cause, Fort Worth, as it did in World War II, as it did in developing the best bomber system in the world, the B-58; and as it will now do in developing the best fighter system in the world, the TFX, Fort Worth will play its proper part. And that is why we have placed so much emphasis in the last 3 years in building a defense system second to none, until now the United States is stronger than it has ever been in its history. And, secondly, we believe that the new environment, space, the new sea, is also an area where the United States should be second to none.

And this State of Texas and the United States is now engaged in the most concentrated effort in history to provide leadership in this area as it must here on earth. And this is our second great effort. And in December—next month—the United States will fire the largest booster in the history of the world, putting us ahead of the Soviet Union in that area for the first time in our history.

And, thirdly, for the United States to fulfill its obligations around the world requires that the United States move forward economically, that the people of this country participate in rising prosperity. And it is a fact that in 1962, and the first 6 months of 1963, the economy of the United States grew not only faster than nearly every Western country, which had not been true in the fifties, but also grew faster than the Soviet Union, itself. That is the kind of strength the United States needs, economically, in space, militarily.

And in the final analysis, that strength depends upon the willingness of the citizens of the United States to assume burdens of citizenship.

I know one place where they are, here in this rain, in Fort Worth, in Texas, in the United States. We are going forward.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE FORT WORTH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, TEXAS HOTEL, FORT WORTH, TEX. (AS ACTUALLY DELIVERED)

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 Fort 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 Fort 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, 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 million, 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.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE DALLAS CITIZENS COUNCIL, THE DALLAS ASSEMBLY, AND THE GRADUATE RESEARCH CENTER OF THE SOUTHWEST, AT THE TRADE MART, DALLAS, TEX., NOVEMBER 22, 1963

I am honored to have this invitation to address the annual meeting of the Dallas Citizens Council, joined by the members of the Dallas Assembly—and pleased to have this opportunity to salute the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest.

It is fitting that these two symbols of Dallas progress are united in the sponsorship of this meeting. For they represent the best qualities, I am told, of leadership and learning in this city—and leadership and learning are indispensable to each other. The advancement of learning depends on community leadership for financial and political support—and the products of that learning, in turn, are essential to the leadership's hopes for continued progress and prosperity. It is not a coincidence that those communities possessing the best in research and graduate facilities—from MIT to Cal Tech—tend to attract the new and growing industries. I congratulate those of you here in Dallas who have recognized these basic facts through the creation of the unique and forward-looking Graduate Research Center.

This link between leadership and learning is not only essential at the community level. It is even more indispensable in world affairs. Ignorance and misinformation can handicap the progress of a city or a company—but they can, if allowed to prevail in foreign policy, handicap this country's security. In a world of complex and continuing problems, in a world full of frustrations and irritations, America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason—or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible will gain the popular ascendancy with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every world problem.

There will always be dissident voices heard in the land, expressing opposition without alternatives, finding fault but never favor, perceiving gloom on every side and seeking influence without responsibility. Those voices are inevitable.

But today other voices are heard in the land—voices preaching doctrines wholly unrelated to reality, wholly unsuited to the sixties, doctrines which apparently assume that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory and that peace is a sign of weakness. At a time when the national debt is steadily being reduced in terms of its burden on our economy, they see that debt as the greatest single threat to our security. At a time when we are steadily reducing the number of Federal employees serving every thousand citizens, they fear those supposed hordes of civil servants far more than the actual hordes of opposing armies.

We cannot expect that everyone, to use the phrase of a decade ago, will "talk sense to the American people." But we can hope that fewer people will listen to nonsense. And the notion that this Nation is headed for defeat through deficit, or that strength is but a matter of slogans, is nothing but just plain nonsense.

I want to discuss with you today the status of our strength and our security because this question clearly calls for the most responsible qualities of leadership and the most enlightened products of scholarship. For this Nation's strength and security are not easily or cheaply obtained—nor are they quickly and simply explained. There are many kinds of strength and no one kind will suffice. Overwhelming nuclear strength cannot stop a guerrilla war. Formal pacts of alliance cannot stop internal subversion. Displays of material wealth cannot stop the disillusionment of diplomats subjected to discrimination.

Above all, words alone are not enough. The United States is a peaceful nation. And where our strength and determination are clear, our words need merely to convey conviction, not belligerence. If we are strong, our strength will speak for itself. If we are weak, words will be of no help.

I realize that this Nation often tends to identify turning points in world affairs with the major addresses which preceded them. But it was not the Monroe Doctrine that kept all Europe away from this hemisphere—it was the strength of the British fleet and the width of the Atlantic Ocean. It was not General Marshall's speech at Harvard which kept communism out of Western Europe—it was the strength and stability made possible by our military and economic assistance.

In this administration also it has been necessary at times to issue specific warnings—warnings that we could not stand by and watch the Communists conquer Laos by force, or intervene in the Congo, or swallow West Berlin or maintain offensive missiles on Cuba. But while our goals were at least temporarily obtained in these and other instances, our successful defense of freedom was due—not to the words we used—but to the strength we stood ready to use on behalf of the principles we stand ready to defend.

This strength is composed of many different elements, ranging from the most massive deterrents to the most subtle influences. And all types of strength are needed—no one kind could do the job alone. Let us take a moment, therefore, to review this Nation's progress in each major area of strength.

I

First, as Secretary McNamara made clear in his address last Monday, the strategic nuclear power of the United States has been so greatly modernized and expanded in the last 1,000 days, by the rapid production and deployment of the most modern missile systems, that any and all potential aggressors are clearly confronted now with the impossibility of strategic victory—and the certainty of total destruction—if by reckless attack they should ever force upon us the necessity of a strategic reply.

In less than 3 years, we have increased by 50 percent the number of Polaris submarines scheduled to be in force by the next fiscal year—increased by more than 70 percent our total Polaris purchase program—increased by more than 75 percent our Minuteman purchase program—increased by 50 percent the portion of our strategic bombers on 15-minute alert—and increased by 100 percent the total number of nuclear weapons available in our strategic alert forces. Our security is further enhanced by the steps we have taken regarding these weapons to improve the speed and certainty of their response, their readiness at all times to respond, their ability to survive an attack and their ability to be carefully controlled and directed through secure command operations.

II

But the lessons of the last decade have taught us that freedom cannot be defended by strategic nuclear power alone. We have, therefore, in the last 3 years accelerated the development and deployment of tactical nuclear weapons—and increased by 60 percent the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe.

Nor can Europe or any other continent rely on nuclear forces alone, whether they are strategic or tactical. We have radically improved the readiness of our conventional forces—increased by 45 percent the number of combat-ready Army divisions—increased by 100 percent the procurement of modern Army weapons and equipment—increased by 100 percent our ship construction, conversion and modernization program—increased by 100 percent our procurement of tactical aircraft—increased by 30 percent the number of tactical air squadrons—and increased the strength of the Marines. As last month's Operation Big Lift—which originated here in Texas—showed so clearly, this Nation is prepared as never before to move substantial numbers of men in surprisingly little time to advanced positions anywhere in the world. We have increased by 175 percent the procurement of airlift aircraft—and we have already achieved a 75 percent increase in our existing strategic airlift capability. Finally, moving beyond the traditional roles of our military forces, we have achieved an increase of nearly 600 percent in our special forces—those forces that are prepared to work with our allies and friends against the guerrillas, saboteurs, insurgents and assassins who threaten freedom in a less direct but equally dangerous manner.

III

But American military might should not and need not stand alone against the ambitions of international communism. Our security and strength, in the last analysis, directly depend on the security and strength of others—and that is why our military and economic assistance plays such a key role in enabling those who live on the periphery of the Communist world to maintain their independence of choice. Our assistance to these nations can be painful, risky, and costly—as is true in southeast Asia today. But we dare not weary of the task. For our assistance makes possible the stationing of 3.5 million Allied troops along the Communist frontier at one-tenth the cost of maintaining a comparable number of American soldiers. A successful Communist breakthrough in these areas, necessitating direct U.S. intervention, would cost us several times as much as our entire foreign aid program—and might cost us heavily in American lives as well.

About 70 percent of our military assistance goes to nine key countries located on or near the borders of the Communist bloc—nine countries confronted directly or indirectly with the threat of Communist aggression—Vietnam, Free China, Korea, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Greece, Turkey, and Iran. No one of these countries possesses on its own the resources to maintain the forces which our own Chiefs of Staff think needed in the common interest. Reducing our efforts to train, equip, and assist their armies can only encourage Communist penetration and require in time the increased oversea deployment of American combat forces. And re-

ducing the economic help needed to bolster these nations that undertake to help defend freedom can have the same disastrous result. In short, the $50 billion we spend each year on our own defense could well be ineffective without the $4 billion required for military and economic assistance.

Our foreign aid program is not growing in size—it is, on the contrary, smaller now than in previous years. It has had its weaknesses—but we have undertaken to correct them—and the proper way of treating weaknesses is to replace them with strength, not to increase those weaknesses by emasculating essential programs. Dollar for dollar, in or out of government, there is no better form of investment in our national security than our much-abused foreign aid program. We cannot afford to lose it. We can afford to maintain it. We can surely afford, for example, to do as much for our 19 needy neighbors of Latin America as the Communist bloc is sending to the island of Cuba alone.

IV

I have spoken of strength largely in terms of the deterrence and resistance of aggression and attack. But, in today's world, freedom can be lost without a shot being fired, by ballots as well as bullets. The success of our leadership is dependent upon respect for our mission in the world as well as our missiles—on a clearer recognition of the virtues of freedom as well as the evils of tyranny.

That is why our Information Agency has doubled the shortwave broadcasting power of the Voice of America and increased the number of broadcasting hours by 30 percent—increased Spanish language broadcasting to Cuba and Latin America from 1 to 9 hours a day—increased sevenfold to more than 3.5 million copies the number of American books being translated and published for Latin American readers—and taken a host of other steps to carry our message of truth and freedom to all the far corners of the earth.

And that is also why we have regained the initiative in the exploration of outer space—making an annual effort greater than the combined total of all space activities undertaken during the fifties—launching more than 130 vehicles into earth orbit—putting into actual operation valuable weather and communications satellites—and making it clear to all that the United States of America has no intention of finishing second in space.

This effort is expensive—but it pays its own way, for freedom and for America. For there is no longer any fear in the free world that a Communist lead in space will become a permanent assertion of supremacy and the basis of military superiority. There is no longer any doubt about the strength and skill of American science, American industry, American education and the American free enterprise system. In short, our national space effort represents a great gain in, and a great resource of, our national strength—and both Texas and Texans are contributing greatly to this strength.

Finally, it should be clear by now that a nation can be no stronger abroad than she is at home. Only an America which practices what it preaches about equal rights and social justice will be respected by those whose choice affects our future. Only an America which has fully educated its citizens is fully capable of tackling the complex problems and perceiving the hidden dangers of the world in which we live. And only an America which is growing and prospering economically can sustain the worldwide defenses of freedom, while demonstrating to all concerned the opportunities of our system and society.

It is clear, therefore, that we are strengthening our security as well as our economy by our recent record increases in national income and output—by surging ahead of most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion and the margin of corporate profits—by maintaining a more stable level of prices than almost any of our oversea competitors—and by cutting personal and corporate income taxes by some $11 billion, as I have proposed, to assure this Nation of the longest and strongest expansion in our peacetime economic history.

This Nation's total output—which 3 years ago was at the $500 billion mark—will soon pass $600 billion, for a record rise of over $100 billion in 3 years. For the first time in history we have 70 million men and women at work. For the first time in history average factory earnings have exceeded $100 a week. For the first time in history corporation profits after taxes—which have risen 43 percent in less than 3 years—have reached an annual level of $27.4 billion.

My friends and fellow citizens: I cite these facts and figures to make it clear that America today is stronger than ever before. Our adversaries have not abandoned their ambitions—our dangers have not diminished—our vigilance cannot be relaxed. But now we have the military, the scientific, and the economic strength to do whatever must be done for the preservation and promotion of freedom.

That 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.

We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility—that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint—and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of "peace on earth, good will toward men." That must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For as was written long ago: "except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE TEXAS DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE, THE MUNICIPAL AUDITORIUM, AUSTIN, TEX., NOVEMBER 22, 1963

One hundred and eighteen years ago last March, President John Tyler signed the joint resolution of Congress providing statehood for Texas. And 118 years ago next month, President James Polk declared that Texas was a part of the Union. Both Tyler and Polk were Democratic Presidents. And from that day to this, Texas and the Democratic Party have been linked in an indestructible alliance—an alliance for the promotion of prosperity, growth, and greatness for Texas and for America.

Next year that alliance will sweep this State and Nation.

The historic bonds which link Texas and the Democratic Party are no temporary union of convenience. They are deeply embedded in the history and purpose of this State and party. For the Democratic Party is not a collection of diverse interests brought together only to win elections. We are united instead by a common history and heritage—by a respect for the deeds of the past and a recognition of the needs of the future. Never satisfied with today, we have always staked our fortunes on tomorrow. That is the kind of State which Texas has always been—that is the kind of vision and vitality which Texans have always possessed—and that is the reason why Texas will always be basically Democratic.

For 118 years, Texas and the Democratic Party have contributed to each other's success. This State's rise to prosperity and wealth came primarily from the policies and programs of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman. These policies were shaped and enacted with the help of such men as the late Sam Rayburn and a host of other key Congressmen—by the former Texas Congressman and Senator who serves now as my strong right arm, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson—by your present U.S. Senator, RALPH YARBOROUGH—and by an overwhelming proportion of Democratic leadership at the State and county level, led by your distinguished Governor, John Connally.

It was the policies and programs of the Democratic Party which helped bring income to your farmers, industries to your cities, employment to your workers, and the promotion and preservation of your natural resources. No one who remembers the days of 5-cent cotton and 30-cent oil will forget the ties between the success of this State and the success of our party.

Three years ago this fall I toured this State with Lyndon Johnson, Sam Rayburn, and Ralph Yarborough as your party's candidate for President. We pledged to increase America's strength against its enemies, its prestige among its friends, and the opportunities it offered to its citizens. Those pledges have been fulfilled. The words spoken in Texas have been transformed into action in Washington, and we have America moving again.

Here in Austin, I pledged in 1960 to restore world confidence in the vitality and energy of American society. That pledge has been fulfilled. We have won the respect of allies and adversaries alike through our determined stand on behalf of freedom around the world, from West Berlin to southeast Asia—through our resistance to Communist intervention in the Congo and Communist missiles in Cuba—and through our initiative in obtaining the nuclear test ban treaty which can stop the pollution of our atmosphere and start us on the path to peace. In San Jose and Mexico City, in Bonn and West Berlin, in Rome and County Cork, I saw and heard and felt a new appreciation for an America on the move—an America which has shown that it cares about the needy of its own and other lands, an America which has shown that freedom is the way to the future, an America which is known to be first in the effort for peace as well as preparedness.

In Amarillo, I pledged in 1960 that the businessmen of this State and Nation—particularly the small businessman who is the backbone of our economy—would move ahead as our economy moved ahead. That pledge has been fulfilled. Business profits—having risen 43 percent in 2½ years—now stand at a record high; and businessmen all over America are grateful for liberalized depreciation for the investment tax credit, and for our programs to increase their markets at home as well as abroad. We have proposed a massive tax reduction, with particular benefits for small business. We have stepped up the activities of the Small Business Administration, making available in the last 3 years almost $50 million to more than 1,000 Texas firms, and doubling their opportunity to share in Federal procurement contracts. Our party believes that what's good for the American people is good for American business—and the last 3 years have proven the validity of that proposition.

In Grand Prairie, I pledged in 1960 that this country would no longer tolerate the lowest rate of economic growth of any major industrialized nation in the world. That pledge has been and is being fulfilled. In less than 3 years our national output will shortly have risen by a record $100 billion—industrial production is up 22 percent—personal income is up 16 percent. And the Wall Street Journal pointed out a short time ago that the United States now leads most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion and the margin of corporate profits. Here in Texas—where 3 years ago,

at the very time I was speaking, real per capita personal income was actually declining as the industrial recession spread to this State—more than 200,000 new jobs have been created—unemployment has declined—and personal income rose last year to an alltime high. This growth must go on. Those not sharing in this prosperity must be helped. And that is why we have an accelerated public works program, an area redevelopment program, and a manpower training program—to keep this and other States moving ahead. And that is why we need a tax cut of $11 billion, as an assurance of future growth and insurance against an early recession. No period of economic recovery in the peacetime history of this Nation has been characterized by both the length and strength of our present expansion—and we intend to keep it going.

In Dallas, I pledged in 1960 to step up the development of both our natural and our human resources. That pledge has been fulfilled. The policy of "no new starts" has been reversed. The Canadian River project will provide water for 11 Texas cities. The San Angelo project will irrigate some 10,000 acres. We have launched 10 new watershed projects in Texas, completed 7 others and laid plans for 6 more. A new national park, a new wildlife preserve, and other navigation, reclamation and natural resource projects are all underway in this State. At the same time we have sought to develop the human resources of Texas and all the Nation—granting loans to 17,500 Texas college students—making more than $17 million available to 249 school districts—and expanding or providing rural library service to 600,000 Texas readers. And if this Congress passes, as now seems likely, pending bills to build college classrooms, increase student loans, build medical schools, provide more community libraries, and assist in the creation of graduate centers, then this Congress will have done more for the cause of education than has been done by any Congress in modern history. Civilization, it was once said, is a race between education and catastrophe—and we intend to win that race for education.

In Wichita Falls, I pledged in 1960 to increase farm income and reduce the burden of farm surpluses. That pledge has been fulfilled. Net farm income today is almost a billion dollars higher than in 1960. In Texas, net income per farm consistently averaged below the $4,000 mark under the Benson regime—it is now well above it. And we have raised this income while reducing grain surpluses by 1 billion bushels. We have, at the same time, tackled the problem of the entire rural economy—extending more than twice as much credit to Texas farmers under the Farmers Home Administration—and making more than $100 million in REA loans. We have not solved all the problems of American agriculture—but we have offered hope and a helping hand in place of Mr. Benson's indifference.

In San Antonio, I pledged in 1960 that a new administration would strive to secure for every American his full constitutional rights. That pledge has been and is being fulfilled. We have not yet secured the objectives desired or the legislation required. But we have, in the last 3 years, by working through voluntary leadership as well as legal action, opened more new doors to members of minority groups—doors to transportation, voting, education, employment, and place of public accommodation—than had been opened in any 3-year or 30-year period in this century. There is no noncontroversial way to fulfill our constitutional pledge to establish justice and promote domestic tranquillity—but we intend to fulfill those obligations because they are right.

In Houston, I pledged in 1960 that we would set before the American people the unfinished business of our society. That pledge has been fulfilled. We have undertaken the first full-scale revision of our tax laws in 10 years. We have launched a bold new attack on mental illness, emphasizing treatment in the patient's own home community instead of some vast custodial institution. We have initiated a full-scale attack on mental retardation, emphasizing prevention instead of abandonment. We have revised our public welfare programs, emphasizing family rehabilitation instead of humiliation. And we have proposed a comprehensive realinement of our national transportation policy, emphasizing equal competition instead of regulation. Our agenda is still long—but this country is moving again.

In El Paso, I pledged in 1960 that we would give the highest and earliest priority to the reestablishment of good relations with the people of Latin America. We are working to fulfill that pledge. An area long neglected has not solved all its problems. The Communist foothold which had already been established has not yet been eliminated. But the trend of Communist expansion has been reversed. The name of Fidel Castro is no longer feared or cheered by substantial numbers in every country—and contrary to the prevailing predictions of 3 years ago, not another inch of Latin American territory has fallen prey to Communist control. Meanwhile, the work of reform and reconciliation goes on. I can testify from my trips to Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, and Costa Rica that American officials are no longer booed and spat upon south of the border. Historic fences and friendships are being maintained. Latin America, once the forgotten stepchild of our aid programs, now receives more economic assistance per capita than any other area of the world. In short, the United States is once more identified with the needs and aspirations of the people to the south—and we intend to meet those needs and aspirations.

In Texarkana, I pledged in 1960 that our country would no longer engage in a lagging space effort. That pledge has been fulfilled. We are not yet first in every field of space endeavor—but we have regained worldwide respect for our scientists, our industry, our education, and our free initiative.

In the last 3 years, we have increased our annual space effort to a greater level than the combined total of all space activities undertaken in the 1950's. We have launched into earth orbit more than four times as many space vehicles as had been launched in the previous 3 years. We have focused our wide-ranging efforts around a landing on the moon in this decade. We have put valuable weather and communications satellites into actual operation. We will fire this December the most powerful rocket ever developed anywhere in the world. And we have made it clear to all that the United States of America has no intention of finishing second in outer space. Texas will play a major role in this effort. The Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston will be the cornerstone of our lunar landing project, with a billion dollars already allocated to that Center this year. Even though space is an infant industry, more than 3,000 people are already employed in space activities here in Texas—more than $100 million of space contracts are now being worked on in this State—and more than 50 space related firms have announced the opening of Texas offices. This is still a daring and dangerous frontier; and there are those who would prefer to turn back or to take a more timid stance. But Texans have stood their ground on embattled frontiers before—and I know you will help us see this battle through.

In Fort Worth, I pledged in 1960 to build a national defense which was second to none—a position, I said, which is not "first, but," not "first, if," not "first, when" but first—period. That pledge has been fulfilled. In the past 3 years we have increased our defense budget by over 20 percent; increased the program for acquisition of 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 60 percent; added 5 combat-ready divisions and 5 tactical fighter wings to our Armed Forces; increased our strategic airlife capabilities by 75 percent; and increased our special counterinsurgency forces by 600 percent. We can truly say today, with pride in our voices and peace in our hearts, that the defensive forces of the United States are, without a doubt, the most powerful and resourceful forces anywhere in the world.

Finally, I said in Lubbock in 1960, as I said in every other speech in this State, that if Lyndon Johnson and I were elected, we would get this country moving again. That pledge has been fulfilled. In nearly every field of national activity, this country is moving again—and Texas is moving with it. From public works to public health, wherever Government programs operate, the past 3 years have seen a new burst of action and progress— in Texas and all over America. We have stepped up the fight against crime and slums and poverty in our cities, against the pollution of our streams, against unemployment in our industry, and against waste in the Federal Government. We have built hospitals and clinics and nursing homes. We have launched a broad new attack on mental illness and mental retardation. We have initiated the training of more physicians and dentists. We have provided four times as much housing for our elderly citizens—and we have increased benefits for those on social security.

Almost everywhere we look, the story is the same. In Latin America, in Africa, in Asia—in the councils of the world and in the jungles of far-off nations—there is now renewed confidence in our country and our convictions.

For this country is moving and it must not stop. It cannot stop. For this is a time for courage and a time of challenge. Neither conformity nor complacency will do. Neither the fanatics nor the fainthearted are needed. And our duty as a party is not to our party alone, but to the Nation, and, indeed, to all mankind. Our duty is not merely the preservation of political power but the preservation of peace and freedom.

So let us not be petty when our cause is so great. Let us not quarrel amongst ourselves when our Nation's future is at stake. Let us stand together with renewed confidence in our cause—united in our heritage of the past and our hopes for the future—and determined that this land we love shall lead all mankind into new frontiers of peace and abundance.

A NEW PRESIDENT IS SWORN IN AT A TIME OF STRESS AND TRAGEDY, BY A WOMAN, JUDGE SARAH HUGHES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Honorable Sarah T. Hughes has written a brief and poignant description of the ceremony in which Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was sworn in as President of the United States.

The article was published in the November 29, 1963, edition of the Texas Observer by Editor and General Manager Ronnie Dugger.

Judge Hughes received a recess appointment as U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas from the late beloved President John F. Kennedy on

October 17, 1961. Her appointment was confirmed by the U.S. Senate, and she was sworn in March 21, 1962.

Because of the historical significance of this article by Judge Hughes, 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:

THE PRESIDENT IS SWORN IN

(By Sarah T. Hughes, U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas)

It was 2:15, Friday, November 22. I had just reached home from the Trade Mart, where a large and enthusiastic crowd had gathered to see and hear President John F. Kennedy. We waited in vain, for he had been assassinated as he was leaving the downtown area of Dallas.

Numbed and hardly realizing what had happened, I drove home. There was no reason to go to court. In the face of the tragedy that had befallen us, all else seemed of little consequence.

I phoned the court to tell the clerk where I was. Her response was that Barefoot Sanders, U.S. attorney, wanted to speak to me. Immediately I heard his familiar voice, "The Vice President wants you to swear him in as President. Can you do it? How soon can you get to the airport?" Of course, I could, and I could be there in 10 minutes.

I got in my car and started toward the airport. Now there was another job to be done—a new President who had to carry on, and he must qualify for the office as quickly as possible. He had much to do, and I must think of him, and do the job that had been assigned to me.

There was no time to find the oath administered to a President, but the essentials of every oath are the same. You have to swear to perform the duties of the Office of President of the United States, and to preserve and defend the Constitution of the United States. I was not afraid. I could do it without a formal oath.

Police blocked the entrance to the location of the plane, but there was no difficulty. They knew me, and I told them I was there to swear in the Vice President as President. One of the motorcycle officers went to the plane to confirm my statement and then escorted me to the plane.

It was a beautiful sight, the presidential plane, long and sleek, a blue and two white stripes running the length of the plane, with the words, "the United States of America," on the blue stripe. It seemed to exemplify the strength and courage of our country.

I was escorted up the ramp by the chief of police to the front door, where one of the Vice President's aids and the Secret Service met me. I was trying to explain that I did not have the Presidential oath but could give it anyway when someone handed me a copy.

In the second compartment were several Texas Congressmen, vice presidential aids, Secret Service men, and the Vice President and Mrs. Johnson. Mr. and Mrs. Johnson have been my friends for many years, but on such an occasion there did not seem to be anything to say. I embraced them both, for that was the best way to give expression to my feeling of grief for them, and for all of us.

By that time a Bible that was on the plane had been thrust into my hands. It was a small volume, with soft leather backs. I thought someone said it was a Catholic Bible. I do not know, but I would like to think it was, and that President Kennedy had been reading it on this, his last trip.

The Vice President said Mrs. Kennedy wanted to be present for the ceremony, and in a very few minutes she appeared. Her face showed her grief, but she was composed and calm. She, too, exemplified the courage this country needs to carry on. The Vice President leaned toward her and told her I was a U.S. judge appointed by her husband. My acknowledgment was, "I loved him very much."

The Vice President asked Mrs. Johnson to stand on his right, Mrs. Kennedy on his left, and with his hand on the Bible, slowly and reverently repeated the oath after me: "I do solemnly swear that I will perform the duties of President of the United States to the best of my ability and defend, protect, and preserve the Constitution of the United States." That was all to the oath I had in my hand, but I added, "So help me God," and he said it after me. It seemed that that needed to be said.

He gently kissed Mrs. Kennedy and leaned over and kissed his wife on the cheek.

Here was a man with the ability and determination for the task ahead. Great as are the responsibilities of the office, I felt he could carry on. I told him so, and that we were behind him, and he would have our sympathy and our help.

As I left the plane I heard him give the order to take off, "Now let's get ready and go." I drove away with my thoughts on this man, upon whom so much now depended.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, much has been said and written in memory of and in tribute to our late President, John F. Kennedy, in the sad and overcast days since his death. One of the most moving tributes I have read was delivered by Daniel F. Foley, national commander of the American Legion, at a joint Legion and Auxiliary memorial service held in Minneapolis on November 23. Commander Foley pointed out that "President Kennedy gave his life for his country as surely as if he had died in combat," and pledged the American Legion to a continuing and active role in the struggle for justice and freedom as the best memorial to our late President.

I ask unanimous consent that Commander Foley's remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS BY DANIEL F. FOLEY, AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL COMMANDER, AT A JOINT LEGION AND AUXILIARY FALL CONFERENCE MEMORIAL SERVICE IN BEHALF OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY DELIVERED AT THE PICK-NICOLLET HOTEL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., NOVEMBER 23, 1963.

National President Mrs. Johnson, my fellow Americans, for some time, I have looked forward to this conference, for the wanderer yearns for home. To be home with members of my own department, where the Legion spirit is deep and where the Legion heart beats strongly.

But today we are sad. The heart of America is sad. The soul of freedom aches. Our President has died—a martyr for the cause of justice and of freedom, not just here in the United States, but throughout the world.

It is the character of the true American to love justice and to jealously regard the highest rights of man as a creature of God.

The sincere, determined efforts of President Kennedy to promote justice among men everywhere will speak well for him before the tribunal of divine justice.

It is the inborn desire of all men to be free, and throughout all of our history brave men and women of great courage have and do defend the cause of freedom. Defenders of the cause of freedom daily lay their lives on the line that freedom may endure.

President Kennedy gave his life for his country as surely as if he had died in combat, and all men of good will are crushed by this tragic event.

But again the great character of the American people, their deep love of God and loyalty to country will spring forth in all its fullness, for all the world to see, in this time of crisis.

Let no one think for a fleeting moment that this Nation will be divided in this hour of challenge.

Whatever differences of a political nature or disagreement on issues that may exist are quickly set aside as all Americans rush to accept the challenge these tragic circumstances have thrust upon our Nation.

One of the hallmarks of a free society under constitutional government is its continuity. What dictatorship can face the people of the world and say it speaks from the freely expressed will of the people?

But here in this Nation, which has now seen eight Presidents die in office, some at the hands of the assassin, such as Abraham Lincoln, James Garfield, William McKinley and now John Kennedy, the Government of the United States continues on—confident and courageous are its people—dedicated and sincere its leaders.

It is this desire to perpetuate freedom that has inspired the American Legion in its many years of fruitful service. We pledge ourselves to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism, maintain law and order, to promote peace and good will on earth, to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy. Devotion to these principles characterizes the service which John Kennedy has left to all the ages, for his life work was filled wtih courage, compassion for others, a deep sense of justice and a love of freedom, as God willed it when He created man.

Into the stream of challenge, created at this hour, the American Legion, a powerful force for good, may well face its most crucial hour—its most difficult test.

We believe it to be the responsibility of every American to be an active participant in the affairs of the present, in a responsible manner. Every man who would enjoy the rights and privileges of citizenship in a free society must discharge the accompanying duties and responsibilities of citizenship. It is the total business of our life's work to be always consistent with the ideals of freedom, which encompasses a love of God—love of country—regard for the rights of others, and a renewed realization of our great responsibility to preserve for our children and our children's children down through the ages an America forever strong and forever free.

The Legion has the great challenge now, if it is to contribute significantly in these moving times, to hold its head high in service to the high cause of freedom, set an example for others to follow in all our actions, in all our utterances and so conduct ourselves in all of our posts across the length and breadth of the land, that our people will always see our work at its best and our ideals at their loftiest.

By so doing, we show reverence to the memory of our dearly loved President, who has fallen, and give hope and encouragement to our new President, who now assumes the awesome responsibility of leadership.

In this hour, so sad to us all, in this hour which challenges us so, we say for all men to hear:

Though the forces of evil, lawlessness, and hatred may beat with all their fury upon the breasts of liberty—

This Nation will endure strong in justice.

This Nation will prosper rich in compassion.

This Nation will stand down through the corridors of time secure in freedom.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do I correctly understand that the time on the Ellender motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 1703 will begin to run at 12:30?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be 30 minutes of discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether provision was made for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No provision was made for a quorum call.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I have another matter for the morning hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. KEATING. Is the Senator from Minnesota seeking recognition? I have already been recognized in the morning hour.

"THAT WAS THE WEEK THAT WAS"—TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as all of us know, the tragedy of November 22 caused all of our radio and television networks to stay on the air to bring us uninterrupted news of the events as they happened, and also public reaction from people here and around the world. I have expressed appreciation to all of the networks for doing this. Helpless as we were before the damnable history, they helped us handle our emotions by living them with all other humans.

One of the most unusual reactions from elsewhere in the world was produced on the British Broadcasting Corp. program "That Was the Week That Was." The video tape of its production in Britain on November 23 was flown here for showing on Sunday evening, November 24.

The program was remarkable for many reasons. This show has been known chiefly for its biting satire and bitter wit on public affairs and figures. On this Saturday night, it scrapped that format and did a program on the United States and the tragedy that befell us. It was a show of reverence and respect.

This we might have anticipated from the British, nevertheless we are deeply appreciative. Our feelings however were far more deeply touched by the character and quality of this program.

It carried a truly tremendous feeling under a superb, just short of staccato control. It had penetrating critical power and mordant analysis with such skillfully understated warmth of restraint that made its feeling a piercing and authentic one.

We did not do this for ourselves. We could not at that time. Perhaps these young Britons were in a position to be more objective. But that is not sufficient explanation for me for the excellence of quality and felicity of what they did. "Art" said the philosopher Santayana "is the trick of arresting the immediate." This program did indeed "arrest the immediate" in all its ugly hardness, but also in its searing tragedy, and in its depth of meaning in history, hope, and duty.

We have apparently been studied deeply—far more than from Friday evening to Saturday night, the time it took to write and produce the program.

It is humbling to know what our friends think and hope. I wish to thank the British Broadcasting Corp. and through them the individuals who wrote and produced the program. I ask unanimous consent to have the BBC copyright transcript printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

TRANSCRIPTION OF "THAT WAS THE WEEK THAT WAS"—TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

(First transmitted by the BBC November 23, 1963)

DAVID FROST. The reason why the shock was so great, why when one heard the news last night one felt suddenly so empty was because it was the most unexpected piece of news one could possibly imagine. It was the least likely thing to happen in the whole world. If anyone else had died—Sir Winston Churchill, De Gaulle, Khrushchev—it would have been something that somehow we could have understood and even perhaps accepted. But that Kennedy should go, well, we just didn't believe in assassination anymore, not in the civilized world anyway.

ROY KINNEAR. When Kennedy was elected 3 years ago, it was as if we'd all been given some gigantic miraculous present. Suddenly over there in Washington was this amazing man who seemed so utterly right for the job in every way that we took him completely for granted. Whenever we thought about the world we had that warm image at the back of our minds of a man who would keep everything on the rails. Now suddenly that present has been taken away from us when we thought we had still 5 more years before we need start worrying again.

DAVID KERNAN. It's funny how people used to talk about Eisenhower as a father figure. Kennedy was far more of a father figure and much more than Ike ever, ever was.

AL MANCINI. One just cannot believe that that rich, happy, talented family could have so much bad luck. Brother Joe was killed in the war, Sister Rosemary born a mental defective and Sister Kathleen died in an air crash.

When Jack Kennedy visited Europe this year after his visit to Ireland, he came to Britain and he flew to Chatsworth in Derbyshire to visit his sister's grave. Well, when he got there, there were more than 200 security officers all around this little churchyard and right next to her, her husband was buried also who died in the war. And there were hundreds of other policemen guarding hundreds of yards of ground in this little churchyard and about 20 feet away from the grave there was a team of medical men with blood plasma just in case anything would happen. Well, it didn't happen in that little churchyard, but in a city like Dallas, thousands of people crowding the streets, it happened. And there wasn't anything that anybody could do about it.

KENNETH COPE. When the news came through just before 8 o'clock last Friday night, more than a thousand people all over London caught buses or tube trains, took taxis, drove or walked to the American Embassy in Grosvenor Square. They had to do something. In Berlin, Mayor Willy Brandt asked people to put lighted candles in their darkened windows. Within minutes they were flickering out all over the city. In Moscow at 5 past 8 the radio broke into its programs to announce the news. It was followed by solemn organ music. In London viewers reacted with equal hostility to being treated to a half hour of comedy or being deprived of 20 minutes of soap operas.

WILLIAM RUSHTON. When Kennedy was picked to be the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1960, Norman Mailer wrote a piece about him in Esquire called "A Superman Comes to Supermart." At that time, of course, the general opinion was that Kennedy was too perfect, too good to be true, a sort of public relations officer's ideal American: the film star image, the beautiful wife, the great speeches with easy quotations from Burke and Shakespeare, the ice-cold efficiency, respect for the facts. But there was the homely, all-American humanity of the man when he went out on his family boating picnics. His wife was down one end of the boat eating the pâté de foie gras, he was sitting quite happily in the bow of the boat knocking back the peanut butter sandwiches.

LANCE PERCIVAL. But once Kennedy was in office, the dream came true. Behind the rocking chair and the cultural evenings at the White House and Caroline's pony and the parties in Bobby's swimming pool, behind the trappings of the image, was the first Western politician to make politics a respectable profession for 30 years, to make it once again the highest of the professions and not just a fabric of fraud and sham. When most statesmen die they have to be explained away with words like "integrity" and "cunning" and "courage," but Kennedy did not need such apologies. He was simply and superlatively a man of his age, who understood his age, who put all his own energy and the best brains of his country into solving its problems and who ended up in more cases than not by doing the right thing at the right time because he'd gone about it in the right way.

DAVID FROST. Few people would have thought at the beginning of this year that by its end we would have lost the leader of the opposition in Britain, Pope John in Rome and the President of the United States. We have been very aware of death this year. Even here in this studio we have lost someone we still miss, but with the murder of John Kennedy, death has become immediate to people all over the world for the first time. Because of the stature of the man and the nature of a shrinking world, people everywhere feel they've lost someone they'll miss. Yesterday 1 man died, today in America 60 lost their lives in a fire. Yet somehow it is the one that matters. Even in death, it seems, we're not equal. Death is not the great leveler. Death reveals the eminent.

MILLICENT MARTIN (song):

"A young man rode with his head held high,
under the Texas sun,
And no-one guessed that a man so blessed
would perish by the gun.
Lord, would perish by the gun.

A shot rang out like a sudden shout, and
heaven held its breath,
For the dreams of a multitude of men rode
with him to his death.
Lord, rode with him to his death.

Yes, the heart of the world weighs heavy
with the helplessness of tears,
For the man cut down in a Texas town in
the summer of his years.

And we who stay must not ever lose the
victories that he won,
For wherever men look to freedom then his
soul goes riding on.
Lord, his soul goes riding on."

DAVID FROST. There has been today one ominous hint of future developments. Already the assassination which seems at the moment, at any rate, to have been the action of an individual, is being made subject to the first manipulations of various groups and sections of opinion for their own ends. In America and even here, they have already begun to show their hand. It would be good to hope that the death of a great man will not become a pawn in a power struggle of one sort or another. But it would, alas, be naive.

ROBERT LANG. There are two men in the world for the first time since the world began in whose hands there lies the possibility of bringing all life on this globe to an end and making its charred remains uninhabitable to the end of time. One of those men looks out on the loneliest view in the world, the view from the White House windows in the middle of our bitter and war-torn century. And, yet, how little true it is that all power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely. It would be closer to the truth to say that such power transforms, elevates, even purifies its holder. At the assumption of so terrible a burden, even as it marks out its bearer as a man forever apart, at the same time it gives him the strength to live it. In what manner this man, whose identity is less important than his office, has come by degrees, to bear the burden of hundreds of millions who know nothing of him is no longer important even if it could be determined.

What matters now is that we recognize what we have done. The loneliness of power is a universally accepted truth. There remains the recognition of the loneliness of absolute power, the responsibility for all life and death, a responsibility hitherto reserved only to God—in a sense so terribly real that it transcends paradox. Mankind has, by a conscious decision, appointed for itself a God-substitute and the blasphemy of the appointment by men of one man to live and die for us all is rooted in the ultimate blasphemy of the world that it made it necessary.

And so, once again, we are reminded that no man is an island, and the bell that tolls in Dallas, tolls for us all. Not only because of our inextricable interdependence. Not only because it shows that although it may be expedient that one man should die for the people, it is neither wise nor just. Not only because it teaches us all, though we cannot sluff off our responsibilities by putting them all onto one elected scapegoat. But above all because, as the bell tolls, it reminds us, in the hideous emphasis it places upon the reality of power, of the frailty of the body in which that power must ultimately rest, and in doing so prompts us to remember with Montaigne that sit we ever so high on a stool, yet sit we but upon our own tails.

DAME SYBIL THORNDIKE. "To Jackie"

"Yesterday the sun was shot out of your sky,
Jackie, why, Jackie.
A man who was able and hopeful and gay
Was called abruptly from this world's day
His journey done, his song half sung, why,
Jackie, why.

What can we say to you, we who all pray
with you, widow and mother,
We who know well the peace loving world
lost a friend and a brother.

His sun is set, but we don't forget you, our
sister,
Yours the hard part, may God give you good
heart, little sister."

BERNARD LEVIN. Amid the echoes of what was, with the exception of the one that killed the Archduke Ferdinand at Sarajevo, the loudest shot the world has ever heard, one bitterly ironic coincidence has gone unnoticed. A few hours before he died, President Kennedy had taken time out of his crowded program to look in on the birthday celebrations in Dallas of John Nance Garner. Garner, who was 95 yesterday, was Roosevelt's first Vice President and is by far the senior of the surviving former holders of that office. And when at the 1960 Democrat convention in Los Angeles, Lyndon Johnson, defeated by Kennedy for the Presidential nomination, was offered the vice presidency, he hesitated. To help him make up his mind he telephoned his fellow Texan, Garner, who had held the post all those years before, to ask whether he would advise acceptance. "No," said Garner, he would not. And in a typically Texan phrase added: "Lyndon, the vice presidency isn't worth a pitcher of warm spit." Nevertheless, Johnson accepted Kennedy's offer. And in consequence became yesterday evening the 35th President of the United States. The succession was immediate. In the world of today neither grief nor shock can be permitted to create an interregnum in the citadels of power. The President is dead, long live the President. And such is the pace at which the modern world moves that even before the mourning is over, indeed, before it has begun, we must begin to think not of the past but of the future.

What, then can be read of the future with President Johnson? For the time has long since gone by when the responsibility of the President of the United States was confined to the people of that country alone.

I believe that this now global responsibility has fallen into good hands. The contrasts between President Johnson and his predecessors are more obvious than important. Johnson, unlike Kennedy, is not an intellectual, but then neither was Truman. Johnson is provincial where Kennedy was metropolitan, but his years as leader of the Senate gave him a knowledge, understanding and control of the realities of power in politics, almost as sophisticated as that of Roosevelt. Johnson, in the inevitable isolation of the vice presidency, had had no direct power to exercise, yet Kennedy, unlike Roosevelt, took his deputy fully into his confidence, and shared with him the results of his decisions, if not their making.

Johnson's health is suspect, so was Roosevelt's, so was Eisenhower's, and so, indeed, was Kennedy's own.

And President Johnson will bring to the awful responsibility of his office qualities and a record that offer promise that he will be more than merely the best available shadow of the light that failed.

Though a southerner, his record on the color question, the rock on which America's future must either be built or sink, is one of the best in the Democratic Party. It was he who steered through Congress the only successful civil rights legislation of recent years. And during the 1960 election he and his wife faced physical violence in his home State for his liberal stand.

The other major domestic political achievement of his career—though, too, the impossibility of considering its effect only on the United States is apparent—was the planning and execution of the strategy that finally destroyed Senator McCarthy. There is every reason to believe that the assumption of supreme office will only confirm in President Johnson and his policies the beliefs that informed these actions and attitudes.

Abroad he will be chiefly remembered for his dash to Berlin during the crisis of the building of the wall. He was then much criticized for his extrovert behavior. But no part of that criticism came from the Berliners, who correctly saw in his visit a symbol of America's determination to stand firm in the face of any threat to freedom. Nor on the other hand is there any reason to fear that the thaw in the frozen attitudes of East-West relations will be seriously endangered, let alone reversed by President Johnson's accession. His incomparable political shrewdness, the clarity and firmness of the lines which President Kennedy had drawn on the charts and policy into the future, the team of younger men that he has inherited—these will combine to insure continuity in those aspects of American policy which are of such direct concern to us all. And the ambassadorial mission he undertook for the then fledgling President a few weeks after Kennedy had been elected, took him through Western Europe, including Britain, and wherever he went he made a good impression which will stand him in good stead now. And it is significant that that mission was carried out in the company of so liberal and devotedly internationalist an American figure as Senator FULBRIGHT.

Nobody tonight can wish more fervently than President Johnson himself that this dreadful opportunity had not fallen upon him. But since it has, we, citizens of the alliance he now leads, have the right to hope for much from his leadership and a duty to wish him well with all our hearts. I think those hopes and wishes will not be disappointed.

A poet once hymned an earlier, narrower moment of crisis in the life of the United States. How much more bitterly relevant are Longfellow's words today:

"Sail on, oh Ship of State.
Sail on, oh Union strong and great.
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging on thy fate."

DAVID FROST. The tragedy of John Kennedy's death is not that the liberal movements of history that he led will cease, it is that their focus may become blurred and that the gathering momentum may be lost.

That is the aftermath of Dallas, November 22.

It is a time for private thoughts.

AMBASSADOR ROWAN A SUCCESS IN FINLAND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since last May 17, Mr. Carl Rowan has been our Ambassador in Finland. The people of Finland have been taken by storm, as it were, by the total diplomacy of our new Ambassador's approach. He gets around in all levels of society in all parts of the country and undertaking everything that may be a part of aiding a broad understanding of what America stands for.

Mr. Rowan has been solidly successful and has been, with his family, taken to the hearts of the Finnish people with genuine warmth.

Finnish-American relations have been and continue to be good. Mr. Rowan has solidified them further with his frankness about America, denying no difficulties with our racial problems at home, while emphasizing the progress we do make, and overall drawing a balanced picture. His accent upon public relations, built upon honesty and forthrightness in all matters, has given impact to his unequivocal presentation of the U.S. position on matters vis-a-vis Russia.

Finland is in a difficult position in relationship to Russia. Finland might be cautious or hope a foreign ambassador would be. They have found Mr. Rowan refreshing and welcome. In short, his brand of diplomacy is of a high order and most effective.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD a recent New York Times magazine article on Ambassador Rowan for the benefit of my colleagues.

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

OUR MAN IN FINLAND

(By Werner Wiskari)

HELSINKI.—Carl T. Rowan is a 38-year-old New Frontiersman who, for the last 6 months, has been the U.S. Ambassador here. When he flew into town last May 17, he began a whirlwind round of what might be called total diplomacy, carrying the message of America to as many Finns as he could reach in the shortest possible time.

Helsinki has been used to a more traditional diplomatic approach, and Mr. Rowan promptly broke all the traditions, taking the capital by storm. But he would have taken Helsinki by storm in any case. For Carl Rowan happens to be a Negro. In fact, the news of his appointment had set all Finland buzzing, not because of any racial prejudice, for none is evident, but because of a curiosity about a race rarely seen here. And so the press informed the nation on the Rowans' arrival that the Ambassador and his sons are "chocolate brown" and that his wife is considerably lighter.

But it was soon apparent that the Finns felt that, color aside, this Ambassador was definitely out of the ordinary.

He went on a constant round of speeches, travel, receptions, bull sessions, bowling, golfing, and taking the steam with university students and others in the sauna. Mr. Rowan is convinced that, as a space age envoy, he should undertake anything that might help provide a broader understanding of America and what it stands for.

The usual career ambassador in Helsinki quietly settles into diplomatic routine after the striped-pants procedure of presenting credentials and paying ceremonial calls upon fellow diplomats and Finnish officials. But Mr. Rowan's traditions are not from the world of diplomacy. He was catapulted into his ambassadorship after 13 years as a newsman and 2 as a State Department custodian of press relations as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Hurtling into diplomacy with all the furious energy of a Kennedy election campaign, the fledgling Ambassador crammed five major speeches into his first 6 weeks along with three forays into the Finnish hinterland to pay official visits to southwestern and northern cities.

From the outset newspapers and magazines featured pictures of the Ambassador, of his wife, Vivien; sons, 11-year-old Carl Jr. and 10-year-old Geoffrey, and miniature greyhound, Gomez. Many of the pictures were of diplomatic activity Finns had never seen before. His Excellency was shown, for example, walking atop an iron fence with his boys or hunting through a neighbor's backyard for a baseball while the lady of the house hung up the wash.

A popular magazine, after his first week here, ran a feature article headlined "The Most Colorful Ambassador in Helsinki"—a headline that caused Mr. Rowan to toss his head back in laughter. At the end of his first month, however, he was happy to note that his whirlwind brand of diplomacy was beginning to be reported without reference to his race.

But, he says, even in that first month, when Finnish newspapers almost invariably described him as "dark skinned," he only rarely had any consciousness here of being a Negro. The few times that he did were when he listened to Voice of America or BBC broadcasts on race riots in the United States or when he had to discuss them at news conferences. He won admiration for declaring that he was not ashamed to speak of the riots even though they were a "national disgrace." He stressed that the Negroes of America had made great progress in the last two decades and that they now had more Government support than ever before.

At the same time, Finnish newsmen who had the opportunity to participate in a bull session with him were flabbergasted by his willingness to tell stories at his own expense about his experiences as a Negro in the United States. One that caused special astonishment was an account of mowing the lawn of the house he had while he was with the State Department in Washington. A white woman driving a big car pulled up to hail him as "boy" and ask how much he charged. His only pay for mowing the lawn, he replied, was the privilege of sleeping with the lady of the house.

Mr. Rowan surprised Helsinki in other ways as well. He does not give the impression in closeup of an aggressive personality likely to make a fast-paced debut as an ambassador. Heavy set, he seems to move almost languidly, speaking with a slow drawl bearing the stamp of his native Tennessee. He seems much older than his 38 years; he says he grew old at an early age.

He was in his late teens before he set out from his red-clay hometown of McMinnville, Tenn., where he had romped barefoot along streets filled with sharp stones. (These days he sometimes looks speculatively at his two sons, about the best dressed boys in Helsinki, and wonders if they will ever amount to anything, for they have never had to go barefoot.)

He left McMinnville with 77 cents in his pocket, carrying his clothes in a cardboard box. His road led first to a summer job in a Nashville hospital, then to a Negro college and, it being wartime, on to a U.S. Navy officer training school as one of the first Negroes to be admitted under what was then a new policy. He was the only Negro in a class of 337, he says, "and that ages you fast."

But World War II, in which 19-year-old Ensign Rowan served as a communications officer on two vessels in the Atlantic, turned out to be his "big break." "It got me out of the race situation," for it led to his move north. He went on to win his bachelor's degree from Oberlin College in Ohio, his master's from the University of Minnesota and a job with the Minneapolis Tribune, on which he achieved acclaim for his reporting on the Negro in the South and on social conditions in India and other Asian countries. His articles became the bases for three books. He received honorary doctorates from Simpson College in Iowa and Hamline University in Minnesota.

Attracting the attention of President Kennedy, he was appointed to the State Department in February 1961. Named Ambassador early this year, he came to Helsinki determined to judge for himself whether there was justification for the suspicions, often encountered in Washington, about Finnish relations with the neighboring Soviet Union.

He was not content to let the usual circle of business and uppercrust Finns and some other selected leaders dominate embassy functions. In a bid to talk to as many Finns as possible, he is struggling to gain something of a conversational ability in the exceedingly difficult Finnish language, since most people in this farmer-dominated northern country speak only Finnish.

He said in an interview that he had nothing against "the elite." He and his wife like "culture and good cognac as well as the next people," he declared. But he thinks that the revolutionary changes that the world has undergone in the last two decades have "also changed the requirement of diplomacy," making it necessary for the space-age ambassador to reach "the masses" in a great variety of ways.

"It is just as much an ambassador's job to go bowling, golfing, or to a track meet," he said, "as it is to go to the endless number of teas and diplomatic receptions."

Finns in general appear to be impressed and pleased with Ambassador Rowan and his accent on public relations. One official has already compared him with John Moors Cabot, now U.S. Ambassador to Poland, who has been highly popular wherever he has served because of his insistence on meeting and discussing America and its ideals with as many people as he could manage—here in the early fifties and subsequently in Sweden, Colombia, and Brazil.

Mr. Rowan has also made a deep impression here with his speeches, which he writes himself. Aware though he is of Finland's delicate position between East and West, he deems it his duty, nevertheless, to express his country's views without equivocation. And so in a speech in which he decried the Soviet-led "assault on the United Nations," he suggested that it had been mounted because of clear evidence that the "uncommitted peoples, these new members of the U.N., have, by and large, exactly the same goals as do the people of the United States and the rest of the free world."

Such remarks would scarcely seem extraordinary in the United States. But to many Finns, accustomed to the increasingly careful Finnish pronouncements of recent years, they appeared a bit startling, though welcome.

What does Mr. Rowan hope to accomplish here? He has no "grand strategy." But already his pattern of diplomacy is clear.

His is a mission largely to the Finnish "masses." But he also wants to get on such a casual basis with Finnish Government leaders that he can telephone for an appointment just to chat and not only when he has official business to transmit.

The Ambassador apparently can take partial credit for one of the most significant public relations triumphs the United States has ever scored in Finland: the outpouring of pro-American sentiment by the unexpectedly large and enthusiastic crowds that greeted Vice President Johnson during his September visit.

Before leaving Washington for Helsinki, Mr. Rowan had pressed hard for more attention to Finland by high level Americans going abroad. The Johnson visit was said to be an indirect result of this.

In general, besides trying "to enhance, if possible, the already excellent" Finnish-American relations, Mr. Rowan wants to be "aware, and make Washington aware, of any way in which the United States can act to assist the Finns in achieving their fundamental goal" of maintaining their independence.

"This," he said, "may mean doing nothing."

But for a man with a record of vigorous action "doing nothing" appears unlikely.

HYPOCRISY AND ANTI-SEMITISM—ACTIVITIES OF ARON VERGELIS

Mr. KEATING. I believe the American people should be alterted to the activities under the cultural exchange program of Aron Vergelis.

Mr. President, among the cultural exchange visitors from the Soviet Union who have been touring the United States was a man sent obviously for the purpose of denying and obscuring the extent of anti-Semitic activities within the Soviet Union. Aron Vergelis, editor of a Yiddish publication in the Soviet Union, has tried to present himself in the United States as a spokesman for the Jewish people in the Soviet Union. Yet it is evident that his purpose is not to give Americans the full truth, not to explain the new trend of persecution and discrimination which fall to the lot of the Jewish people within the Soviet Union, and above all not to serve as a genuine link between the Jews in the Soviet Union and their coreligionists in the free world.

In one statement after another, Mr. Vergelis has tried to deny the obvious facts of discrimination, the closing of synagogues in the Soviet Union, the denial of a Yiddish language press or a cultural rights comparable to those of nationality groups within the Soviet Union. Vergelis has even insisted that "a Jewish problem does not exist in the Soviet Union" and that those who discuss it are only trying to interfere and block peaceful relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I wish that the words of Mr. Vergelis were true and that the rights of Jews and other religious groups in the Soviet Union did receive the respect which is their due. It is, however, only too well documented that Jewish persons in the Soviet Union are being made scapegoats for economic failure of all kinds. Because of a sympathetic and often sentimental tie with the State of Israel, Soviet Jews are often considered disloyal citizens. They dare not give the true story of the discriminations they meet. But it is clear to those who have looked at the mounting evidence that the religious and cultural rights of the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union are gravely threatened. In their continuing battle against all religion, the Soviet Communists have recently exerted special pressures against members of the Jewish faith and have denied to them the human rights which we in the United States regard as basic principles of government and ethics.

Mr. President, the American people are not deceived by the words of Aron Vergelis. Neither are we seeking to increase tensions between the two countries merely because as citizens of a free nation we see and recognize the facts. But certainly it would be a useful step in the easing of tensions and in the recognition of mutual interests if the Soviet Union would move to correct the injustices that are so clearly evident to the entire world and to insure for all its citizens the rights which it so proudly boasts of before other countries. That would be a step forward, a step that would be welcomed by all free peoples throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, in the RECORD the text of an article and editorial which appeared in the Jewish press on this subject.

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

[From the Jewish Press, Nov. 29, 1963]

ARON VERGELIS

Aron Vergelis has come to America. Who, you will ask, is Aron Vergelis? If you were to ask the gentleman himself he would modestly say that he is merely a Russian writer here, together with 15 other such worthies, on a 3-week tour of these United States. The man's modesty, however, does not tell the entire picture.

For Aron Vergelis is a famous man these days, a celebrity at least. Because of Aron Vergelis 18 top Jewish leaders met in hasty conclave feverishly to discuss what to do about him. Because of Aron Vergelis, the International Airport at New York was filled with reporters waiting for the Soviet jet that brought him here to land.

But, you impatiently ask, why? Who is this Aron Vergelis? It is a simple question but one which, unfortunately, does not have a simple answer. We could say that Vergelis is a writer, a Soviet journalist, the editor of the only Yiddish magazine in Russia today. It would hardly be the whole story.

We would have to say that Aron Vergelis is a "moser" (an informer) who has been sent here by the Soviet Government to brand all the stories about Soviet Jewish persecution as a "fistful of lies invented by the capitalist ruling circles as part of their cold war strategy." We would have to say that he is sent here to confuse the issues in the minds of the Jewish peoples. We would have to quote you from one or two of his remarks upon arriving.

Thus, upon being asked why such minute groups as the Gypsies and Yakuts have complete cultural autonomy while the Jews have not, Vergelis quite logically said: "The Jews are already integrated; they are satisfied with a general Jewish culture." Upon being read a quotation from a Soviet journal that read: "What is a Jew's secular god? Money. Money, that is the jealous god of Israel before whom there is no other god," Vergelis coolly replied: "I read it and it does not bother me in the least. It is not the kind of Judaism I believe in that is being described in those articles."

And so, while the yeshivas in Russia are still closed and the synagogues diminish in number; while the physical well-being of the people is threatened and the spiritual life is being destroyed, Vergelis comes to deny it all.

Who—or what—is Aron Vergelis? We leave it to you, dear readers, to tell us.

MOSCOW EDITOR SAYS NO ANTI-SEMITISM IN RUSSIA

NEW YORK.—Aron Vergelis, editor of the Sovietish Heimland published in Moscow, and Robert Rozhdestvensky, a prominent Soviet poet, asserted here this week with great heat that there was no anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, the latter insisting "a Jewish problem does not exist in the Soviet Union" and those in this country who say so are interested only in "interfering with the relaxation of tensions" between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Vergelis and the Russian poet were members of a three-man group of Russians who held a press conference at the headquarters of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations. Most of the questions directed at the group, which was headed by another well-known Russian writer, Boris Polovoi, concerned the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union.

Both Mr. Vergelis and Rozhedestvensky avoided direct answers in regard to closures of synagogues by Soviet authorities and denial to the Jews of the Soviet Union cultural rights. However, Mr. Vergelis did produce for the television cameras and other photographers a large colorful poster announcing in Russian a performance by Yiddish artists and said that there are more Jewish theatrical performances in the Soviet Union than there are in the United States. Challenged about the high percentage of Jews given the death sentence for alleged economic crimes in the Soviet Union, Mr. Vergelis said that the victims were sentenced merely as criminals and that no anti-Semitism was involved.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of yesterday, the Senate will now resume the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 1703, the Mexican laborer bill.

The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to concur in the House amendment, upon which 30 minutes of debate is permitted, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has requested a quorum call. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side on the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that my request be modified accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be modified accordingly.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I speak briefly in support of the motion made yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. His motion would call for the adoption by the Senate of the bill as passed by the House, which would extend the operation of the Mexican labor act, or the bracero act, for 1 year only, from December 31, 1963, to December 31, 1964.

The Senate, by a single vote margin, adopted the McCarthy amendment, which was the amendment omitted by the House in the passage of its bill.

The House had the same subject before it—that is, the McCarthy amendment—and it disposed of it in this way: The House Agriculture Committee rejected the McCarthy amendment by a

vote of 28 to 4. When the McCarthy amendment was considered on the floor of the House, it was rejected by a division vote of 79 to 131.

The bill as passed by the House calls for an extension of 1 year only, without the McCarthy amendment.

Statements were made on the floor of the House to the effect that 1 year would be the limit of the extension to be expected by those who are using Mexican braceros for the production and harvesting of their perishable crops.

I understand that the distinguished chairman of the Senate committee stated yesterday on the Senate floor that, so far as he and his committee are concerned, their commitment is to an extension of 1 year, and not beyond that time.

Without laboring the question, let me make two points. First, this program is one requested by the Mexican Government itself. I served in the Senate committee when this solution was arrived at. The Mexican Government wanted it done this way because it said that under the old program Mexican laborers moved, too frequently, from communities which had no problem of unemployment. The Mexican Government wanted to have the right to select the laborers who would come to this country from areas of unemployment, therefore to have charge of the selection and handling of their people.

That purpose was accomplished under this program. It was not accomplished under the former program. It will not be accomplished by the program which will be left on the books after this program ceases to exist.

As I have stated, therefore, first, the Mexican Government wanted this program. It gives the Mexican Government an opportunity to send laborers from areas where acute unemployment exists in their own country, and to know that their people will be fairly treated.

Secondly, we must consider the need for these laborers in our country. Despite the fact that the number of such laborers has greatly decreased in the last year about 200,000 of them came into areas producing perishable fruit and commodities, and some other commodities, but mostly perishable commodities, to help, in the main, in the cultivation and harvesting of highly seasonal and perishable crops, which must be harvested at the time they mature.

We are now in the middle of a harvesting year and a production year, depending on the area in which these laborers are employed, because they are employed from Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, just outside Mexico, up through Colorado, Arkansas, and Michigan, where last year some seven or eight thousand were employed in harvesting the pickle crop.

I do not think it is fair even to think about eliminating this program and eliminating the possibility of the use of 200,000 laborers by those who have to depend upon obtaining laborers when they need them, when the crops are ready to be handled, and when they are doing that at this very moment in part of the area represented by the Senators from Arizona—and I see present the distinguished senior Senator [Mr. HAYDEN]—and by the Senators from California, who are interested in this program, and by the Senators from Texas, who are vitally interested in this program.

Mr. President, in my own State we do not use these particular laborers. We use, at times, laborers from the offshore islands under an entirely different arrangement, under which we pay much more than is paid in the case of Mexican laborers.

It would be very burdensome and difficult for the thousands of affected farmers to solve the problem in such a short time. Passage of the bill with the McCarthy amendment added to it would not solve the problem. I strongly support the pending motion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I spoke at some length on this subject matter last night, and today I wish to make only two or three points, and to offer those points for the consideration of Senators.

First of all, I appreciate the position of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], who opposes the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

I am sure he does so in all sincerity. However, I say to him and to other Senators who are in his position that the senior Senator from Colorado would not presume to judge the conditions in Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, or any State other than my own. I hope that they will accord to those of us who are involved in this matter the same courtesy and the same consideration.

The main issue, so far as the Senator from Minnesota is concerned, is whether the Senate will accept the motion made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, or whether it will adopt the amendment which was in the Senate bill originally.

First of all, this is only a simple 1-year extension; and it would be a physical impossibility for the Secretary of Labor, within the 1-year extension, to put into effect the workmen's compensation provision, which must come under State laws, and implement the other conditions and provisions of the McCarthy amendment, before the expiration of the Act.

Therefore, in effect, the Senate would be indulging in an exercise in futility if it did not accept the motion made by the Senator from Louisiana.

The question has been repeatedly raised: What kind of program is this?

I wish again to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that three main conditions must be met by the Secretary of Labor—not by the farmer in the field, not by the hometown, not by the State—but by the Secretary of Labor, before braceros may be imported.

The first condition is that it must be found by the Secretary that there are not sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I request that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. The second qualification that must be met is that 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.

The third qualification is 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.

Mr. President, there are many articles which I should like to include in the RECORD. However, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bracero Program Is Vital Part of State's Agricultural Economy," published in the Centennial State Farm Bureau News; excerpts from the testimony of Robert M. Sayre before the House Agriculture Committee; and questions and answers concerning the Mexican national program.

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

[From the Centennial State Farm Bureau News, July-August 1963]

BRACERO PROGRAM IS VITAL PART OF STATE'S AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

The importance of Public Law 78 to the sugarbeet, lettuce and vegetable segments of Colorado's agricultural industry was emphasized by both producers and processors at a meeting with four members of the State's congressional delegation in Denver on June 21.

At a meeting arranged by Farm Bureau with Senators ALLOTT and DOMINICK and Representatives BROTZMAN and CHENOWETH, both growers and processors outlined the need for continuation of the Mexican bracero program.

The situation was summed up in a very few words by George Bensheid of the Arkansas Valley when he told the Senators and Representatives that without this source of labor the vegetable industry in Colorado "has had it."

Unless Congress acts to reverse the vote cast in the House of Representatives late in May, Public Law 78 will expire at the end of this year. The proposed extension of the law was defeated on May 29, described by Representative CHENOWETH as a very bad day to try to get serious consideration of the proposed legislation to extend the program.

Being the day before a holiday, many of the Members of the House were absent. The total vote on the measure was 158 to 174.

CHENOWETH pointed out that all but one member of Colorado's delegation in the House worked hard to save the law in the House.

All areas of Colorado were represented at the meeting with the Congressmen. In order to make best use of the time available, those attending the meeting selected spokesmen for the various interests represented.

Roy Inouye, member of the Colorado Farm Bureau board of directors and chairman of the organization's labor committee, chaired the meeting. He pointed out that the meeting had been called to give both growers and processors and the elected officials an opportunity to discuss the labor problem and the possibilities of reviving the program.

Spokesmen selected were Richard Blake, sugarbeet growers; Fred Holmes, sugar processors; Wayne Escheman, lettuce growers and shippers; Paul Hoshiko, vegetable growers; and George Benshied, vegetable processors.

All spokesmen for the various interests agreed that loss of the program would result in a damaging blow to the economy of both the agricultural industry in this country, and the general economy of Mexico.

The bracero program provides Mexico with its third largest source of dollar income.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT commented in his remarks to the growers and processors that he believes that $1 paid to a Mexican worker does more good than $5 paid in foreign aid. Representative CHENOWETH put an even higher value on the program.

Wayne Escheman, in discussing the value of the bracero program in the lettuce production and shipping industry, pointed out that Colorado meets all the requirements for building a strong industry except an adequate supply of hand labor. He pointed out that domestic labor is not available to do the fieldwork which is now being done by the imported labor.

Richard Blake stated that the sugarbeet industry was shocked by the action of the House. The entire industry needs the program.

Without the bracero program, acreage of sugarbeets will have to be reduced. There is not enough mechanization, as yet, to meet production requirements.

Fred Holmes of the Great Western Sugar Co. told the Congressmen that the industry used to be able to recruit 18,000 domestic workers for fieldwork. Now, the recruitment program supplies only about 4,000 domestic workers.

Paul Hoshiko, vegetable grower in Weld County, brought out several points which concurred with later discussion of the values of the program in people-to-people and international relations. Hoshiko reported that he still corresponds with workers from Mexico who worked for him as long as 5 years ago.

In discussing the program, many points were brought out in reference to why the program has been and is successful and needed. Principal opposition to the program has come from organized labor and organizations which have a completely erroneous picture of the program and the way in which it is operated.

Senators ALLOTT and DOMINICK reported on the action they are taking in the Senate to try to get at least a 1-year extension of the program. Senator ALLOTT has introduced a bill calling for such an extension.

QUOTATIONS FROM ROBERT M. SAYRE'S TESTIMONY, HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ON S. 1703, MARCH 27, 28, 29, 1963

The second international consideration I should mention is the importance of the program to the economy of Mexico.

Remittances home from the braceros, estimated at least $100 and possibly twice this amount, not only have often substantially supported their families and relatives, but have contributed notably to cover the Mexican deficit in its trade and in repaying its loans. The Bank of Mexico estimated these remittances at $37 million in 1962.

The program also provides an important source of temporary employment for many thousands of Mexican workers. When it is recognized that the annual per capita income in many areas from which the Mexican workers come is approximately $100 it can readily be seen how important this supplemental income can be to the Mexican worker. This temporary program has thus fulfilled mutually satisfactory objectives: American farmers have been able to obtain temporary agricultural laborers and Mexican workers have been able to earn a fair income under labor conditions satisfactory to both governments.

I would also want to note that the sudden loss of the dollar income of Mexican workers would be a serious blow to their family income and constitute a significant loss of foreign exchange to Mexico.

The Department of State urges that the contribution to the economies of both countries be kept in mind in considering the continuance of this program.

The Department of State concurs with the Department of Agriculture that Public Law 78, as amended, should be extended at least a year beyond the present date of expiration.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING THE MEXICAN NATIONAL PROGRAM

1. Who are the agricultural workers who come in under Public Law 78 who are frequently defined as braceros?

Answer. They are Mexican agricultural workers who enter the United States under the agricultural agreement that exists between the two nations and who have been certified by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor as being needed for the culture and harvesting of crops within the United States because of a lack of qualified U.S. workers.

2. What work are they permitted to perform?

Answer. The braceros are certified only for specific agricultural labor jobs for which American domestic workers are not available as determined by the Secretary of Labor. They can only be used in temporary or seasonal employment. They cannot operate power driven, self-propelling, harvesting, planting or cultivating machinery except in specific cases found necessary by the Secretary of Labor.

3. What safeguards are imposed in Public Law 78 to protect domestic agricultural workers?

Answer. Public Law 78 and the United States-Mexican Migrant Labor Agreement govern the importation of Mexican farmhands (braceros) as supplementary labor:

(a) The Secretary of Labor has complete authority to deny the employment of Mexican workers if qualified domestic workers are available.

(b) The Secretary of Labor has complete authority to remove Mexican workers from employment if qualified domestics become available.

(c) Wages paid Mexican workers cannot be less than wages paid domestics for similar work.

4. Does the Mexican labor contribute to the Nation's unemployment?

Answer. No. All domestic farmworkers' jobs are protected. Under Public Law 78 supplemental workers cannot be contracted until all available domestic workers have been employed. Certification for the employment of supplemental Mexican national workers must be obtained from the State employment service, as well as the U.S. Department of Labor.

5. Does the use of foreign labor depress wages?

Answer. No, because Public Law 78 has a provision for the Secretary of Labor to determine whether or not the importation of such Mexican national workers under Public Law 78 has an adverse effect upon American domestic agricultural workers. Before foreign agricultural workers can be brought into any area, growers must agree to pay them the prevailing wage rate being paid to domestic agricultural workers in the area or such higher rates as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be necessary to avoid adversely affecting rates paid domestic workers. These rates are determined by periodic wage surveys based only on earnings of domestic workers.

6. Will unemployed American industrial workers perform agricultural stoop labor?

Answer. Experience dictates that the answer is "No." State unemployment insurance laws do not require unemployment insurance recipients to accept employment in an activity foreign to their usual type of work. In addition, such employees are reluctant to jeopardize their chances for skilled work by accepting unskilled agricultural jobs. Skilled industrial workers feel that it is beneath their dignity to accept stoop agricultural jobs. Even a high rate of unemployment in industrial areas will not produce workers for farmwork.

7. Does the importation of Mexican nationals contribute to the growth of large farms to the detriment of small farms?

Answer. No. The only small farmers who require supplemental Mexican national contract workers when domestic workers are not available are those who produce the type of crops that require large numbers of stoop farm laborers. These small farmers are assisted immeasurably in the culture and harvest of their crops by banding together in associations for the purpose of hiring domestic workers and, if needed, Mexican national workers. In many cases small farmers do not have a large enough operation to maintain either a domestic or a Mexican national crew. In either case, whether he is large or small, he is not permitted to have Mexican national workers except for temporary or seasonal use. The timing of the cultural practices or harvest of perishable crops is just as important to the small farmer as it is to the large farmer. If labor is not immediately available when needed, either can lose his entire crop.

8. Is Public Law 78 a hidden subsidy to users?

Answer. No. The recruitment costs to the grower for obtaining Mexican national laborers is greater than the costs of obtaining domestic labor. The charge is made that 1 percent of the farmers use this supplemental stoop labor. This is true, but the 1 percent who use this supplemental labor are those who produce the crops requiring the greatest amount of hand labor. For example, every spear of asparagus, every head of lettuce, every head of cauliflower, every shoot of broccoli, every tomato, cucumber, stalk of celery, every strawberry must be harvested by hand, and it is because of these highly specialized crops grown on 1 percent of American farms that it is necessary to use supplemental labor. Again it is pointed out that American domestic workers do not make themselves available for this type of work.

9. Will the termination of Public Law 78 have an adverse effect on availability of agricultural commodities to the consumer?

Answer. It is obvious that there will be an adverse effect on the consumer since curtailed production will force prices upward so that both fresh and processed fruits and vegetables will become luxury items. Farmers will not plant what cannot be harvested. These highly perishable crops must have hand and eye selection for quality. They do not lend themselves to mechanization at this time or in the foreseeable future, although efforts are being made to develop mechanical harvesting.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I urge my friend from Minnesota to give those who are involved in this program and whose States need this program an opportunity to phase out the program, because otherwise many individual farm families will suffer in the next year.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to make a few observations on the comments which have been made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

I have not been advocating that the program be killed. What I have been seeking to do is to have the program for the importation of Mexican laborers continued when it is found that there is a need for such importation, and that we should establish for American migratory workers and our potential domestic farmworkers conditions similar to those that are offered to the imported Mexican laborers, who come to this country in competition with American farmworkers.

It is rather interesting to note the comment of the Senator from Colorado when he said that Senators who do not have the same specific problem in their own States should more or less disqualify themselves and not have any judgment or take any position or express any opinion with regard to this particular problem.

Mr. President, I can qualify in that respect, because migratory workers are used in Minnesota, in the production of sugarbeets and other crops. Over the years some Mexican nationals have also been employed in Minnesota including a few in 1962.

In the debate several months ago, I suggested that if there are any States which could not produce sugarbeets without the use of imported Mexican laborers, Minnesota would be very glad to take over their share of the sugarbeet production and produce the sugarbeets without the use of Mexican laborers and solely with the use of American domestic farmworkers.

Mr. President, I believe that every Senator has an obligation to look across State borders at problems in other States.

We are not limited to consideration of problems which exist only in our own States. After all, this is the Senate of the United States. We do not back off from a consideration of a problem which may exist in another State. All of us should have an opportunity to study problems that exist anywhere in the country and to make recommendations to the Senate.

I do not say that the importation of Mexican workers is unnecessary. All I say is that before we give the growers the right to import Mexican nationals, we owe something to our own domestic farmworkers, to at least establish some of the same standards for them that we establish for Mexican laborers.

In the testimony it was clearly shown by the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture that since the program has been initiated, the hourly, daily, and even annual income of American migratory workers has gone down.

It can be said that other forces contributed to this decline, and that may be so, but the circumstantial evidence is very clear that the importation of Mexican laborers has had that effect. It is also clear that there is not a need for as many Mexican workers as are being brought into the country. They have had the effect of depressing wages and income.

All we request is that we establish reasonable, comparable conditions, and that these conditions be offered to American workers before certification for the importation of Mexican laborers is permitted.

The action we propose was approved by the Senate after prolonged debate. We are simply asking that our conferees have the opportunity to take our position to conference with the House of Representatives.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, suppose that the crops of some of the farmlands of America are ready for harvest; suppose that the farmers on those farmlands cannot obtain the assistance of their fellow citizens in the harvesting of the crops simply because there are none available? What does the Congress propose to do about it? Is it suggested now that we turn our back on the American farmer and say to him, "Let the crops perish; that is your problem, not ours"?

Congress is aware, and ought to be aware of the problem. That is the reason why Public Law 78 was passed. It provides, in part, that the Secretary of Labor must first determine that there are no qualified American citizens available for employment by the American farmer in the harvest of his crops before he can permit the Government of Mexico to send, temporarily or on a seasonal basis, Mexican citizens to help American farmers.

The last time the Senate debated this issue, I told the Senate that I had the honor to be a member of the American delegation to the Mexican-American Parliamentary Conference, which met last spring in Mexico. I was the reporter of the panel of Mexican Senators and Deputies, and American Representatives and Senators, who sat around the table to discuss this and other problems.

The delegates from both nations were unanimous in favor of continuing the program.

There is no better program of foreign assistance than this program with Mexico, in which our friends from below the border can come here temporarily and then go home with a greater opportunity of establishing themselves in their own country.

I hope that this program will be approved by the Senate.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator yield me 3 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I propose to vote for the motion by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], but I wish to make clear my position on the bill.

I said a long time ago that I thought the bracero program should be phased down. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] had introduced a bill which would have done so, but the bill did not receive favorable action. The need for some action in that direction is indicated.

So while I shall vote for the Ellender motion, I shall do so with the clear understanding that next year I hope to see some action directed toward phasing out the program, or at least toward phasing it down. Failing that, I may be persuaded to support some amendment along the line of the McCarthy amendment, with which I am in agreement in some respects.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the Senate will support its action taken at the time the McCarthy amendment to the so-called Mexican farm labor bill was adopted. One or two things ought to be noted before the vote.

As it went to the House, the Senate bill did not discriminate against Mexican workers. What was sought by the adoption of the McCarthy amendment was to provide for American laborers, American workers, conditions comparable to those that are provided in the agreement entered into between the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico for the contracting of Mexican farmworkers. This point should be made crystal clear, because there are those who say that we are attempting to do something that would be injurious to our good friends south of the border—the citizens of Mexico who come to the United States, work on our farms, and thereby earn capital for the improvement of their living conditions.

The Senate has sought to make certain that American workers will not be discriminated against. If the Senate adopted the House bill—that is, the amendment that is before the Senate—American workers would be discriminated against merely because they are American citizens. The Senate version provides that American workers must be offered comparable conditions in transportation, housing, workmen's compensation, work guarantees, and all other benefits that are now offered to the imported Mexican workers.

The House version, because it does not contain the McCarthy amendment, would continue to deny to American nationals certain important benefits which are extended to Mexican nationals. That situation cannot be justified. Under present law and under the House amendment, American workers could get all these benefits if they went to Mexico, took out Mexican citizenship, and then were imported back to the United States as braceros. But American workers could not obtain such benefits if they applied for jobs in this country as American citizens.

The situation means that an American law, passed by the U.S. Congress, makes it a handicap for one having American citizenship to be an American worker. Such conditions cannot be justified.

One further point: The agreement between the Government of Mexico and

the Government of the United States for the importation of Mexican workers also contains a prohibition against discrimination. I applaud that agreement; I salute it. For example, it contains a provision for complete equality of treatment in what are called public accommodations. The agreement between Mexico and the United States is a basic civil rights act. I applaud the agreement for achieving that purpose.

There is a prohibition against any discrimination. For example, the language of the agreement requires that the chief law-enforcement officer of the community in which Mexican workers are employed must require that no discriminatory acts be perpetrated against Mexicans in that locality, and further states:

> 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.

In other words, the Mexican Government says, in effect, "If it is desired to have Mexicans employed in the United States, they must be given their full equal rights; there must be no discrimination. They shall have access to all places of public accommodation. They shall have access to every public facility in the United States without discrimination."

On that basis, the agreement is excellent. The McCarthy amendment does not alter that agreement; it supports it. The McCarthy amendment merely extends some of the same conditions to American workers.

I am hopeful that the Senate will support the action of the Senate and will not support what is considered to be discriminatory legislation passed by the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank my colleague for his statement. The Mexican Government could in no way be offended by what the Senate intended to do by adopting my amendment. The Mexican Government ought to be pleased. We are merely trying to secure for Americans the same standards of employment as we have provided for Mexicans when they come to this country. The Mexican Government ought to be pleased to know that we are trying to raise the standards for American workers to the level we have insisted should be provided for Mexican workers before they come to the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in support of the pending bill I would like to point out to my colleagues that the passage of the measure would not mean the displacement of one domestic farmworker by Mexican nationals. This program merely insures that farmers engaged in vegetable and similar agricultural production will have the supplemental labor force necessary to plant and harvest their crops next year. Most of the braceros are employed in areas where hot temperatures prevail. This factor, together with the arduous nature of the work, such as continual stooping, has made it impossible for these farmers to fill their necessary work forces from the domestic labor pool.

If Congress does not extend this program, many of our farmers will be forced to curtail production. This would raise the prices on the national market and would depress the agricultural economy in many parts of our country.

The present regulations under which the Secretary of Labor administers the program insures that no domestic farmworker is replaced by this "bracero labor" and that the wage standard paid for this type of work is not depressed.

Our farmers need at least this 1-year period in order to find a solution to their labor problem without curtailment of production.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The Senator from Texas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which shows the percentage of cotton harvested by machine in Texas and the average number of domestic agricultural seasonal hired workers in Texas. The table shows that the percentage of cotton harvested by machine in Texas has increased from 44 percent in 1959 to 78 percent in 1962; and it shows that the average number of domestic agricultural seasonal hired workers in Texas have decreased from 141,000 in 1959 to 127,000 in 1962.

I also submit, for printing in the RECORD, a memorandum of statistics on Texas agriculture in connection with the bracero bill; a memorandum of data on the Mexican farm labor program and its effects; and, finally, a table which is taken from page 13 of the House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture report (No. 722) on this bill.

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

1. Percent of cotton harvested by machine in Texas.

Year:	*Percent*
1962	78
1961	64
1960	58
1959	44

2. Average number of domestic agriculture seasonal hired workers in Texas.

Year:	*Number*
1962	127,000
1961	133,000
1960	137,000
1959	141,000

Source: BES, Department of Labor, In-Season Farm Labor Report.

MEMO TO SENATOR YARBOROUGH FROM ALLAN MANDEL RE STATISTICS ON TEXAS AGRICULTURE IN CONNECTION WITH BRACERO BILL

1. No 1963 figures are available on agricultural employmeint in Texas. Figures for agricultural employment, however, show a steady drop over the past 4 years.

Annual average agricultural employment for Texas:

1959	397,992
1960	383,891
1961	360,383
1962	343,100

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

2. Average annual total unemployment rate for Texas:

	Percent
1959	4.6
1960	5.1
1961	5.6
1962	4.8

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

3. Total number of Mexican workers contracted and recontracted in Texas, 1959–62:

1959	225,498
1960	140,308
1961	135,515
1962	36,289

Source: Minority views in Senate report on bracero bill.

4. Number of farms using bracero labor in Texas:

1959	22,310
1960	not available
1961	16,498
1962	13,092

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

5. Total number of farms in Texas:

1959	252,000
1960	240,000
1961	232,000
1962	224,000

Source: Department of Agriculture.

DATA ON MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECTS

(1) Peak employment of Mexican nationals in Texas totaled 136,200 in 1959. In 1962, a total number of 24,200 Mexican nationals were employed in the peak month. The total number of braceros employed in Texas in 1962 was 36,289; in 1961, 135,515.

(2) The extent of mechanization in Texas is illustrated by the fact that 35 percent of the 1958 crop was mechanically harvested in 1958 as opposed to 78 percent of the crop in 1962.

(3) A two-row cottonpicker cost about $18,000. It can do the work of 50 to 60 handpickers.

(4) The decline in employment of Mexican nationals has been matched by reduced number of domestic workers employed. This is because of mechanization. When a farmer mechanizes, he must go the complete route. This eliminates jobs for domestic workers as well as Mexican nationals.

(5) The peak employment of seasonal agricultural workers in Texas has fallen from 206,200 in 1959 to 180,400 in 1962.

(6) All farmers cannot afford to mechanize. The investment is too great for many. Land topography is also a controlling factor. Smaller farmers will continue to require supplemental labor. It is in their interest to have a supplemental labor program when domestic workers are not available.

(7) The Mexican labor program is important to the economy of Mexico. According to the Department of State remittances home from braceros are estimated to average at least $100 per worker and maybe twice this amount. The Bank of Mexico estimates these remittances at $37 million in 1962. The program offers an important source of temporary employment for Mexican workers.

Man-months of Mexican labor, by States, 1959–62

State	Man-months				Percent change, 1959–62	State	Man-months				Percent change, 1959–62
	1959	1960	1961	1962			1959	1960	1961	1962	
U.S. total	1,630,950	1,358,058	1,148,800	716,426	−56	Montana	3,257	3,376	3,122	2,644	−19
						Nebraska	2,733	2,712	2,474	2,715	−1
Texas	733,724	569,177	496,702	188,409	−74	Wyoming	1,816	1,852	2,423	2,010	+11
California	560,690	487,680	406,255	378,570	−32	Georgia	1,812	1,806	1,454	0	−100
Arizona	110,608	104,078	86,810	61,666	−44	Wisconsin	1,496	1,531	1,340	1,327	−11
Arkansas	84,689	78,436	52,988	18,664	−78	Utah	1,837	1,804	1,276	1,850	+1
New Mexico	81,368	60,362	46,783	17,888	−78	Tennessee	2,474	2,283	1,060	330	−87
Michigan	22,776	21,381	23,788	18,361	−19	All others	4,945	4,013	1,835	2,302	−53
Colorado	15,747	16,112	19,192	19,690	+25						

Source: Farm Labor Market Developments, February 1963, BES–USDL.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this program is being phased out because of the increasing mechanization of agriculture in Texas.

In the past I have voted for correction of abuses in the bracero program, for the employment of American labor. Under the emergency now existing I will vote for a 1-year extension of it, for this year only. This 1-year extension will provide an opportunity to phase out the bracero program; and that development is inevitable because the use of both bracero labor and domestic agricultural labor is declining, as the result of the increasing mechanization of agriculture. I agree with the chairman, when he states that he will not bring out a bracero bill another year. I vote for this 1-year extension to enable American farmers to adjust their labor supply, to search for domestic labor, and to lighten the disruption caused by a too sudden termination of the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

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

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to point out that in our area, bracero labor is of very great importance because of the sugarbeet industry. We have found this type of labor most important in connection with the harvesting of the sugarbeet crop.

Therefore, with the understanding that the proposed 1-year extension of the program will be "the end of the line," I hope the Senate will concur in the proposed 1-year extension, which will make good sense and will provide the small sugarbeet farmers with the opportunity they need to employ this type of labor.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to concur in the proposed 1-year extension of the program—and only a 1-year extension.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, how much time remains available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes.

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD two telegrams which have come to me from Arizona. One of the telegrams is from Lawrence Anderson, of Arizona Vegetable Distributors. His telegram reads as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
November 20, 1963.

Senator EUGENE J. McCARTHY,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are certainly opposed to any extension of Public Law 78 and we ask your help in defeating the passage of this bill. We have plenty of local labor which needs to work. We may have to pay higher wages but we should do this. This national bracero program has done nothing but give us overproduction in all forms of farming as the large farmers bring in such large amounts of labor it depresses all operations. We are small growers and this program is doing nothing but ruining all small growers. So we ask your help to defeat this program.

LAWRENCE ANDERSON.

The following telegram has been sent to me by Mr. A. W. Bodine, president of the Bodine Produce Co.:

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
November 15, 1963.

Senator EUGENE J. McCARTHY,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We would like to have your support in voting against any extension of Public Law 78. We are growers and shippers of fruits and vegetables farming over 3,000 acres in the Salt River Valley of Arizona. We have plenty of domestic labor available to do our work or they can be secured at slightly higher wages than we are now paying the Mexican nationals and it will certainly stabilize our fruit and vegetable growing operations. With the tremendous amount of labor in Arizona and California now in all districts it has caused our markets to become very demoralized and growers and shippers are facing losses of many thousands of dollars. We urge and request your support in this matter for an overwhelming defeat of Public Law 78. Thanks.

A. W. BODINE.

These two telegrams were sent to me by growers in Arizona.

I have also received the following telegram from Thomas L. Pitts, secretary-treasurer of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, in San Francisco, Calif.:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
November 15, 1963.

Senator EUGENE J. McCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Air mail specialing November 2 S. F. Examiner article on closing Dole Corp.'s Oakland cannery which employs 930 people during canning season. Of interest to Public Law 78 fight is Dole President Malcolm MacNaughton's reported statement: "Our Oakland plant was designed and equipped to process cling peaches, tomatoes, and tomato products. These products have been in chronic oversupply for several years, resulting in depressed prices and unprofitable operations at this plant."

THOMAS L. PITTS.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article referred to in Mr. Pitts' telegram.

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

DOLE SHUTS CANNERY IN OAKLAND

Dole Corp., subsidiary of Castle & Cooke, Inc., announced yesterday that it is permanently closing its 410,000-square-foot Oakland cannery, but will continue to use the warehouse adjacent to it as a distribution center for Dole products.

"Our Oakland plant was designed and equipped to process cling peaches, tomatoes and tomato products," said Malcolm MacNaughton, Dole president. "These products have been in chronic oversupply for several years, resulting in depressed prices and unprofitable operations at this plant.

The plant at 5733 San Leandro Boulevard, formerly F. M. Ball Co., was acquired by Dole in 1955. It normally employed 120 year-round personnel and up to 930 people during the canning season.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me. However, I have not received any further requests for time; therefore, I am ready to vote, and I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back or expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703. Is it correct that if the pending motion is rejected, it then will be in order for the Senate to request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two bodies to the amendment of the House to Senate bill 1703?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; but the question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BEALL (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. PROUTY (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would vote "yea."

The respective pairs of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and that of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] have been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 261 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Aiken	Bennett	Boggs
Allott	Bible	Byrd, Va.
Cooper	Holland	Randolph
Cotton	Hruska	Robertson
Curtis	Jackson	Russell
Dirksen	Jordan, N.C.	Saltonstall
Dominick	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Eastland	Kuchel	Stennis
Edmondson	Lausche	Talmadge
Ellender	McClellan	Thurmond
Ervin	McGee	Tower
Fulbright	Miller	Walters
Goldwater	Morse	Williams, Del.
Hart	Morton	Yarborough
Hartke	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Hill	Pearson	

NAYS—36

Anderson	Gruening	Monroney
Bartlett	Humphrey	Muskie
Bayh	Inouye	Nelson
Burdick	Javits	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Pastore
Cannon	Keating	Pell
Case	Mansfield	Proxmire
Clark	McCarthy	Ribicoff
Dodd	McGovern	Scott
Douglas	McIntyre	Smith
Fong	McNamara	Symington
Gore	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—14

Beall	Hickenlooper	Mechem
Brewster	Kennedy	Prouty
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Church	Long, La.	Sparkman
Engle	Magnuson	

So Mr. ELLENDER's motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703 was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, my good friend and former colleague in the Cabinet of President Kennedy, Justice Arthur Goldberg, is an American of whom we can all be proud. His dedication to duty and high concepts of service have been fruitful both for his country and his fellow citizens. He recently presented a thoughtful and scholarly paper on the meaning of human rights and the denial of those rights to Jews in the Soviet Union. Justice Goldberg addressed the Jewish Theological Seminary of America's Louis Marshall Award dinner. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

HUMAN RIGHTS

(Address by the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, Associate Justice, U.S. Supreme Court, at the Louis Marshall Award dinner of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, November 17, 1963)

I am deeply honored to have received an honorary degree from the Jewish Theological Seminary greatly respected as it justly is for profound scholarship and uncompromising devotion to Jewish learning.

As an outstanding rabbinical school, the seminary, in its teachings, demonstrates that fidelity to Judaism is also devotion to the moral heritage of our civilization. Jewish tradition instructs us to turn inward and to set the true value on our days and works; to find the purposes for which we spend the few years granted to us and to ask whether individual dignity and freedom prosper in our cause.

This seminary and its preeminent place among institutions of Jewish learning is testimonial to the belief shared by Jews throughout the centuries that man's mind and spirit will not relinquish the faith most precious to him, regardless of the torment and suffering through which he must pass.

The sacred text and commentaries which form the subject of the seminary's studies necessarily bring to mind man's ancient and continuing struggle for human rights—the rights of man.

In my service on the Supreme Court I often have occasion to reflect upon the origins of the human rights which are proclaimed in the Constitution of the United States. It would be a mistake to assume that they derive solely from English constitutional history—from Magna Carta or the English Bill of Rights or from John Locke's philosophy, although much is owed to English Barons and philsophers alike. The roots of our contemporary conceptions of human rights reach much deeper in time and thought.

Many commentators have noted the historical connection between our modern views of the rights of man and older natural law thinking which Western civilization inherited from Graeco-Roman culture.

When Lord Coke told King James that the King, though not under any man, is under "God and the law" he was merely paraphrasing Sophocles. For it was the great Greek dramatist in Antigone who had the heroine defy the king by appealing to a "higher law" than the positive law of the state: "Nor did I deem that thou, mortal man, couldst by a breath, annul and override the unwritten immutable laws of heaven; which were not born today or yesterday; they die not, and none knoweth whence they sprang."

But the sources of our Bill of Rights are more ancient even than the Greeks—they reach back to Biblical times and to Judaic-Christian teachings and tradition. The Old and New Testament teach that all men have rights—that every individual has rights because as a child of God he is endowed with human dignity.

The framers of our Constitution were men of varying degrees of property and of education but they shared one thing in common, in addition to patriotism, knowledge of the Holy Scriptures—a household book in colonial times when other books were often unavailable or lacking.

Our Court in its opinions reviewing our Nation's history has often had occasion, including a most recent one, to acknowledge the indebtedness our constitutional theory owes to religious teachings.

In the recent and much commented upon prayer decision (*Abington School District* v. *Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203, 213) Mr. Justice Clark speaking for the Court said: "The fact that the Founding Fathers believed devotedly that there was a God and that the unalienable rights of man were rooted in Him is clearly evidenced in their writings, from the Mayflower Compact to the Constitution itself."

Mr. Justice Black, also speaking for the Court, in *Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 434 observed: "The history of man is inseparable from the history of religion. And * * * since the beginning of that history many people have devoutly believed that 'More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of'."

Mr. Justice Douglas for the Court in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 313 gave specific recognition to the proposition that "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being."

And in the Prayer case I pointed out that: "Neither government nor this Court can or should ignore the significance of the fact

that a vast portion of our people believe in and worship God and that many of our legal, political, and personal values derive historically from religious teachings."

The Torah teaches what our Bill of Rights recognizes that the history of man's struggle for freedom is in large degree a struggle against oppressive procedures. Both Scriptures and the U.S. Constitution afford the right, basic to a fair trial, to know the charge and to have an adequate opportunity to defend; the right to confront the accuser; the privilege against self-incrimination; protection against double jeopardy; the right to a speedy trial; the right to a trial by a fair and impartial judge; and numerous other procedural safeguards essential to due process of law.

It is commonly assumed that the presumption that a man is innocent until proven guilty is solely an Anglo-Saxon conception. In the ancient Jewish tradition, however, this presumption was so broadly applied that if, in a meeting of the Sanhedrin, no judge volunteered, at the outset, to say a good word for the accused; the case had to be laid over, to give the accused the benefit of reflective application of this great principle.

The noble concept, equal protection of the laws, symbolized by the inscription on the entrance to the Supreme Court building: "Equal Justice Under Law" was long foreshadowed in the famous passage from Leviticus 19: 15: "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor."

And fair treatment of neighbors in Holy Scriptures included fair treatment of aliens as well as Jewish citizens.

It is no accident that communism, a materialistic philosophy, stands opposed both in theory and practice to the basic conception of the Bible and of our Constitution enthroning the human rights of individuals. As Professor Cranston has stated in his excellent book, "What Are Human Rights": "Marx regarded the notion of rights of man as a bourgeois illusion; he was opposed to the individualism which underlies the classic doctrine of rights—and by individualism he meant the belief that each particular human person is a unit of value and an end in himself. Marx believed in humanity, in the whole, collective mass of mankind, and he argued that this humanity would come into its own when men ceased to think and feel as individuals with separate inalienable rights."

I mention these differences between these conflicting ideologies not for historic or academic interest but because they have important significance in this very day, as I shall later point out. The patriarchs and sages and the Founding Fathers shared another important idea about the safeguarding of human rights. Both recognized that for the meaningful assertion of these rights, judicial machinery must be provided for their enforcement. From the earliest times, in Judaic tradition, the great rights of man though divinely proclaimed were not deemed self-executing ordinances. On the contrary they were Torah—"law" to be interpreted and adjudicated by the Sanhedrin and other courts.

The practice of judicial review is a very old and never challenged part of Jewish tradition. The great sages were at one with the great Chief Justice, John Marshall in decreeing that supreme law—in the case of the sages scriptures, in the case of Marshall, the Constitution—had to be interpreted and applied by courts to have true meaning and significance.

They both recognized that human rights to be safeguarded must be more than ethical preachments, they must be positive law—legally enforceable standards as well as moral ideals.

The age-long quest for universal adherence to end enforcement of human rights culminated in our times in the provisions of the charter of the United Nations which "reaffirmed faith in fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person." Furthermore, by the charter all member states pledged themselves to take separate and common action for the recognition of these fundamental values.

The charter of the U.N. reflected the consciousness of mankind that the persecution, expulsion and extermination of millions of human beings, including the great body of European Jewry, during World War II exceeded any denial of human rights recorded in the previous history of civilization. This bitter experience awakened world opinion to the importance of extending international protection to the individual.

The United Nations at its meeting in May 1946 established the Commission on Human Rights charged with the responsibility of submitting to the General Assembly recommendations and reports regarding "An International Bill of Rights." Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, of blessed memory, was elected Chairman of the Commission.

The Commission on Human Rights thereupon drafted that great document which properly takes its place in the annals of human liberty known as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The declaration is really in two parts. One deals with economic and social problems, the other with political and civil rights. It is the latter that I discuss tonight because of its relationship to my theme.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, like our Constitution and like the Bible, proclaims the dignity of the human person, and defines the rights of man as rights which belong to him simply because he is a man.

Regretfully, the universal declaration provides no means of enforcement. The Communist bloc countries in alliance, sadly enough, with our own and other Western countries objected to the setting up of international machinery for implementation on the untenable grounds that this "would tend to undermine the sovereignty and independence of states." Americans and the ancient Hebrews knew otherwise; they both knew, by historical experience, an unimplemented declaration of human rights amounts only to a manifesto, a statement of ideals and not binding law.

Our Government in 1953 went so far as to announce that it would not sign any treaty on human rights drafted by the United Nations to implement the declaration. This remained our position until 1961 when Mrs. Roosevelt returned to the U.N. and once again announced our support of a binding treaty regarding human rights.

The time is overdue for the adoption of such a treaty and for the establishment of an International Court of Human Rights to implement the essential civil rights of the universal declaration.

Some men of good will believe that world justice through the rule of law can be achieved only with the creation of a full-fledged super state in which all nations are merged—a super national organization that has political and military control over all of its units. My own view accepts Dean Roscoe Pound's premise that "all states need not be merged in a great world state, in which their personality is lost, in order that their conduct may be inquired into and ordered by authority of a world legal order."

I agree with my colleague Mr. Justice Brennan, who is one of the world's leaders in urging international protection for the great rights of man, that: "All that seems necessary is that the United Nations signatories ordain by a simple treaty statute a structure and scheme for securing international due process of the nature of the national due process familiar to every American: A prompt and speedy trial; legal assistance, including assistance for the indigent; prohibition of any kind of undue coercion or influence; freedom to conduct one's defense; the right to a public trial and written proceedings; the presumption of innocence and the burden upon the state to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt; and security against cruel and unusual punishments. These standards of due process, and thus of effective justice, only words now in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, have their counterparts in our own U.S. Constitution. The vital difference, however, is that our Nation has vitalized them for our people through a national forum and a national procedure for their enforcement."

The establishment of an International Court of Human Rights is not a new or impractical idea. Indeed a beginning has already been made in the creation in 1953 by the 15 countries of the Council of Europe of the European Court of Human Rights, and a Commission of Human Rights which may receive complaints from individuals or groups, or from member nations, of alleged violations of a wide range of human rights.

The absence of an International Court of Human Rights increases the obligation of all who believe in the dignity of man to protest the denial of human rights whenever or wherever it occurs.

The denial of human rights by the Soviet Union to Jews is properly a matter, therefore, of deep concern to all Americans of every religious persuasion.

The evidence of discrimination against Jews by the Government of the Soviet Union is overwhelming.

The 2½ million Jews of the Soviet Union, though classified by the Soviet Constitution and laws as a national group are deprived of their national culture and the means of expressing it. Every other Soviet nationality is permitted the use of its national language and is granted support for its cultural institutions. But the teaching of Hebrew, the biblical language, is banned in the Soviet Union; Yiddish, the tongue of 450,000 Soviet citizens, is discouraged; Jewish schools virtually prohibited and nonexistent; the once flourishing Yiddish theater scarcely tolerated and Jewish literature and publications sharply curtailed.

The religious freedom of Soviet Jews is severely limited—more so than any other religious group; increasingly synagogues are closed and private worship restricted; both Bible and prayer books are denied reprinting; other necessary religious articles made unavailable; the last Kosher butcher shop in Moscow closed down, the ancient Jewish cemetery in Kiev condemned; the state baking of matzoth discontinued; private baking discouraged by prosecutions; the training of Seminarians hampered and religious exchanges discouraged.

Jews are vilified in the Soviet press and other mass media which reflect hostility to the Jewish people as such.

Jewish emigration even for the limited purpose of reuniting families torn asunder by war and Nazi persecution is permitted only on the most insignificant scale.

There is increasing evidence of discrimination against Jews in employment and areas of public life.

Finally, there is also evidence that an undue proportion of Jews is being prosecuted and executed for economic crimes.

No law-abiding citizen of any nation and particularly no judge can urge that any person or group is immune from the equal application of any nation's laws. But when 60 percent of those executed in the Soviet Union for economic crimes are Jews who comprise only a little more than 1 percent of its population then the belief naturally is fostered that Jews are receiving unequal

treatment under Soviet law. Particularly is this so, in the setting of other discriminations against the Jews both historical and current in old Russia and in the Soviet Union.

Discrimination against Soviet Jews is not solely an internal matter for the Soviet Union. It is a proper concern for all in this country and elsewhere who believe in human values. Soviet mistreatment of the Jews violates worldwide concepts of human rights and human dignity; transgresses the United Nations Charter to which the Soviet Union is a party and violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which is morally binding upon all member states of the United Nations.

It is not a sufficient answer to reply, as Soviet officials are wont to do, that some of my best in-laws are Jewish. Nor is it an answer to assert that those charging discrimination are motivated by hostility to the Soviet people. The philosopher Bertrand Russell is a self-proclaimed friend of the Soviet Union and even he has found it necessary to write profound and serious letters to Mr. Khrushchev expressing deep concern about Soviet treatment of its Jewish citizens in terms similar to those I have expressed this evening. In stating my views, I do so as an American citizen who supports the effort of our Government, with due regard for our own security as a nation, to seek ways for better understanding between our country and the Soviet Union; one who shares with the great majority of our people the desire for an end to the cold war and for a just and lasting peace.

In appealing for an end to governmental discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union, I am mindful that as a nation our record is not perfect—we all too often fall short of realizing the great ideals of human liberty and equality embodied in our great declaration of human rights. I am also mindful, however, that our Government policy is directed to ending rather than extending discrimination.

But one need never apologize for speaking out for human rights of all peoples everywhere. For as the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights asserts, "recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world."

REPORT ON RECENT UNESCO DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, our former colleague William Benton, who represented my State of Connecticut here in the Senate 1949–53, today represents the United States on the executive Board of UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—with personal rank of Ambassador. Bill Benton was one of the founders of UNESCO, during his years as Assistant Secretary of State, immediately after World War II. In Chicago last month, at a conference sponsored by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, he made the first of what we can hope will be a series of reports about recent UNESCO developments. I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful address be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF FORMER SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON

We seem to live today in the age of misunderstanding. I've just spent 3 weeks in Paris at a meeting of UNESCO's executive board which was largely dominated by misunderstandings. Indeed, may not the misunderstanding seem more acute than ever—if only because the capacity to communicate is greater than ever? We are living in a world of educational poverty in the midst of communications plenty.

Many of us who worked in the field of world affairs as the war ended were somewhat naively persuaded that Understanding with a capital "U" was the answer to many of mankind's ills. That belief guided us as we wrote UNESCO's charter. Many of us then indulged ourselves in the luxury of believing that when we conquered the misunderstandings in the world there would then be few tensions to be relaxed, few relations to be improved, and no need for such redundancies as "peaceful coexistence."

Yet today we live in an age in which a single misunderstanding might be the last misunderstanding. President Kennedy reminded us last week that 300 million people can die in an hour. So we have a new and necessary test ban agreement. We have a "hot line" telephone linking the White House and the Kremlin. We listen so carefully to Chairman Khrushchev that we scour each word for a hidden meaning. Indeed, we look up all the meanings listed under Mir in our Russian dictionaries whenever he mentions the word "peace." The Soviets even want UNESCO to be converted into a forum on disarmament. We worry. All the world worries.

As we worry tonight we can also remember that we have UNESCO—and we have Director General Rene Maheu who flew from Paris to be our guest in Chicago today.

On and off over the past 18 years I have been fortunate enough to be associated, in varying capacities, with this provocative organization. Ever since World War II UNESCO's friends have watched it work with plodding patience, even though often with little skill, to build what the great Chicagoan, Archibald MacLeish, described in the preamble to the UNESCO constitution as "the defenses of peace." Indeed, my association with UNESCO now covers the entire span of its existence, from sharing in its inception in wartime London, when I was Assistant Secretary of State responsible for the American delegation, through service in various roles to my present assignment as the U.S. member of the UNESCO executive board, the governing body which meets twice a year in Paris.

Over the years that have separated the wartime devastation of Europe from the instruments of horror that now wait beneath their concrete silos in Nebraska cornfields—and in Siberian cornfields—UNESCO has changed its immediate programs though not its fundamental goals. Today, the urgent needs of our times have transformed UNESCO's old priorities into a new challenge—how to use education, science, and culture to help the new nations lift themselves out of the privation, poverty, and ignorance of centuries.

UNESCO went into its first general conference, in 1946, with 24 member nations. Today it counts 113. But the change in its program since 1946–47 seems to me to be roughly a swing of 180°. I remember well the temper immediately on the heels of World War II. Our preoccupations at these early meetings were with the more developed countries, let us call them. How could we handle the defences of peace in men's minds so as to prevent a third world war? At that time we were not giving primary attention to the large areas of the world which were soon to achieve national independence—or even to those other areas which, independent politically, were economically and socially underdeveloped. They did not look like the countries in which future wars would generate.

UNESCO has now swung away from its early primary goal of intellectual cooperation among the more advanced countries—the goal to which the League of Nations' Institute of Intellectual Cooperation was dedicated. The entire structure of the United Nations, indeed, since the early 1950's has increasingly turned its attention to the problems of the less developed countries, or shall we call them hopefully, the developing countries. This shift in emphasis led in 1961 to the adoption by the U.N. General Assembly of a suggestion of President Kennedy. This was the now famous Resolution 1710, which declared the 1960's to be the "decade of development."

Yes, this is the accelerating trend of the last decade—to help the developing countries achieve economic and social progress. The goal is to narrow the existing gap and ultimately to eliminate it. I don't object to a phrase as strong as that.

In the early days of UNESCO, I used to hear the charge and suspicion that the United States was supporting UNESCO financially to further a program of "American cultural imperialism" and "dollar penetration." I am pleased to report that such fears and such talk have disappeared.

* * * * *

The gentleman whom I am pleased to introduce to you at this forum has been a stanch proponent of the preeminence of education as a bulwark against poverty and conflict. His sense of the challenge recalls the words of another famous French visitor to America, Alexis De Tocqueville. De Tocqueville said that "since the uses of intelligence represent the wellsprings of strength and prosperity, we should consider every new scientific development, every new bit of knowledge, every new idea as a nucleus of power placed within the grasp of the people." De Tocqueville and Maheu were the pioneers who saw the issue long before the current crop of economists who are suddenly proclaiming the importance of education as a tool in economic development.

Mr. Maheu is a rare phenomenon—a civil servant in a U.N. agency who has risen to the top and seized the helm. He rose to the eminent post he now holds because of three personal qualities: Intellectual capacity, energy, and the administrative ability to absorb vast quantities of detail and still keep his eye on the horizon. The document we have just been discussing in Paris, spelling out the UNESCO budget and program for 1964–65, is about as thick as the Chicago telephone book. He knows the numbers in it, including those that are unlisted. Literally thousands of projects must be followed through. Politicians must be dealt with (or circumvented). People, money, buildings must be found. He will find them.

"Little by little, I have merged my life with that of the Organization," Mr. Maheu has said.

Rene Maheu sees UNESCO's program as a two-pronged effort; the first, help to the developing nations; the second, what he has termed "a composite interdisciplinary reflection on contemporary man." (This latter shows his preoccupation with the essential philosophic and intellectual aspects of UNESCO.) One day, he hopes, these two currents will meet and blend. He says, "When that happens, there will be complete convergence and all parts of the program will be united and have the same meaning. And then, UNESCO's action will bear its true humanistic stamp."

Mr. Maheu's career is a blend of teaching, journalism, and diplomacy. Born at Saint Gaudens in the Pyrenees, he is familiar with the culture of Spain through firsthand experience. Before the war he served as professor of French literature and philosophy at the French Institute of Great Britain. From 1936 to 1939 he was cultural attaché at the French Embassy in London. Later

he was head of the French mission working with the British Ministry of Information. He is indeed a great propagandist whether he likes the term or not.

A couple of weeks ago in Paris he called on the Executive Board to help him develop ideas for UNESCO that will move men's hearts and spirits. He called them ideas with resonance. I ask this Conference to join with him in the pursuit of ideas. As a matter of fact, Mr. Maheu, this Conference here in Chicago is such an idea and I congratulate the National Commission and the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations upon it. Last week I suggested to Mr. Maheu that UNESCO conduct an annual Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Conference on human rights to be attended by the world's great philosophers and scholars interested in this area which is causing us of the United States such "anguish"—to use the word of another Chicagoan, Governor Stevenson. This is the kind of idea to which Rene Maheu responds.

In 1946 he joined the infant UNESCO, as head of the Free Flow of Information Division. This was a division dear to the United States and UNESCO has never done enough with it. This is when I met him. Five years of his subsequent UNESCO experience was as the UNESCO representative to the United Nations in New York. Thus he knows us well. Or shall I say to this Chicago audience, that we can at least hope he knows New York well? After his New York service he was named UNESCO's Deputy Director General.

Emphasis on the priority of education, and on the dignity of the individual, has been with Rene Maheu all his life. He attributes much of his own attitude and his desire to advance social justice to his paternal grandparents, neither of whom could read or write. In his address accepting his present role, Mr. Maheu said: "It is from them that I acquired what I consider to form the essence of my character and convictions, above all else, the longing of the humble for learning; the people's quenchless thirst for social justice."

Mr. Maheu has learned enough from history to agree with the philosopher Henri Bergson that "there is no obstacle which cannot be dealt with by wills sufficiently keyed up if they deal with it in time." Like Bergson, he refuses to believe in "the fatality of history." But he has been acute enough to note that most of mankind must still be fatalities of history—instead of its beneficiaries—as long as most of mankind remains uneducated.

He has now had 17 years of close involvement with UNESCO in which to evolve his own equation for moving men to move mountains by starting with the alphabet.

Mr. Maheu is now urging that UNESCO's program give new priorities to science—to bring science and technology at once to a par with education. Few men so well as Rene Maheu realize that time may not be on UNESCO's side. He thinks that science is.

It is of course impossible to keep an accurate box score on the achievements of an organization such as UNESCO whose working materials are the minds of men and women. Where is an exact box score on the great universities of the city of Chicago? UNESCO can surely point with pride, like a great university, to its accomplishment in helping to infuse a group of widely scattered intellectuals—intellectuals of all races and conditions—with a sense of unity, dignity, and high purpose. However, for all its dedication to such goals, UNESCO's work now rests squarely on the soil of contemporary political reality. Sometimes it seems difficult for intellectuals to accept this necessity. I often hear that some of Mr. Maheu's associates don't accept it. But to build on any other foundation is to use bubbles for bricks and dreams for cornerstones. The present goal of UNESCO is realistically to use the instruments of education, science, and culture to help shape the developing new world.

To help achieve an understanding of this goal is the purpose of this conference in Chicago. Hasn't diplomacy always been too crucial to be left to diplomats? Increasingly it centers on the understanding that comes only through informed, thoughtful public opinion of the kind that develops here.

I hope I need not reassure our honored guest that those here, and the powerful groups they represent throughout the United States, are strong in their support of UNESCO's goals. The continuing support of his organization by the United States, both from a material and political view, is and has been strong and substantial. President Kennedy reaffirmed this support at the time of my appointment when he called on UNESCO to remedy what he called "the desperate lack of adequate and relevant educational resources in those countries of the world which are trying to engineer an escape from ancient poverty."

On behalf of the American people, Mr. Director General, the U.S. Commission for UNESCO and the University of Chicago, with which I have been associated for more than a quarter of a century, I bid you welcome to this rostrum and to this city. You will find a warm welcome here.

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on November 22, 1963, the Senate of the Dialectic and Philanthropic Literary Societies of the University of North Carolina adopted a resolution expressing the deepest sympathy to the family of the late President John F. Kennedy and declaring support for his successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this 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:

A RESOLUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA CONCERNING THE DEATH OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Whereas President John F. Kennedy has served this Nation with courage and dignity for 3 years in times of great foreign and domestic turmoil; and

Whereas the President exhibited great devotion and meticulous attention to his duties even up to his final hour, often in the face of acid criticism; and

Whereas he never faltered in his faith and belief in the dignity of all humanity and he proved his conviction by living a life of unceasing struggle against complacency and half-truths; and

Whereas he met an untimely death at the hands of a despicable and misguided assailant: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Dialectic and Philanthropic Literary Societies meeting in joint session, That we are deeply shocked and dismayed by the untimely passing of a great American and a noble human being. We express our deepest sympathy to the family of John F. Kennedy for their great loss and do hereby declare our united support and encouragement to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Respectfully submitted.

LESLIE W. BAILEY, Jr.

Passed by acclamation, November 22, 1963.

HUBERT W. HAWKINS, Jr.,
President.

DREXEL INDUSTRIES, A MAGNIFICENT EXAMPLE OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on November 7, 1963, the Newcomen Society of North America saluted Drexel Industries, Inc., and its president, Robert O. Huffman, at a dinner at the Hotel Charlotte in Charlotte, N.C. Drexel Industries, which has its home office at Drexel, N.C., constitutes one of the most famous furniture manufacturing organizations in the United States, and one of the finest examples of the free enterprise system to be found anywhere on the face of the earth.

Under the enlightened leadership of its president and directors, Drexel Industries has committed itself to the proposition that the interests of the stockholders and employees are identical. It manifests its commitment in this respect by dividing its profits among its stockholders and employees. In so doing, it points out to all American industries the surest way to industrial peace.

It was my happy privilege to introduce Robert O. Huffman at this dinner, and to hear him recount the history of this organization which has grown from a small beginning to one of the great furniture companies of the United States. This history should be made available to all who believe that the future welfare of our country depends upon the preservation of the free enterprise system.

As a consequence, I ask unanimous consent that my introduction of Mr. Huffman and Mr. Huffman's history of the genesis and development of Drexel Industries be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, such introduction and history were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR ERVIN PAYS TRIBUTE

Robert O. Huffman has lived at Morganton in Burke County, N.C., all of his life. I have known him with affection and admiration at least as far back as the day in the second year of Teddy Roosevelt's administration when the Morganton graded schools opened their doors to Morganton's youth and admitted me to the first grade. Incidentally, Rob Huffman's father and my father were members of the board of trustees who organized these schools at that time.

Rob Huffman traces his ancestry to German and Scotch-Irish folk who settled among the beautiful hills of Burke County before the American Revolution and participated in that fight for freedom.

While winning his bachelor of arts degree at the University of North Carolina, Rob Huffman was chosen president of Phi Beta Kappa because of his intellectual accomplishments and was tapped for membership in the university's highest honor society, the Golden Fleece, because of his demonstrated leadership in many student activities. The esteem in which he was held by his classmates was attested by his selection as permanent president of his class, and the pride of his alma mater in his achievements after graduation was manifested by its bestowal upon him of its honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Rob Huffman's talents would have carried him to the top of any enterprise anywhere in the United States. Instead of succumbing to the temptation to go to what appeared to be at that time more inviting

fields elsewhere, he returned to the place of his birth upon his graduation and joined his revered father, Samuel Huffman, in the management of the Drexel Knitting Mills Co., which was then a comparatively small plant engaged in the manufacture of hosiery.

Since that time, Rob Huffman has made contributions of great moment to American business and industry in these capacities: president of the Drexel Knitting Mills; president of the Huffman Hosiery Co.; treasurer, president, and chairman of the board of the Morganton Hosiery Co. and its predecessor the Morganton Full Fashion Hosiery Mills; director of the Huffman Knitting Mills and its predecessor, Huffman Full Fashion Hosiery Mills; president and chairman of the board of Drexel Enterprises and its predecessor, Drexel Furniture Co.; president of the Burke Farmers Cooperative Dairy; member of the advisory board of the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.; member of the executive committee of the Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Co.; director of the American Thread Co.; director of the First National Bank of Morganton; director of the Charlotte branch of Wachovia Bank & Trust Co.; and director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond. He has also rendered significant services to business and industry as a director of the National Association of Manufacturers, vice president of the National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers, president of the Southern Hosiery Manufacturers' Association, and director of the Southern Furniture Manufacturers' Association.

Despite the tremendous demands which these positions have made upon his time and energy, Rob Huffman has played a vital role in the civic, public, and religious life of his town, county, area, and State.

As a consequence, he can speak to all his neighbors, both near and far, words similar to those which Kipling spoke to the people of India:

"I have eaten your bread and salt,
I have drunk your water and wine,
The deaths ye died I have watched beside,
And the lives that ye led were mine.

"Was there aught that I did not share
In vigil or toil or ease—
One joy or woe that I did not know
Dear hearts across the seas?"

Rob Huffman has served with rare diligence as chairman of the board of deacons of the First Baptist Church of Morganton; mayor of Morganton; trustee of the Morganton graded schools; president of the Morganton Kiwanis Club; trustee of South Mountain Institute; chairman of the board of trustees of Mars Hill College; trustee of Grace Hospital at Morganton; chairman of the board of governors of the Drexel Foundation; and president of the Business Foundation of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

He has long been interested in Free Masonry, serving for a time as master of the Catawba Valley Lodge No. 217 at Morganton and holding membership as a 32d degree Scottish Rite Mason and Shriner. One of the most inspiring moments of my life was hearing him deliver a masonic lecture on the occasion of my being raised to the degree of Master Mason in Catawba Valley Lodge. He was chosen Morganton's Man of the Year in 1955. During the Second World War, Rob Huffman was called to Washington where he rendered valuable service to the war effort in various positions with the Office of Production Management, the War Production Board, and the Office of Price Administration. He was recalled to further service of this nature with the Office of Price Stabilization during the Korean conflict.

Rob Huffman was happily married to Miss Pearl Trogdon and is the father of three charming girls.

The Swiss philosopher, Amiel, declared that "it is not what he has, or even what he does which expresses the worth of a man, but what he is."

I have told you something about what Rob Huffman has and something about what he does. I am sure, however, that what I have said does not reveal in adequate manner what he is.

Rob Huffman is a man in whom a strong and honest mind, a compassionate and courageous heart, and a simple faith in God and man are blended in harmonious proportions. These attributes are exemplified in everything he thinks, says, or does. As a consequence, he is a genial companion, a true friend, a lover of his fellow man, an exemplary citizen, a devoted churchman, a dedicated free enterpriser, an enlightened industrialist, a hard fighter for causes he believes just, and withal a man of many graces, much humility and a gentle spirit.

I deem it a high privilege to present him to you.

FURNITURE GIANT GROWS FROM SMALL BEGINNING

(By Robert O. Huffman, president)

Since I am the only remaining official of Drexel who remembers the organization of that company, and who has been a witness to its affairs, the duty has devolved upon me to read this paper, giving in a most condensed form some of the highlights of the history of this company.

To a very real degree the growth of Drexel has, for 60 years, paralleled the growth of our country and its economy. Like all companies of similar age, Drexel has enjoyed the opportunities and shared in the setbacks and disappointments experienced by business generally.

It is difficult for the younger generation to realize how financially poor this small-town area of western North Carolina was in 1903, and how backward it was by modern standards. It was no easy task to find local subscribers who would obligate themselves to invest something like $33,000 in a new and completely strange manufacturing enterprise. Sixty years ago there was not a mile of good road in Burke County. Such roads as did exist were simply narrow strips of red clay. Any oldtimer here tonight can remember how gooey, slippery, and miry, red clay could be in the rainy season. In this rural section the era of the automobile was some 15 years away. The first gasoline I ever saw was bought from a drugstore.

As it happens, 60 years ago on this very day the organization meeting—the first meeting of the subscribing stockholders of Drexel Furniture Co.—was held at the home of Morganton's then only capitalist, Mr. A. M. Kistler. At this meeting, over which Mr. Kistler presided, a board of directors was chosen, and a manager was elected. The first directors consisted of Messrs. A. M. Kistler, W. C. Ervin, D. B. Mull, S. Huffman, P. W. Patton and J. D. Boger, all of Morganton. Mr. J. S. Abernathy was selected as secretary-treasurer and manager, and this new enterprise was launched.

Sixty years ago pleasures were rarer and simpler. The giant automated corporations of today, at least many of them, were at that time simply small, struggling companies, trying to find for themselves a place in the world. In those days, by force of necessity, rugged individualism characterized the the people of the Southern States, and nowhere was this more true than in Piedmont, N.C., lying at the foot of the great Blue Ridge, and of its offshoot, the South Mountains.

Perhaps one-third of the 620 square miles of Burke County, N.C., was still virgin forest. Even at that late date farmers were cutting down the original forests to clear land on which to scratch out an existence. Transportation was so impossible that many of these beautiful logs were simply piled up and burned, instead of being converted into lumber. It was natural that under such circumstances, with such an abundance of fine timber, that sawmills would be established at sites where it was practical to convey to market the lumber they produced.

In the middle nineties such a sawmill was erected by two businessmen from Morganton, who later became subscribing stockholders to Drexel Furniture Co. These were the late Samuel Huffman and his brother-in-law, D. B. Mull. This little business was established on a railway siding in the midst of a great primeval forest, at what is now known as Drexel, N.C.

A modest degree of prosperity was enjoyed, and other equipment was added from time to time until the point was reached where a general line of building material was produced. The ambition of the founders of this business led them to seek wider activities for the use of the local timber that was available and hence, the idea of a furniture factory for the little community of Drexel was advanced. Merchants, professional, and other businessmen of Morganton and surrounding area became parties to this venture, and a total of something slightly in excess of $30,000 was subscribed to make it possible.

There exists no record of the affairs of this Drexel Furniture Co. from the date of the organization meeting, November 7, 1903, until February 5, 1906, the latter reading:

"J. S. Abernathy resigned as secretary-treasurer on February 5, 1906. F. O. Huffman was elected to succeed Abernathy and took charge on that date."

The next record found in the minute book is a record of disaster, and yet, I cannot help but feel that this is perhaps indicative of something that has characterized Drexel from its beginning. The minutes of a directors' meeting on that date (December 7, 1906) read as follows:

"The meeting was called to order by Mr. A. M. Kistler, president, and steps were taken to look to the rebuilding of the plan which was destroyed by fire on December 7, 1906."

As a teenage boy I happened to be a witness to this meeting. The fire was still burning; the air was full of ashes and smoke; timbers were still falling, and with insurance of only $25,000 this board of directors made the momentous and courageous decision which was to affect the economy of the locality for future years.

The story of Drexel falls naturally into two chapters; first, the story of Drexel Furniture Co. alone, which began on November 7, 1903, and which ended in 1957 when the Morganton Furniture Co., of Morganton, and Heritage Furniture Co., of High Point and Mocksville, were acquired by an exchange of stock, the first such acquisition by the Drexel Furniture Co.

During the first chapter Drexel Furniture Co. enoyed considerable growth. The first balance sheet of record is for the year 1908, at which time the net worth of the company was shown to be $45,766.67. At the close of business on November 30, 1956 the net worth of Drexel Furniture Co. had grown to $13,231,847. Sales had grown from an estimated $150,000 per annum to nearly $29 million.

The first furniture made by Drexel was a bedroom suite of native oak, comprising a bureau, a washstand and a double bed, wholesaling at about $14.50. In the very nature of things it had to be of very simple design and construction. Employees experienced in the manufacture of furniture were almost impossible to obtain. Knowledgeable management was equally rare. It was inevitable that both management and the production force must together learn the intricacies of the manufacture and sale of furniture. Satisfactory sales arrangements were very difficult to secure. The new factories were almost completely in the hands of professional metropolitan sales agents, who designed, priced and sold their furniture.

As the years went by, the workers took on additional skills and management acquired a more complete knowledge with respect to the solution of the problems of management and selling. I can assure you that in the fields of both production and management, the accepted method of making progress was that of trial and error.

Yet, in spite of all the difficulties, and in spite of the lack of knowledge, which could be gained only by experience, this young company prospered steadily. By January 1911 it felt sufficiently prosperous to declare a small dividend. The financial statement for the year 1911 shows an accumulation of profits for the years 1908–11 of $50,071.70.

As the company improved its financial condition it also improved the character and design of its product. In the teens, it pioneered in the manufacture of "figured red gum" furniture, and this product became a very important factor in the furniture field.

It had also somewhat become of age in the area of marketing, and it was no longer so completely at the mercy of one sales agent. Cost systems had been added, which could serve as a proper guide for pricing the furniture. During the year 1915 we read from the minutes that the affairs of the concern were in good shape and the prospects bright. At the 1916 mid-year meeting a dividend of 2 percent per month was declared for the remainder of the year.

The ambitious and still young company was beginning to flex its muscles. In 1918 another 20,000 square feet was added to the one plant at Drexel, and in the same year the Blue Ridge Furniture Co. of Marion was purchased for cash from the owner who was preparing to go into service in World War I.

As of December 30, 1922 the company showed a net worth of $540,323, and in 1923 took two notable steps by declaring a 1,300 percent stock dividend, and by purchasing the plant of the Morganton Manufacturing and Trading Co. in Morganton, thereby entering that town for manufacturing purposes.

During this period of growth, when the principal emphasis was upon production, and the acquisition of facilities for such, the sales of the company had been consolidated to a high degree until a very large part of its total production was being sold to one very large wholesale house, which had a number of branches in strategic areas in the United States. The depression of the thirties found this customer to be in financial difficulties, and it was compelled to go out of business. This left Drexel with two problems: One, to collect the large sum of money due it from the bankrupt customer; and two, to find another outlet for its product. The force of necessity demanded a change of policy in marketing.

Other misfortunes struck the company at this same time. Our beloved president, Mr. A. M. Kistler, who had been president from December 7, 1906, died suddenly on July 5, 1931. Mr. S. R. Collett, longtime director of the company, was chosen to succeed Mr. Kistler in this capacity, and he served from September 3, 1931 to June 27, 1932, when his untimely death occurred. F. O. Huffman was elected president to succeed Mr. Collett.

It was during this period of the early thirties that Drexel suffered its only profitless year, sustaining a loss of some $4,200 for its operations in the year 1933. However, during this year important policies were being created which were greatly and favorably to affect the future of the company. The decision was made to offer the line principally to retail stores and through commission salesmen located in important marketing areas throughout the country. This was a very important step to take, and one which could not bear fruit very rapidly. However, in the light of subsequent years the wisdom of this plan had been demonstrated.

During this difficult period of the early thirties the astute management, finding its company with its principal customer out of business, and with a serious depression raging, realizing that drastic action was necessary if they were to make sales, brought out a bedroom suite of furniture at an extremely low price, and among other places showed it in a rented space in the Furniture Exposition Building in Jamestown, N.Y., which at that time was an important furniture center. The suite of furniture being quite attractive and priced at a ridiculously low figure, practically "stole the show" to such an extent indeed that the Furniture Exposition Building in Jamestown would no longer rent Drexel space for showing. The resourceful management, however, rented an empty store building in Jamestown and kept on selling.

Just in the midst of this period of development tragedy again struck. On May 12, 1935, President F. O. Huffman died in Chicago, making three presidents that Drexel had lost in 4 years. R. O. Huffman was, on June 1, 1935, selected as president of the company.

Mr. T. Henry Wilson, who had for a period of a couple of years been sales manager for Drexel, was elected vice president and general manager. Under his management the company made considerable progress in the character of its line and the expansion of its area of sales. It was during this period that Drexel inaugurated its program of advertising. The first piece of national advertising done by Drexel appeared in a nationally distributed homefurnishings magazine in April 1937. This advertising program has grown by leaps and bounds and is now a very important element in Drexel's marketing effort.

On November 30, 1944, Mr. Wilson and other members of the organization resigned, in order to start their own manufacturing business, and President R. O. Huffman assumed active management of the company. A new organization was set up at the time. Mr. Burton R. Tuxford, one of Drexel's outstanding salesmen was called in to headquarters to act as sales manager. Mr. G. Maurice Hill was brought in to assume charge of production, and Mr. Robert L. Connelly, for several years an accountant with Drexel, was put in charge of finances, and the company continued its growth by increasing its output, diversifying its styling and expanding its sales.

During the 11 years following, sales grew from slightly more than $7 million to slightly less than $29 million. Profits went from $230,700 to $1,800,000. During this period Mr. Tuxford resigned and was succeeded as vice president for marketing by Mr. David J. Brunn.

In January 1951 Drexel purchased for cash all of the outstanding stock of Table Rock Furniture Co. of Morganton. This old and respected company was incorporated in 1925 principally by local stockholders. Mr. N. O. Pitts served continuously as president of Table Rock from its organization to its sale to Drexel. This plant has become an important manufacturing facility for Drexel Furniture Co.

This period to which I refer as the growth period ended with the year 1956. During this period Drexel had grown from within itself. The next period, beginning with 1957 and continuing to the present, I refer to as the expansion period, since during this period three fine companies were acquired by an exchange of stock.

During 1957 Heritage Furniture Co. of High Point, and Mocksville, was acquired by an exchange of stock. This company was established in 1937 by Mr. Elliott S. Wood of High Point for the purpose of manufacturing upholstered furniture for national distribution, and showed a most remarkable growth and success through the years. In 1947 this fine company built a new plant in Mocksville for occasional tables.

At the same time of the acquisition of the Heritage Furniture Co. the Morganton Furniture Co. of Morganton was acquired also by an exchange of stock. This excellent company was only a couple of years younger than Drexel, having been established in 1905. The first superintendent of this plant was Mr. A. C. Chaffee, who moved to Morganton at that time. Mr. Chaffee's affiliation with this company, first as superintendent, then as one of the principal owners and general manager, as president, and finally as chairman of the board, continued through the years until its acquisition by Drexel. Mr. Chaffee was recognized as the dean of the western North Carolina furniture industry, and served on the board of Drexel Furniture Co. from 1957 until his death in 1962.

At the time of these acquisitions the Heritage organization was given the responsibility for the operation of the Morganton Furniture Co. plant, which manufactures bedroom and dining room furniture. This enables Heritage to offer a complete line of bedroom and dining room furniture. The Heritage brand name is recognized as one of the finest names in furniture. The name Morganton through the years has enjoyed a most enviable reputation for the quality of its product.

In January 1961 this expansion was continued by the acquisition, through exchange of stock of the Southern Desk Co., an old and well established company with headquarters at Hickory, which manufactures church, school, library and domitory furniture. This splendid company was established in 1908 by the late George F. Ivey of Hickory, and has shown continuous and steady growth since that time. In 1952 Mr. George F. Ivey died and his son, Mr. Leon S. Ivey succeeded him as president. A new plant, recognized as a model of efficiency, has been built at Hildebran for this company. We are expecting great results from our affiliation with this company.

After the acquisition of these three companies the decision was made to set up a new form of organization, in order to provide a more effective means of coordinating the activities of each company. Therefore, in 1960 the decision was made to merge all of these newly acquired companies into Drexel Furniture Co.; then change the name of the corporation to Drexel Enterprises, Inc., and to operate the companies as divisions of the corporation.

The result is that there are now three such divisions, operating under the corporate board; the Drexel Furniture Co. Division, the Heritage-Morganton Furniture Co. Division, and the Southern Desk Co. Division.

Under this plan of organization each division enjoys a high degree of autonomy, subject only to the general over-all policy determinations of the corporate board. Each division has its own president and complement of officers, its own board of directors, its own sales organization, and is held responsible for its own performance.

Currently, Mr. G. Maurice Hill is president of Drexel Furniture Co., Mr. Charles S. Shaughnessy of the Heritage-Morganton Division and Mr. Leon S. Ivey of the Southern Desk Co. Division.

Any business that has been in successful operation for 60 years must invariably develop certain philosophies. Drexel Enterprises is no exception. There are a number of areas within the operations of this company where very definite philosophies may be observed.

The first of these is that every person who works for Drexel is considered to be an important individual. Some have much greater abilities than others; some have much greater responsibility than others, but it is, nevertheless, definitely our thought that each employee is within himself an in-

dividual, and is an important person in the operations of the company.

This philosophy just naturally develops another one, and that is that everyone who works for Drexel should share in the profits, if any, of the division in which he works. Each division is a profit center of its own, and every employee may expect to share in the profits of his division on the basis of a simple formula. In addition to this, each division has a full complement of fringe benefits. There is a uniform pension plan, wholly paid for by the divisions. Hospitalization, major medical, group insurance, and other benefits are offered on a contributing plan.

Several years ago our then chairman of the board (now honorary chairman), Mr. A. L. Harwood, Jr., in making a talk to a group of Drexel employees, established a set of high principles which we earnestly undertake to live up to; that is, that Drexel must be a good neighbor, a good citizen, and a good employer.

We like to believe that wherever we have plants there is ample evidence that we are making a serious effort to live up to these high principles.

So tonight I am able to say to you that the little company, which 60 years ago started out in such insignificant fashion, has now become one of the great furniture companies of America, operating some 15 plants, and doing an annual volume approaching $60 million. There are those who will tell you that the name "Drexel" is the best known name in furniture in this country.

As I look back over the years, I try to analyze the things that have been responsible for the growth of this company. Of course, there are many elements which have contributed to this. Not an unimportant one is just plain good luck, but I do, in my heart, feel that the greatest factor in the growth and development of this company has been the complete dedication of those who, through the years, have been responsible for what has happened. In all my life I have not witnessed any greater selflessness than that which has been demonstrated by the great rank and file of Drexel officials and employees. It is this which has given Drexel its personality and which has furnished the driving force necessary for accomplishing what has been done.

This high morale of the organization, the loyalty of its customers, which include the finest stores in America, the pride of our workers in the company and its product, and a devotion to teamwork form an unbeatable set of circumstances. We have a word for this esprit de corps at Drexel * * * we call it Drexelitis. As long as this characterizes the spirit of Drexel people, there should be no fear for its future.

As I look back over the past 60 years of observing the history and participating in the affairs of Drexel I can recall many happenings in which Drexel might take just pride but in all this period of time I recall no honor so distinguished as that which is being conferred tonight by Newcomen.

I know that I can speak for all Drexel in expressing deep appreciation and great gratitude for this splendid event, and our thanks to you, our neighbors and friends, who have contributed so much to this occasion by your presence.

OMAHA LATVIAN SOCIETY'S INDEPENDENCE DAY OBSERVANCE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on November 16, it was my pleasure to meet with the Omaha Latvian Society in observance of the 45th anniversary of the declaration of Latvian independence.

It was both a moving and inspiring experience, as these sincere and earnest people recalled the 22 years of independence, cultural, social, and economic progress before their beloved ancestral country fell, along with the other Baltic States, under the Communist yoke.

The president of the Omaha Latvian Society, Mr. Arveds Vinovskis, spoke briefly on that occasion, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an extract of his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LATVIAN PEOPLE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM AND LIBERTY

Forty-five years ago a new independent state was born—the Republic of Latvia. After centuries of foreign domination and servitude, after bitter fights and direct assistance of the United States, Great Britain, and France, Latvia regained its freedom.

During the 22-year period that followed the achievement of independence, cultural as well as economic life in Latvia progressed at a rate seldom surpassed.

In its international relations Latvia adopted a strictly neutral attitude, favoring neither its powerful neighbor to the west, nor its equally powerful neighbor to the east, desiring only to be left alone to enjoy the fruits of its restored freedom.

But the peaceful and happy days lasted not long. The outbreak of World War II was a tragedy for the Baltic States. In October 1939 Latvia and the other Baltic countries—Estonia and Lithuania—were forced to sign a treaty of friendship and mutual assistance with the Soviet Union, granting of military bases within the territories of the Baltic States.

In his speech at the state dinner given after the signing of the pact, Stalin gave his Bolshevik word of honor that the Soviet Union would adhere to its promises and obligations as specified in the accords just concluded.

It took the people of the Baltic countries 8 months to learn the value of solemnly signed and sealed Soviet obligations, voluntarily offered, and strengthened with Stalin's personal word of honor, though they were.

In June 1940 the Soviet Red Army invaded Latvia. Since that time land, industry, commerce and banking were nationalized. All economic life was disrupted, the people terrorized and pauperized. Farmers were forced into collectivized farming after Soviet pattern. Religious freedom disappeared with other liberties. More than 100,000 people were deported to Siberia, and tens of thousands w killed.

Today, on Latvia's Independence Day, the free world accuses the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against Latvia.

Today the Latvian people in the free world pledge to intensify their joint organized activity for freedom and liberty for all.

ARVEDS VINOVSKIS,
President, Omaha Latvian Society.

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on November 24, on the eve of the late President John F. Kennedy's funeral, Dr. James P. Wesberry, pastor of Morningside Baptist Church in Atlanta, delivered a heart-warming television message dedicated to the memory of our slain President.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Wesberry's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

MESSAGE DELIVERED BY DR. JAMES P. WESBERRY, PASTOR, MORNINGSIDE BAPTIST CHURCH, ATLANTA, IN MEMORIAL SERVICE ON EVE OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY'S FUNERAL, SUNDAY NIGHT, NOVEMBER 24, 1963.

The heart of our great Nation has been broken by a deep sorrow. The body of our great President, John F. Kennedy, lies in state under the dome of our Nation's Capitol. Multiplied thousands of people have already passed in review and will, and tomorrow, the day of President Kennedy's funeral, has been declared a day of national mourning.

How quickly and shockingly momentous world events take place. Little did any of us think that we would come to this Thanksgiving Sunday bowed in grief over the untimely and tragic death of our brilliant and gifted leader. Full of life and completely dedicated to the service of the Nation and to the freedom and peace of the entire world, the President of the United States was cruelly and brutally shot and killed by an assassin in Dallas, Tex., last Friday, and now the assassin is dead.

It is as unbelievable as it is shocking—and yet we know it is true. How hard it is for us to believe that such a thing could happen in so-called Christian America. We find it so difficult to believe that we are living in a land where such a thing as burning churches, bombing a synagogue or church, and murdering a President could happen. To think that he who gave his life so freely and who carried within his office the greatest power on earth could have his life snuffed out in such an atrocious way.

This sadly reminds us that the awful sins that helped to crucify the Lord of glory on Calvary over 1900 years ago still lurk in the human heart, and there are yet evil forces that would tear down and destroy everything for which Christ stands and upon which America was built.

President Kennedy commanded the respect, love and admiration of the world. His was a great faith—a true profile of courage. His sacrificial death has a sobering effect upon our Nation and our world. America can never be the same after such a tragic, staggering blow. Whatever comfort there may be in it, God is great enough to make the wrath of man to praise him—out of evil good can come. As great as President Kennedy was in life, he is many times greater in death. This is a better world today because of his life and death and America has been brought closer to God.

Senator WAYNE MORSE was right when he said just before the Senate was recessed Friday: "If ever there was an hour when Americans should pray, this is the hour." This sort of thing humbles us all and causes us to hear again God say, "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land." Only time will reveal Mr. Kennedy's contribution to the unity of our world, of the nations, of religious denominations, to brotherhood, justice and peace.

The universe is full of vicarious suffering. One thing lays down its life for another. This is true in the vegetable world as well as the animal world. Everything is bought with a price. Men lay down their lives sometimes in single heroic acts of martydom, sometimes by years of patient, self-denying service—the physician, the school teacher, the engineer, the statesman. Only God knows the price many pay to serve—mothers and fathers, husbands and wives.

Oh, what a price they pay as they suffer and sacrifices for the well-being of their

children. This is the nature of atonement, and in every corner of the world it is spelled out like a dim and broken inscription on the fragments of human life. Everywhere this vicarious principle is at work. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

We find this at the very summit of all being. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." We do not expect our great Creator to ignore this vicarious principle with which He has filled the world. He, too, suffers and sacrifices for his children. The throne of God is one of self-sacrificing love. "The Lamb is in the midst of the throne" is a "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." There is the blood of the Cross. There is a voice saying, "Father, forgive them."

Father Damien, at the age of 18, joined the Society of the Sacred Heart. When he finished training he asked to go as a missionary to the Hawaiian Islands. Deeply moved by the sad condition of lepers on the Island of Molakai he went to live among and minister to them. "No matter," he said to those who opposed his going, "it is the call of God and of human need, and I am going." He lived with those unhappy people the rest of his life, contracted the dread disease and died from it, disfigured almost beyond recognition, after 26 years of devoted service. Like his Master, whose spirit he had caught, he gave himself for lepers through long years of faithful and loving ministry. So it has been with many others, such as, David Livington, giving his life to Africa; Wilfred Grenfell, of Labrador; Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, and now John F. Kennedy.

Nothing short of this experience of earnest service and unflinching sacrifice for the triumph of God's will can interpret to us today the meaning of the sacrifice of Christ on His cross.

Every man or woman who has ever tried to do these things in any measure knows only too well that there can be no salvation either from sin or from the misery sin entails on guilty and innocent alike save by the vicarious sacrifice of some brave, generous servant of righteousness and benefactor of his fellows. This great doctrine of vicarious suffering is self-evident to every man who ever fought entrenched and powerful evil or sought to rescue the wicked from wickedness. To those who know nothing of giving themselves for others this doctrine, like all deeper spiritual truths, remains an unintelligible and impenetrable mystery.

The first man I talked to after the tragic news that our President had been shot said, "I feel guilty myself, as if I had a part in it." Don't we all? For we are all responsible citizens or should be.

This is not the only crisis our Nation ever faced. There have been many others. It was a sad day in America over a hundred years ago when a troubled minister wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and suggested that the recognition of our undying faith should be printed in some form on the coins of our Nation. "This," he wrote, "would relieve us from the ignominy of heathenism. This would place us openly under the Divine protection we have personally claimed. From my heart I have felt our national shame in disowning God as not the least of our present national disasters."

Upon receipt of this eloquent plea the Treasurer wrote the Director of the Mint in Philadelphia saying, "No nation can be strong except in the strength of God, or safe except in his defense. The trust of our people should be declared in our national coins."

The Director of the Mint ordered that a motto be prepared expressing in fewest words this national recognition. Several mottoes were tried, but in 1864 there first appeared on a U.S. coin, a 2-cent piece, the words, "In God We Trust." These immortal words symbolize the faith and righteousness that exalts a nation, and have a ring of timelessness as though they had been given to our Founding Fathers upon tablets of stone.

Blind indeed are they who would pull this standard down. It must be maintained at all costs. The ancient landmarks for which we are most grateful, and for which our Nation stands and which have made America great, must never be removed: The Bible, church, home, Christian schools, the Lord's day, Sabbath, prayer.

No people ever suffered greater hardships than our pilgrim fathers. Of 102 immigrants who landed on that bleak, rocky, storm-tossed shore of Cape Cod in the winter of 1620, almost half of them died during the first year. They built seven times more graves than they did homes. Only God knows what they suffered during that cold, hard winter. There was sickness, hunger, depression, death, bitterness, sorrow, loneliness, and separation from native land. But of all that history records regarding them, there is nothing written more indelibly than their faith in Almighty God.

For many this may seem like a midnight hour, but let us, like the Psalmist say, "At midnight I will rise to give thanks unto thee because of Thy righteous judgments." And remember, as long as our trust is really in God, all things work together for good—and as He has blessed our Nation in times past, so will He go with us as we face the future, for it is He who says, "Be strong and of good courage, fear not, nor be afraid of them: for the Lord thy God, he it is that doth go with thee; He will not fail thee, nor forsake thee." Deuteronomy 31: 8.

WALLS OF FUTILITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of December 2 entitled "Walls of Futility."

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 2, 1963]

WALLS OF FUTILITY

Some time ago David McDonald of the United Steelworkers joined with steel industry spokesmen to ask for Government protection from foreign steel imports. More recently the AFL–CIO convention passed a stiff resolution indicating that unions in general are beginning to think more and more in terms of import curbs.

It's certainly understandable that people who feel their jobs threatened by imports might fail to appreciate the argument favoring free trade. Still, as past experience well demonstrates, protectionism is futile and self-defeating.

Certainly it is not in the workers' interest. They are also consumers and taxpayers, and when a domestic industry is shielded from foreign competitors, American citizens pay for this "privilege" either through higher prices (the result of tariffs) or more taxes (the result of subsidies) or both. And if, as is likely, the excluded foreigners create higher import barriers of their own, the retaliation hurts other American industries; a great many U.S. jobs depend on exports. All of this applies to Mr. McDonald's steelworkers as well as other workers.

Even the protected industry and its workers ultimately suffer from protectionism. One example is the American shipping industry, where unions along with management support protectionist policies that include both subsidies and protective laws. As a result, the American shipping industry has become so sluggishly dependent on this treatment over the years that it has had to forfeit the flourishing world market to its vigorous foreign rivals, at the expense of thousands of jobs for American seamen and other workers in the maritime industries.

But the worst effect of protectionism and the one most injurious to employment is that it relieves the industry of responsibility for meeting competitive conditions as they really are. The result is that it looks to Government and not its own energies for solutions to every market crisis. A weak and dependent industry can be neither a guarantee of existing jobs nor a creator of new ones.

If union leaders are really in earnest in their effort to improve employment opportunities, they should first address themselves to the labor costs that have been making American industry less able to compete. This would be far more fruitful than a futile attempt to build protective walls that don't really protect.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the editorial very eloquently underscores my own long-held views on foreign trade policy. Protectionism in any form—whether in the guise of unduly restrictive buy American-type legislation, tight quotas on residual fuel oil, a more restrictive antidumping law, or especially costly marketing requirements of imported goods—is against the best interests of the United States.

We are about to embark on some very difficult trade negotiations, the first under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The atmosphere of these negotiations has already been clouded, controversy and suspicion have been provoked, by ill-timed restrictive actions on the part of the EEC—European Common Market—and there are grave doubts as to the likelihood of any worthwhile accomplishments coming out of the forthcoming talks in the foreseeable future. Further restrictive steps on our own part at this time would further endanger these crucial talks.

Restrictions on steel imports proposed by the Steelworkers and the steel industry are not in their own best interest either. Restrictions on our part in turn engender restrictions abroad which would inevitably damage our exports, jobs, the economy, and the balance of payments of the United States.

I am particularly impressed by the editorial's argument that:

> The worst effect of protectionism and the one most injurious to employment is that it relieves the industry of responsibility for meeting competitive conditions as they really are.

The strengthening of the competitive capability and performance of our own economy is the best solution to import competition as well as the meaningful expansion of exports. This means an early enactment of a substantial tax cut, the maintenance of price and wage stability at home, and the reduction of the cost of production through automation with just provision for the workers concerned.

DISCRIMINATORY OCEAN FREIGHT RATES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, has recently held hearings on ocean freight rates and their effects on the balance of payments. Govern-

ment officials, shippers, and private economists have informed the committee that substantial disparities exist between outbound and inbound ocean freight rates. It costs more to send American products to Europe or Japan than it costs to send European or Japanese products to this country. There is an extensive list of such rate disparities.

Representatives of the American steamship industry recently told the committee that these disparities were insignificant and did not affect the movement of commerce for, in most cases where the disparities existed and where the outbound rate was higher than the inbound rate, these rates were usually "paper rates" under which commerce did not move. Moreover, it was said that many disparities exist in the opposite direction, that is, it costs more to ship commerce inbound from Europe and Japan than it costs to ship American products to Europe or Japan. But, again, they said that such disparities were insignificant because these also were paper differentials.

Mr. President, I am not sure that these disparities exist for the reasons stated by the steamship industry. It is my opinion that many of these disparities are real and not paper disparities, and tend to act as a barrier to American exports.

The Federal Maritime Commission has recently taken a courageous step and ordered the major steamship conferences—the associations of lines which establish ocean freight rates—to reduce their outbound rates to the inbound levels on 45 potential export commodities or justify to the Commission why these disparities exist.

If the disparities are paper disparities and do not affect the movement of commodities, the steamship lines and conferences should not object to their elimination. Apparently this is not their intention, judging from recent newspaper articles which indicate that the steamship industry, particularly the foreign lines, intend to strongly resist the Commission's order. This would indicate that either the American lines are not telling the Joint Economic Committee the whole story when they argue that most rate disparities are not significant, or the American lines cannot influence the steamship conferences which are predominantly controlled by foreign-flag operators.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD various newspaper articles which indicate that there is a serious battle shaping up between the Maritime Commission and the steamship conferences.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two Washington Post articles which commend the Commission for its action and question whether the United States should continue to allow steamship conferences to exist by exempting them from our antitrust laws.

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

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 4, 1963]

REGULATING OCEAN RATES

The Federal Maritime Commission has made a beginning in what hopefully will be a successful effort to narrow the ocean shipping rate differentials that exist between inbound and outbound traffic.

Last June Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, called attention to ocean shipping rates paid on inbound cargoes of steel products which were very much lower than those paid on outbound shipments. Subsequent hearings before his committee revealed a pattern of discriminatory ratemaking practices that inhibit the growth of American exports, thus contributing to our balance-of-payments difficulties.

The Federal Maritime Commission has now directed eight outbound shipping conferences—the cartels in which rates are set—to eliminate the inbound-outbound disparities on some 45 commodities or file justifications for their existence. This is the boldest effort which the Commission has made to date in fulfilling its regulatory responsibilities. But if substantial progress is to be made in eliminating the transport-cost impediments to export growth, a frontal attack will have to be made upon the shipping conference system.

Under the Shipping Act of 1916, American carriers are permitted to join conferences or international cartels of ship operators which set rates and pool revenues. And since it is the policy of the Maritime Administration, now in the Department of Commerce, to withhold subsidies from companies which do not adhere to conference rules, the cartels are in fact bolstered by the coercive power of the Federal Government.

The conferences, which attempt to regulate competition among their members, engage in discriminatory practices which raise shipping rates above their competitive level. There is a dual rate system under which shippers who agree to use only conference liners for some minimum length of time are given lower rates. And in some conferences loyal shippers are rewarded with deferred rebates. Both practices are calculated to tie shippers to conference lines and divert business from the nonconference competitors.

Since ships in the traffic which is outbound from the United States are more fully utilized than those on the inbound runs, there should be a normal inbound-outbound rate differential. But it is magnified by the stronger cartel discipline in the outbound shipping conferences.

The Maritime Commission may be able to narrow these differentials by efforts to regulate the conferences in the manner of public utilities. However, success in such an endeavor involves the policing of hundreds of individual conferences and cooperation of their foreign members. These difficulties raise the question of whether it would not be better to forbid American participation in the shipping cartels, thus relying on the unfettered forces of the marketplace.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 2, 1963]

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 eight 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.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Nov. 29, 1963]

SHIPPING GROUPS PONDER RATE ORDER COURT FIGHT

(By George Panitz)

A serious battle between the steamship industry and the Federal Maritime Commission appears imminent in the wake of a controversial order by the regulatory agency that ship conferences equalize inbound and outbound cargo rates or justify the continuing rate disparity.

Spokesmen for many of the eight U.S. based ocean freight conferences directed to take such action by December 15 voiced bitter denunciations of the FMC move and hinted that a court challenge of the agency's power may definitely be in the offing.

BOTH EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

The eight shipping conferences control the outbound rates of American exports to western Europe and the Far East. Eight other ocean freight conferences located abroad and acting similarly on shipments imported to the United States have also been directed to file rate data with the FMC on a selected list of products in the country's foreign commerce, some of these dating back almost 4 years.

However, the order to reduce rates on export commodities applies only to those conferences with headquarters in the United States.

As of Wednesday, only two of the 16 shipping conferences involved had been served with section 21 orders—that part of the FMC authority applying to production of information by steamship companies. They were the North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference and the Continental North Atlantic Westbound Freight Conference.

Officials of ship line members of the two freight groups declined comment on the FMC action. However, they reflected utter dismay at the agency move while indicating that counteraction is being studied.

Other industry spokesmen termed the FMC order as "stupid" and one official charged that the conferences are being harassed because of pressure from Congress.

TWO SENATORS

This was a reference to the activities of Senators DOUGLAS and PROXMIRE in goading the ship regulatory agency to act against conferences in rate matters presumably because it could aid American exports to better compete in foreign markets.

Senator DOUGLAS, from Illinois, and Senator PROXMIRE, from Wisconsin, have persistently charged that conference rate disparities on the same types of cargo items made in the United States and in foreign lands are hurting American trade expansion plans. Only last week and in the face of steamship industry testimony contradicting this stand, Senator PROXMIRE introduced new legislation calling for rate equalization or an explanation by ship lines why a level tariff cannot be issued.

While industry reaction to the FMC order was generally unofficial it was, nevertheless, extremely heated indicating the strong undercurrent of resentment that is affecting the steamship companies. Some conference officials said that they would withhold comment until receipt of the FMC order.

WON'T MEET DEADLINE

It became clear, however, that the industry would not meet the December 15 deadline set by the FMC Chairman Adm. John Harllee. Industry spokesmen noted that in addition to possible legal action, delays in complying would probably result from the mass of detail involved in the sweeping order.

In the case of the two North Atlantic-Europe conferences, the FMC has ordered a reduction in the rates of the eastbound conference, to a level of that in the westbound conference on more than a score of products. Included are fruit juices, radios, plywood, electronic data processing computers, hand tools, iron or steel castings and forgings, pipe, finished steel goods, costume jewelry, copper sheets, brass tubing, zinc and lead ingots, unboxed automobiles and trucks, potash, nitrogen and phosphate fertilizers, batteries, printing presses and motorcycles.

However, this is only a partial list of the products that the FMC says should be moved at equal rates to and from the United States.

SPOKESMEN COMMENT

The over-reaching nature of the FMC order and the wide number of commodities involved prompted one steamship industry leader to voice disbelief that the agency would even think of taking such action. "This is ratemaking in its most inequitable form," he charged, "Are they (FMC) now going to come in and upset the rate structures that have been built up with approval of shippers for decades?"

Another conference official, whose member lines have had difficult problems with nonconference line competition asked why the FMC has not gone after the independents. "The independents have different rates on their inbound and outbound trades, what about them?"

Still another industry spokesman offering strong support of the conference ratemaking system suggested that the latest FMC move could prove to be "the end of the honeymoon" with the shipping agency that was formed under new legislation in 1961. "We have been bending over backwards to work with the Commission but this has brought nothing but deep resentment," he added.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 29, 1963]

MARITIME COMMISSION ORDERS OCEAN SHIPPING RATE CHANGE

(By John P. MacKenzie)

The Federal Maritime Commission has made its boldest move to date in its venture into the regulation of ocean shipping rates.

In an action certain to raise storms of protest in the shipping industry, the Commission told 16 major ratesetting conferences of ocean shipping lines to correct "alleged disparities" in rates or give a good reason for not doing so.

The "disparities" listed by the Commission involved about 45 commodities which cost more to export than to import. Congress and the administration have charged that the rate structure—and Commission inaction—have frustrated the U.S. trade expansion program.

The Commission chose the commodities carefully. Ranging from books to sewing machines and canned vegetables, the goods appeared to be selected more for their export potential than for their economic impact on shipping lines.

MAY BE FIRST STEP

Since the goods chosen for corrective action do not constitute much of the shipping lines business, the industry must decide whether the rate structure is worth fighting for in prolonged hearings.

If the industry complies with the Commission directive to bring the inbound and outbound rates into line, there is no guarantee that the Commission will not start regulating other, more sensitive commodities.

The Commission directive calls on the conferences, which represent perhaps 100 shipping companies, to correct the disparities by December 15 or file justification for them by December 31.

Although the Commission has the power to amend the rate structure by canceling the conferences exemption from antitrust laws, it has never exercised the power. Until recent prodding by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress and the late President Kennedy, the Commission had declined even to threaten regulation.

INVESTIGATIONS STARTED

Last summer, at the height of congressional irritation over the shipping structure, President Kennedy named Commissioner John Harllee as Maritime Chairman. Harllee pledged to move "more vigorously" to implement national export policy.

In a burst of activity, Harllee started one staff investigation into shipping rates for steel, initiated another which headed off a rate increase contemplated by a major Atlantic shipping group, and began studying an export-inhibiting surcharge on shipments from the west coast to Manila.

Joint Committee Chairman PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who spearheaded the congressional inquiry and encouraged President Kennedy's shakeup at Maritime, praised the Commission's move. "If properly followed up," he said, there could be major progress in the battle to redress the U.S. deficit in international payments.

In another response to Capitol Hill criticism, the Commission announced it would hold an open session with a group of lawyers and newsmen to discuss the "free flow of information" in the agency.

Charges that the maritime agencies "are the most secretive in Washington" were made in recent hearings before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Dec. 2, 1963]

STEEL FREIGHT RATE STUDY SCOPE WIDENS

(By Barbara Spector)

WASHINGTON, December 1.—The Federal Maritime Commission's iron and steel freight rate investigation is turning up facts and figures which conceivably may well lead to similar investigations on the disparity between import and export rates in trades between the United States and Latin America, India and Pakistan.

Ninety percent of the current investigation (docket No. 114), which is limited to the trades between the United States and Europe, Britain, Japan, the Philippines and Australia, informed commission sources told the Journal of Commerce.

Generally, the Commission investigators have found that in the European trade, the Common Market has expanded production facilities rapidly and has possibly outstripped the U.S. ability to market their iron and steel commodities in Europe—except for specialty items." One Commission source

put it rather succinctly, "generally there would be no sales of U.S. iron and steel products even if freight rates from the United States were zero."

DOUGLAS HEARINGS

The Commission investigation, initiated by ex-Chairman Thomas Stakem, results from hearings by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. Senator DOUGLAS has stated that higher export rates from the United States than import rates on similar products moving in the same trades are hurting our balance-of-payments posture. The investigation is aimed at determining just where the disparities lie in the iron and steel industries.

This presently is the only docketed Commission investigation dealing with the disparity between inbound and outbound freight rates.

It is now expected that hearings will begin on January 14 in New York City. Importers and exporters are expected to testify on their ability or inability to make foreign sales as such opportunities relate to freight rates. Importers will be questioned on their ability to make sales here as such sales relate to very low inbound freight rates.

In February similar testimony will be taken in San Francisco. Gulf importers and exporters will be given an opportunity to testify either in New York or a special session may be called in that area. At the conclusion of testimony taking, the hearings will probably resume in Washington so that conference and steamship industry executives, and perhaps iron and steel industry leaders, will have an opportunity to testify.

RELUCTANT DRAGON

According to informed FMC sources the steel industry, which in the beginning played the reluctant dragon, has become very helpful. U.S. steel companies engaged in the export field at first refused to supply the FMC with the information originally requested. However, these same companies are reportedly now being most cooperative and have submitted to the FMC different information which the Commission regards as more useful to the investigation than the original material sought.

Commission sources indicate that the information from the iron and steel companies will help broaden their investigation to cover why there are rate differentials in the same inbound and outbound trades—and not just to show that they do exist.

The steel companies have handed over to the FMC their correspondence relating to the disagreements with conferences over outbound freight rates, it was learned. The exporters have gotten action on at least half of their complaints, and the Commission will endeavor to show what percentage of half of the complaints were acted upon in a way to satisfy the exporters.

The steel company responses to FMC queries lead the Commission to suspect that rate practices to the Far East from the United States reflect preferential differential treatment for Japan.

DECLINING MARKET

For instance, in the New York to Far East trade, covered by the Far East Conference, there is a declining U.S. iron and steel market and rates had to be reduced by the conference.

The conference reduced the rates to Hong Kong and Australia, but not to Japan and the Philippines. This backs up FMC thinking that these rates embody a preferential treatment for Japan and the Philippines which keeps those rates high to keep U.S. steel out. In that same trade, it was learned, it was cheaper to ship iron and steel commodities to Korea than to Japan, even though a ship had to stop at Japan before stopping at Korea.

The Far East Conference is made up of four American carriers, nine Japanese, four European and two Philippine flags.

The other conference in that trade, but from the U.S. Pacific coast, the Pacific westbound freight conference is made up of 10 Japanese, 7 American carriers, 4 European and 2 Philippine flags.

COMMISSION PLANS

The Commission plans to concentrate its hearing time on 4 or 5 of the 10 largest steel companies because they each represent entirely different modes of doing business abroad. It was learned that one of the companies works out of steel mills it has built abroad.

Another area of investigation will be the effect of low import freight rates on the European's ability to capture a good share of the market generally reserved for U.S. production.

The investigators will explore the corporate tieup between Japan's leading shipowners and leading steel producers.

They will also cover the influence British steel producers exercise over British shipowners to raise European inbound rates to a level bound to limit U.S. imports.

The FMC is also expected to explore "the fantastic increase in U.S. imports of Australian steel products in the last 7 or 8 years." FMC wants to know how this came about. This is expected to involve the level of each rate involved.

FEDERAL ORDER AROUSES SHIPPERS: COURT FIGHT SEEN ON RATES

(By Robert S. Burns)

The Federal Maritime Commission's order to steamship conferences to justify or end alleged disparities between export and import freight rates has aroused confusion and resentment along shipping row.

Foreign-based conferences that regulate rates on imports have refused similar orders and have had their refusal backed by the courts. Conferences located in the United States, which set export rates, do not intend to obey the latest order without a fight.

American lines, most of whom are Government subsidized, must comply. One line reported that the job of gathering all the information requested by the Commission would cost at least $20,000.

Inbound conferences have until December 15 to comply with the Commission's request to justify differences in export and import rates. Outbound conferences and some of their member companies have until December 31 to supply information for a rate study being undertaken by the agency.

It is fully expected that the conferences and lines will ask and get an extension of these deadlines. The Commission's action was taken to comply with an order from the Congressional Joint Economic Committee to do something about the alleged disparity in rates by January 10.

The committee is investigating charges that rates on American exports are higher than on similar imports. Last week American shipowners told the committee that most export rates were lower or equal to similar import rates and that in any event the higher export rates did not place American manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage.

It was pointed out that the difference in average profit a revenue ton outbound versus inbound does not exceed 68 cents and probably is less than 50 cents on the adjusted scale.

A typical reaction to the Commission's action was given yesterday. "We are damned upset over the whole situation. It has almost reached the point of harassment," one industry leader said.

"The industry is up in arms * * * this goes well beyond any right the Commission has under the law," another said.

WORLD CONFERENCE ON OCEANOGRAPHY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my Senate colleagues to an excellent suggestion made recently by Representative BOB WILSON of California.

Representative WILSON has asked the Congress to call a World Conference on Oceanography to be convened in the United States in 1965.

As the good Representative pointed out, the undetectable approaches to our shores which lie under water constitute one of our greatest perils of enemy surprise attack. And so the subject of national defense would be high on the conference agenda.

But we all know that scientists have only begun to ripple the surface of the vast oceans of the globe in their search for untold treasures.

We know the oceans yield food but we take but a fraction of the food because we have yet to learn the necessary processing techniques. We know the oceans cover enormous mineral wealth, oil and other natural resources.

We know the oceans may some day be a prime source of energy. Each year we have managed to lower the cost of converting salt to fresh water. Some day we may eliminate the world's deserts and convert them into rich, productive farmlands.

To sum up, each of us acknowledges the importance of oceanography and its virtually limitless potentials. A world conference on this subject could not help but prove to be beneficial to the United States and all mankind.

Since my House colleague suggested the conference be held, I can only second his motion—with one slight amendment. I propose Hawaii as an ideal conference site.

Hawaii, surrounded by the Pacific Ocean, is ideally suited as a conference site. The city and county of Honolulu is just now completing a modern civic auditorium complex which would make an ideal location for the Conference.

I am certain the faculty of the University of Hawaii's Geophysics Institute would be happy to act as Conference hosts.

In conclusion I hope that my Senate colleagues will give their wholehearted support to the proposal that a World Conference on Oceanography be held in the United States in 1965, preferably, of course, in Hawaii.

DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, Calendar No. 648, Senate bill 1111, be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. 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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ANDERSON. 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. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to S. 1111 may be agreed to en bloc and that the bill, as so amended, be considered original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, S. 1111, implements the report of one of the finest select committees ever created by this body—the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

The committee was authorized by Senate resolution 48 of the 86th Congress and was composed of members of the Public Works, Commerce, Agriculture and Forestry, and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. The late Senator Robert S. Kerr was its chairman. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL of California, the distinguished minority whip, was vice chairman. Serving on it were Dennis Chavez, chairman of the Public Works Committee; Senator Allen Ellender, the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee; Warren Magnuson, chairman of the Commerce Committee; Senator Henry Jackson, the present chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and such distinguished minority Senators as Senator Milton Young of North Dakota, Andrew Schoeppel of Kansas, Francis Case of South Dakota, and Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania. It was a blue-ribbon group, from both sides of the aisle.

Hearings were held the length and breadth of the Nation under the guidance of the chairman, Senator Kerr. The committee studied firsthand in a great majority of States the water problems of each individual area.

While the hearings were being held, experts on water and water-related resources in the Government and private life prepared for the committee a series of 32 studies published as committee prints. An outstanding authority on water problems has described these prints as the finest collection of material on the Nation's water resources ever brought into 6 inches of shelf space—it would take books covering 1000 feet of shelving to find the same material anywhere else, and much of it could not be found elsewhere.

On January 30, 1961, the committee filed its report and recommendations with the Senate. They had found that six types of water problems confront the various areas of the Nation: supply, distribution, natural quality, pollution, variability, and floods.

The committee found that five major regions in the Nation will have inadequate water supply in 1980 to meet anticipated increases in population and economic activity even with full development. They are:

First. South Pacific.

Second. Colorado River basin.

Third. Great Basin—Utah, Nevada, California.

Fourth. Upper Rio Grande-Pecos.

Fifth. Upper Missouri River basin.

By the year 2000, the committee foresaw supply shortages also in the Upper Arkansas-Red River basins, the western Great Lakes States, and the Louisiana-Texas western gulf area.

Other major areas of the Nation, the committee found, would have adequate usable water only if they invest billions of dollars in pollution control, recycling, storage reservoirs to level out variable seasonal flows, and establish more efficient management practices.

The whole great industrial area of the United States from Boston south to Norfolk, Va., and then sweeping west in a great band to Kansas City and Sioux Falls, S. Dak., was found to be in the latter category—facing shortages of usable water unless they spend billions to conserve and manage it right.

The Senate select committee made five major recommendations. Shortened, they were:

First. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins in the United States.

Second. The Federal Government should stimulate more active participation by States in planning and undertaking water development and management activities by setting up a 10-year program of grants to the States for water resources planning. A minimum of $5 million should be made available annually for matching by States.

Third. The Federal Government should undertake a coordinated scientific research program on water.

Fourth. The Federal Government should prepare biennially an assessment of the water supply-demand outlook for each of the water resources regions of the United States.

Fifth. The Federal Government in cooperation with the States should take steps to encourage efficiency in water development and use.

The U.S. Senate has acted to implement the third recommendation by the passage of S. 2, the Water Resources Research Act, now under active consideration by the House committee.

President John F. Kennedy on July 13, 1961, transmitted to Congress the original river basin planning bill, which became S. 2246 of the 87th Congress. Its objectives—to provide for development of comprehensive river basin plans, biennial assessments of regional water needs and supplies, aid to the States, and encouragement of more efficient water development, management, and use—were the same as the objectives in the pending bill, as was much of the language.

Title I of President Kennedy's bill provided for a Federal Water Resources Council, giving it responsibility for the biennial water surveys, stimulation of river basin planning, and administration of aid to the States.

Title II of President Kennedy's bill provided for the establishment of river basin planning commissions, including representatives of the States, whose members would all, however, be appointed by the President.

Title III of the President's bill provided for $5 million in aid to States each year for 10 years for water resources planning, as proposed in bills then pending in Congress by Senator Kerr, chairman of the select committee, and myself.

In August 1961, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee held joint hearings on President Kennedy's bill. There was a good deal of opposition to it from the States represented by the Interstate Conference on Water Problems and from water organizations. They wanted the bill amended to declare that the States had primary interest in water, to provide that planning could not be undertaken in a basin unless two-thirds of the States requested it, and that the Commission would have a voting arrangement in which the States would pretty much dominate the decisions. The President's bill gave the Federal Government all of the final authorities.

In 1962, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held a further hearing to receive the detailed views of the State governments as they had been gathered by the Interstate Conference on Water Problems. The conference submitted an extensively revised version of the bill which was not acceptable to some of us on the committee. But we felt that with patience and diplomacy on both sides, an acceptable bill might be worked out.

I regarded this as an extremely important project. I did not want to see the reports and the work of the Senate select committee entombed in the Archives and forgotten as a dozen major water reports had been filed and forgotten in the past.

This country has been struggling since 1908 to do something about river basin planning—a span of 55 years. On February 3, 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt's Inland Waterways Commission recommended "prompt and vigorous action by the States and Federal Government to this comprehensive plan for all the Nation's river basins." There have been repeated efforts in the past half century to bring about that river basin plan. They have succeeded in getting the job done in less basins than there are fingers on one hand.

Because of the increasing urgency of our water problems, committee members and staff have spent weeks and months negotiating with representatives of the Interstate Conference on Water

Problems and the various water organizations on an acceptable bill.

In these negotiations, agreement was first reached that the bill would be kept entirely out of the Federal versus State water rights controversy and that it would be drafted so it would not adversely affect any existing agencies operating in the water resources field.

Section 3 of S. 1111 is a statement and a proposed enactment of these basic understandings and purposes. It needs to be read carefully and understood, for it puts aside many of the controversial side issues which have in the past unnecessarily delayed the water planning job. Section 3 reads as follows:

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 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 repeating 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.

During one of the hearings on this bill, I made the statement that the longstanding water rights controversy between the Federal Government and the States had never prevented the construction of a project. I challenged one witness to name any project which had been forestalled by the rights issue. He named two, but it proved that he was mistaken on both of them.

It was, and is, my belief that if we will set the water engineers and experts from the Federal Government and the States down around a table to come up with the very best possible plan for the use of the water of a river basin, they will get the job done without any extensive debate on rights. They deal in facts. The costs and benefits of alternative projects and programs are measurable. They will study those alternatives, compare them, and select the alternatives which are best for the basin involved.

Time after time the engineers have been able to recommend projects which all of the participants in some of our major water rights battles come in and support and then go back home and start scolding each other about water rights again.

We can plan. We can prepare for the development of our water resources which will be urgently needed in the next 10, 20, and 30 years, if we will just suspend bureaucratic arguments long enough to set up a planning machinery which will allow the engineers and the water experts to get together.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which has recommended the passage of S. 1111, has another bill before it, S. 1275, which deals with the State and Federal water rights issue. We are going to hold hearings on it and see if we can take at least a short step toward settlement of that dispute. I am not sure whether we will be able to or not. But that dispute can be dealt with separately and does not need to impede the passage of S. 1111 to get the planning job done.

Mr. President, S. 1111, before the Senate today, still seeks to achieve the same purposes as President Kennedy's bill which is the implementation of recommendations 1, 2, 4, and 5 of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

Title I of S. 1111 establishes a Water Resources Council composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, including the five major agencies which have responsibilities for water resources planning now.

The title charges this Council with performing one of the important jobs recommended by the Select Committee on Water Resources, a biennial assessment of water supply and demand in the various regions of the Nation.

This is a considerably more important function than many realize. Experience shows that it sometimes takes 20 years and longer to bring major water resources facilities from the planning stage to completion. After all the planning is done, after all the blueprints for a dam have been completed and Congress has actually authorized the first money to start work on a dam, it sometimes takes 5 to 7 years just to construct the access roads, excavate, drill foundations, bore water tunnels, and finally erect the structure that will impound a river's waters.

It is too late to start the planning and construction of a dam after a water shortage is upon a city. It must be done years in advance. It is consequently essential that we know years in advance when demand is going to exceed the supply under different stages of development.

A second major function of the Council—and a very important one in some major areas—is to assess the effect that the individual river basin plans will have on other regions in the Nation.

The Mississippi River basin has been treated for Federal water planning and development purposes as six different basins in the past. It has been treated as a Lower Mississippi River basin, the Tennessee, the Ohio, the Upper Mississippi River basin, the Missouri basin, and the Arkansas-Red-White River basin.

Water management in the Tennessee Valley affects water flows in the lower Mississippi below Cairo, Ill., as does water management in the Ohio. Irrigation in Montana and North Dakota affects the amount of water flowing past Vicksburg, Miss. It is necessary that there be a Federal agency making certain that in instances like the Mississippi basin that the plan for one of the six segments does not adversely affect others.

A second example of interbasin relationships which must be watched is interbasin exchange of water. Some of these are intrastate, as in California, where it is planned to divert water from humid northern California areas to arid southern California. Some instances are interstate, such as diversions from the Colorado River to the Missouri and Arkansas River basins.

A third major task of the Water Resources Council has already been undertaken on an ad hoc basis. We needed a new statement of Federal principles, standards, and policies to provide Federal water agencies with a common guide for justification and planning of water projects. President Kennedy asked the four Cabinet members in the proposed Council to meet on an ad hoc basis and prepare such principles and standards, to replace the old and unpopular standards in Budget Circular No. 97. This job has been successfully accomplished. S. 1111 directs the new Council to keep this work current, to develop common cost allocation practices, and to encourage voluntary coordination of the Federal Government's water planning and development activities.

Title II of the bill is where the principal debate has occurred. It provides the pattern for the Federal-State river basin planning commission.

Under S. 1111 the Federal Government and the States will each appoint and pay their own representatives in any commission. The Federal and State people will meet as representatives of autonomous units of government. The commissions will be truly Federal-State, not Federal commissions, to which the President has appointed people intended to represent the viewpoint of the different States. The Federal Government and the States will share in the budget.

Since preparation of the best plan for the development of the water and related land resources of a river basin requires a determination of the best alternatives based on the facts involved, and it is not a political question which can be settled by voting—no provision is made for voting in the commissions. In instances where the engineers and experts finally disagree on what is the best plan, then the commissions will report to the President and the Governors, and through them to the legislative bodies, on the alternatives. Congress ultimately has to authorize the projects. It will not be unusual if we have to judge occasionally between alternative projects. It will be unusual to judge between alternatives where the engineering facts and the anticipated results of the alternatives have been clearly defined and we know the exact nature of the choice we are making.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on which three distinguished members of this body serve with distinction—Senators ERVIN, MUNDT, and MUSKIE—has approved this new type of commission with some enthusiasm.

The Commission includes representatives of the executive branch of the

Federal Government, Senators, Representatives, Governors, State legislators, mayors, county officials, and private citizens.

The members of the Commission, without any dissents, agreed to a report on this bill which said—and I quote their report:

> We believe the concept of Federal-State cooperation in river basin planning and development, as proposed in the bill, is not only desirable but consistent with sound principles of intergovernmental relations in our Federal system. Success of the proposed program of course would depend on the way in which both levels of government react to their responsibilities. By having an active role in the planning process, the States would have an added incentive to undertake developmental and construction projects contained in the plans developed by basin commissions * * *.
>
> Insofar as we are aware, the proposed Federal-State structure for river basin commissions would establish a novel pattern for furthering intergovernmental cooperation, but one of major advantage to our Federal system in that it is adaptable to changing times and circumstances.

I must confess that I am a little bit proud of the fact that in the preparation of this bill there has developed an agency pattern which this great Commission has described as something new and novel, which can be of major advantage in furthering intergovernmental cooperation within our Federal system.

My pride in it is partly based on the source of that comment. The Advisory Commission is not a partisan body, but a bipartisan commission of outstanding practitioners of the art of government at every so-called level within our system.

It includes, besides our three distinguished Senate members, Governors John Anderson, of Kansas, and Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho, Mayors Richard Batterton, of Denver, Raymond Tucker, of St. Louis, Neal Blaisdell, of Hawaii, and Arthur Naftalin, of Minneapolis. The Chairman of the Commission is an outstanding political scientist and administrator, the Honorable Frank Bane.

Title III of the measure before us, Mr. President, is the minimum program of aid to States for water resources planning proposed in the select committee recommendation No. 5. It authorizes the appropriation of $5 million each year for 10 years, to be apportioned out to the States on a matching basis, to develop State water plans, including both intrastate and interstate water resources, their own independent planning, and planning which may be done by title II commissions, interstate compact commission, or other interstate water planning agencies with which the State works.

The formula for the distribution of the State aid funds is a rather complex one, based on population, land area, need for water resources planning, and financial need.

On the average, States can get up to 50 percent matching to pay the cost of developing State water plans. Individual States will be eligible to more or less than 50 percent matching depending on their average per capita income. If their average per capita income is more than the U.S. average, the ratio matching will be less than 50 percent. If their per capita income is low, and they have less than average Americans to spend, then they will get more than 50 percent matching. The Federal matching is never to be more than two-thirds or less than one-third, except in instances where the States adopt some elaborate scheme where even one-third of the cost exceeds their share of the $5 million under the population area need allotment. A State cannot get more than its allotment under the population area need distribution originally made.

I am advised that this same formula is working well in the Pollution Control Act, from which it was taken.

Title IV of the bill has several housekeeping provisions. One authorizes necessary appropriations. Others authorize rulemaking, delegation of some functions by the Council members, borrowing of personnel for planning from established agencies, where it is agreeable to the employing agency, and provision of employee benefit programs.

During committee consideration of the bill, we have adopted several amendments to make it satisfactory to the executive agencies. We adopted one to make it clearer that the measure does not displace, supersede, or limit existing interstate compact commissions and like established agencies.

As the report on the bill states, the only disagreement with the executive branch remaining, of which we are aware, is an authorizing provision which would allow the Civil Service Commission to extend Federal employee benefit programs to commission employees, on a contract basis.

We want the planning commissions to have the very finest water resources planning personnel. We do not want loss of Federal employee benefits to be a deterrent to working for a commission. We would like to see them become an attraction.

In any event, we do not require the Civil Service Commission to contract to provide such benefit programs, we just authorize them to, and then provide a little persuasion toward that end in the report on the bill.

This river basin planning bill has more widespread support than anyone could have conceived possible when the measure was first proposed.

President Dwight Eisenhower's Budget Director sent a river basin planning bill up to Congress on January 16, 1961. It did not even get introduced in Congress until President Kennedy, in July 1961, used the Eisenhower bill as the model for title II of his bill.

Our committee did not have a handful of witnesses in favor of title II in President Kennedy's bill in the first series of hearings. As revised, we have not had a handful of opposition.

The Interstate Conference on Water Problems, to which all 50 States belong, endorses it heartily, as does the Council of State Governments, its parent organization.

The National Reclamation Association, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the National Association of Soil Conservation District Officials and organizations which have not been in the same room together for years tell us this bill is all right.

Besides their endorsement through the Council of State Governments and Interstate Conference, the officials of 33 States have independently sent in messages of approval, 6 more liked it with certain amendments, and only 3 saw fit to oppose.

Mr. President, I believe we have an opportunity to take a step forward toward this Nation's 55-year-old goal of river basin planning by the enactment of S. 1111.

I hope that the Senate will pass it with a big majority as a recommendation to the House of Representatives to do likewise.

Mr. President, I wish to compliment the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who has been engaged in the study of this bill over a long period of time.

The Senator from Colorado will offer certain amendments. I appreciate the way in which the Senator has worked on the amendments. He has not suddenly flashed them on the Senate, so as to require Senators to consider them suddenly. Over a long period of time he has discussed the principles involved. So far as we can, we shall try to meet the objections and requests of the Senator from Colorado, who has done an extremely outstanding job in this particular field. He has done an outstanding job in many other fields, but this is one field in which I have seen his work, and I appreciate the contribution he has made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico for his kind remarks. I always enjoy working with him on any matter which pertains to water, because he is quite knowledgeable in this field.

I am a little embarrassed to find it necessary to offer amendments under these circumstances, although the Senator has been entirely gracious about it. The Senator knows and understands that at the time of both markup sessions on the bill in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I was compelled to attend other committee meetings, and it was not possible for me to attend the sessions on the markup of the bill or to present my amendments, although the Senator and I have discussed many times the general nature of my ideas about the bill.

At this time I merely wish to express my appreciation to the Senator. I believe other Senators would like to ask him some questions. I will yield at this time, so that they may do so, before I make my statement.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I understand the situation which the

Senator from Colorado faced. He was busily engaged in work on appropriation bills, and in particular one bill with respect to which he was the ranking member of the subcommittee. His presence was absolutely required.

We discussed what we should do—whether we should call off all our hearings and wait until the Senator was free. There is no way of knowing when a Senator will be free these days, with all the responsibilities Senators have.

I therefore suggested to the Senator from Colorado that the bill be reported, with full rights reserved to him to present amendments at a later date if he wished to do so.

The Senator was represented at all hearings by members of his own staff. I appreciate the fact that they have been hardworking and careful. I understood completely the situation in which the Senator from Colorado found himself.

I appreciate the fact that he let us go ahead, complete the hearings, and mark up the bill, without his presence, since his presence was required elsewhere.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that title 3 of the bill provides for an annual authorization of $5 million for 10 years. If these authorizations are fully funded, this could be a $50 million program. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I notice that in the committee report there are certain references made that relate the amount to be granted to each State for study from this $5 million to per capita income. It is provided that it shall vary between one-third and two-third grants, depending on the State's need and its per capita income. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. Water flows in unusual ways. It does not always flow through States that have the greatest resources to take care of the problem. I can imagine that the State of New York, for example, which has had an abundant budget surplus, certainly in recent years, could take care of many of these costs; whereas there are many States that are hard pressed to take care of their regular running expenses and must find new sources of revenue. It is preeminently for those States that there is a need for this legislation.

We had long conferences with State officials and with Governors on this subject. It was requested that a formula be placed in the bill which makes it possible to take care of the needs of States which may not have a great supply of money.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Procedures for payment of funds are described on page 8 of the committee report. I presume those procedures are spelled out on pages 21, 22, and 23 of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. It starts at the bottom of page 20. Those procedures are all spelled out.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On page 1 of the committee report is contained a list of areas of the country, such as South Pacific, Colorado River basin, Great Basin, and so forth, that are in dire need. They are five areas which by 1980 will have a very substantial water shortage.

Following that list is a list of two or three other areas which will have a serious shortage by the year 2000.

The question that occurs to me is that in some parts of the country there may be initiative and urgent pressure to get these funds for studies, in view of the fact that the bill provides guidelines that are fairly general, and, as the Senator from New Mexico has said, flexible.

I am concerned about the possibility that in other areas, such as the State of Wisconsin—there is mention of the Great Lakes States—there may be a water shortage later. I wonder if people in those States may later be foreclosed because other States had made efforts earlier to get the funds.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is provision in the bill or in the committee report for protection of States which may not be as eager or as alert as other States are.

A few years ago if anyone had suggested that there would be a shortage of water for the city of New York, he would have been laughed off the course, because there were ample reservoirs in and around the city to make sure it would have an adequate supply of water for a long time.

Then came the vogue for swimming pools and other uses for water, and now New York finds itself short of water. It is not a critical shortage of water yet, as it is in other areas, but by the year 2000 it may be.

The provisions of this bill are related to areas that need planning. There will be a time when States which have not done so will require planning, and there will be money available for them. It is the responsibility of a careful administrator to see to it the funds are available for programs that come along now and to be prepared to meet others that may come along later. If certain areas are not now distressed, they may be by the year 2000.

A great many water experts testified before the select committee established under the leadership of the late Senator Kerr and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. It was surprising the calculations they made about the water needs within a few years. People who never worried about the possibility that their States might be short of water realized that they might be critically short of water. That is why, for example, the Atomic Energy Commission is working with the Department of the Interior on a large atomic plan which will not only develop electricity at reasonable rates, but which will develop ways of making used water potable, and also to obtain an unlimited amount of water from the sea for use.

We are doing that because the flow in the Colorado River is far lower than we thought it would be. That may be the experience of other river basins. Therefore, it is necessary to plan long in advance if water is to be made available. Every thought was given to the problem of the States. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] asked many questions concerning his State and others. I think thorough consideration was given to the possibility that there may be a need at a subsequent time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What protections are there to assure that only one, two, three, four, or five States will not get virtually all of this money, as the Senator has said there are? This is a field where there has been a great need for making substantial and expansive studies of this kind.

On page 20 of the bill there is reference to use of the funds. I do not see any limitation as to the amount of funds one State can get.

Mr. ANDERSON. There are these limitations. This money is available on this basis. Some States may get more funds than others, if there is no other demand for the money temporarily. We have to depend on the honesty and integrity of the administrator to take care of that problem. For instance, the Department of Agriculture had to consider acts of Congress for retirement of land. There were limitations on how those lands could pass out of cultivation. Some States did not use up the money at all. Other States needed a great deal more.

We must depend on the administrator to administer the program in a sensible way. If one State did not use any of the money and later wanted it, the administrator would put it back into the program. I think that is the only safe rule to follow.

I do not see how we could require Congress to look into all the details. We would have to depend on the integrity of the administrator. The procedures are set out in the report. I think that is as far as we can go. All we can do is state what the expectations of the water shortage are for the year 2000 or the year 1980. If the Colorado River basin finishes its planning and its work is completed by 1980, then the money could be transferred to the Great Lakes States, for example, for the next 20 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does it mean that the administrator would make a commitment of $5 million each year, or that he would not make a commitment over many years, so that if certain States made applications in 1965 or 1966, for example, other States would not be foreclosed if they decided to come under the program in 1967, for example?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is this the first time the Federal Government has engaged in this kind of program, where it has made grants of this size for study of water resources?

Mr. ANDERSON. The housing authority does it. I also want to say that back in the days of the WPA there were grants given to States on the theory that States should have a shelf full of projects available which might be utilized if we had a depression.

I would not want to say this is the first time it has been done. I only say to the Senator that in the deliberations

of the committee we felt this was a field that was pretty well ignored at this time. The water problem is developing very rapidly, and the thing to be done was to pass this bill now and make sure that there was future planning for taking care of this problem.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is the first time for water resources. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I would have to——

Mr. PROXMIRE. The WPA was established to take care of various projects. There might have been some incidental water studies, but not any really significant amount such as in this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Not of this comprehensive type. I was a part of the WPA, and I had responsibility for all the 11 Western States. The work on the Grand Coulee Dam started as a WPA project. Therefore, it had some of these aspects. However, this is the first time that this kind of comprehensive approach has been made by legislation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may I first inquire whether the Senator from New Mexico has completed his presentation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. This is not a late hour in this legislative day, but it is a late hour in this legislative session. I regret very much that it is not possible to have a greater number of Senators in attendance for the consideration of the pending bill.

In my opinion, the bill would affect the lives of more people in the United States, their economics and their resources, than any other bill that this Congress will consider this year. I am sure the Senator from New Mexico has this in mind and realizes it as well as I do.

The reason why the bill will affect the lives of people, their economics and their resources, is that it deals drastically, and almost dramatically, with their water resources. To those of us who, like the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and I, live in the West, dealing with water is not a new thing. We fight to conserve it. We fight to obtain it. We fight to get the best beneficial use out of it. There are many interstate compacts which have been beat out on the anvil, just as a piece of brass is beaten out on the anvil, to obtain those agreements.

This is a new situation, particularly to the people of the Midwest. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] asked a few questions a few moments ago. The situation is new for the people of the East and of the South. They have never been in the position in which water is literally a lifeblood.

The growth of New Mexico—and I am sure the Senator from New Mexico does not mind my saying this—depends upon how well it serves its water uses as much as on any other dozen factors.

The same thing is true in my State and in every other reclamation State.

It is hard to put this in context with sufficient weight for the people of the Midwest, the East, and the South because they have never faced these problems. They think essentially of water in terms of something that is obtained by the turning of a tap.

In the great arid and semiarid areas of the West, that is not true. It is the subject of constant litigation and constant attention. It is one which we place at the top priority of the things we must watch and attend to assiduously.

With respect to the pending bill, I said in the beginning that I wish it were possible for every Senator to be present. I know it is not. I know that Senators must eat. I know that Senators must attend committee meetings, which are in progress throughout the Capitol. We are doing our best to try to wind up this session. Believe me, Mr. President, when I say that what we do here today on the pending bill will eventually affect the water rights and the water uses of every State in the Union. As the years go by and the pressures build up in the Midwest, the East, and the South, and accelerate and come into the foreground, to that extent the economics and the lives of those States will be affected.

After consultation with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, I prepared a series of amendments, which I propose to the pending bill. I believe those amendments would improve it. I must be completely frank in saying that I do not believe that those amendments would make it a good bill. I know that the Senator from New Mexico realizes my position. What we needed in this country many years ago was the establishment of a department of government under a Cabinet head, in the form of a department of natural resources.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico, as I recall—and he often alludes to it both as a matter of humor and with respect to some experiences he had—was the Secretary of Agriculture under President Truman. He is aware, as I am aware, that with the proliferation of interest in resources throughout the various departments of government, the amalgamation of natural resources department under one Cabinet member, which in my opinion and in the opinion of many others would be the proper way to do it, is for all practical purposes an impossibility.

I do not know how the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior could ever be amalgamated, particularly with respect to the Bureau of Public Lands, the Park Service, and the Forest Service, into one department. I am sure no one else knows. It is all so set in the pattern of this country, and the interests are so vested, that the result is a situation of inertia which seems to be impossible to change.

Therefore, what the pending bill does is to offer an alternative to what is not within the bounds of practical reality. It is an attempt to set up a means of dealing with the situation.

I wish to refer very briefly to several points in the bill, and then I shall get to the amendments, which should not take too long a time to consider.

Title I of the bill would establish a Water Resources Council, which is referred to in the bill as the Council. It is to 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.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask the Senator from what page he is reading?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am reading from page 3 of the bill, line 7 and subsequently.

I believe the reason for the selection of these particular agencies is apparent from the functions they perform. I shall not try to explain that section further, unless it is desired that I should do so.

What concerns me is that ultimately the bill, even in spite of the amendments I propose to offer, would vest within the Council such great powers over the planning, use, and development of water that we who have been reared in the tradition and the law of States rights and State control of water are fearful of it.

I must say this because the rebuttal could be made to that statement that many interests in this country, waterwise, have looked at the bill, studied it, and now approve of it.

I am not attempting to chastise my good friends of the National Reclamation Association, who, after examining the original bill in 1961, opposed certain phases of it. The present bill is a rewriting of the earlier bill, in an attempt to eliminate some of the objections. But I am somewhat surprised that my good friends in the National Reclamation Association, which has in its membership many outstanding, able water lawyers and others who are knowledgeable in the water field, cannot see the potential dangers in the bill. I do not believe that I am seeing an Indian behind every bush.

By the bill, the Council would be given the authority to—

(a) maintain a continuing study and prepare a biennial assessment of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to keep 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 * * *.

It then gives to the Council certain other powers with respect to the expenditure of funds, planning, and so forth, as might be expected from such a bill.

On page 7, title 2 provides for the establishment of river basin commissions. The subjugation, if I may call it that, of river basin commissions to the Council, which would be an all-Federal agency, is, I believe, the feature of the bill that concerns me the most. The bill defines how the commissions shall be organized, and I shall discuss that provision later, when I offer my amendments. Incidentally, the chairman of each commission would be appointed by the President and would have considerable powers under the bill.

Then provision is made for the organization of the commissions and the duties of the commissions to:

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.

The commissions shall:

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.

The commissions shall:

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.

With these preliminary remarks, I have merely tried to lay the foundation for the broad, general program, which is that because of our history, we are really dealing in an antiquated way with the problem of resources.

I am sure that many persons would desire an entirely different approach than that provided in the bill, if that were possible. I realize that it is not possible. So what I shall try to do, through the amendments which I shall offer, is to bring this proposal into line and attempt to make the bill as compatible as possible with the ideas and theories of the water rights laws that most Western States have.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? There is one matter I should like to have made clear before I attend a conference on the foreign aid bill.

On page 18, under title 2, section 207 (a) provides:

Each commission shall determine the proportionate share of its expense which shall be borne by the Federal Government and each of the States.

It appears from the way the bill is written that some States could bring other States into a commission setup, whether the other States wanted to come into the arrangement or not. I want to make certain that the commission could not assess a State if the legislature of that State was opposed to such action.

I recall that a few years ago the West Virginia Legislature declined to make an appropriation for some works in the lower Ohio Valley of which the State did not approve. The Supreme Court decided that West Virginia was liable for the assessment made by the Ohio River Compact Commission. The difference in that case was this: West Virginia had voluntarily joined in the Compact Commission.

But in the bill before us, are we saying—and I am thinking in terms of my own State—that if four, or three, New England States decided that they wanted to establish a commission, could they then assess the State of Vermont for a part of the costs of that commission whether or not Vermont had voluntarily become a member?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the author of the bill, without losing my right to the floor, because I believe he can best express the intent of the bill.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the Senator from Vermont that the State of Vermont could not be assessed. If four New England States should form such an organization, there would be no power whatever to make the State of Vermont, under this provision, pay a portion of the expense.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there not some provision in the bill by which States in a river system could organize a commission and bring other States into the same system, States which perhaps did not care to come into the commission?

Mr. ANDERSON. They could not be dragged in.

Mr. AIKEN. They could not be dragged in?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I refer to page 21 of the bill, section 303:

The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—

Does that language mean that one State could submit a program which might affect a river system which extends into other States, and would the council then be required to approve the program submitted by that one State, so long as the program met the certain criteria established by the council?

Mr. ANDERSON. This provision is only for the purpose of putting up participating money for States to plan for waters in their own State, or interstate waters insofar as they affect their State. Another State could not step in and say that the State of Vermont must accept a project they have planned. Each State has to stay within its own limits. The council could step in, but not individual States.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his assurances regarding limitations on the authority of certain States to assess other States.

Mr. ALLOTT. Before the Senator from Vermont thanks the Senator from New Mexico too much, and goes to his committee meeting, I should say to him that I have been very much concerned about the operation of section 207.

If it is made very clear that the statement of the Senator from New Mexico is correct, the Senator from Vermont may be assured in his position. But if not, I should say that the language as written cannot be susceptible of any other interpretation than the one which the Senator from Vermont does not want. I read from page 18, line 6:

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.

If we give the Commission the power to determine the proportion of the expense to be borne by the Federal Government and the proportion to be borne by each of the States, in the absence of a clear legislative record here that it is not intended that this be a legal obligation, I submit that probably it would be a legal one.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say to the able Senator from Colorado, who constantly shows us in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that he is a good lawyer, that I am not trying to get into an argument with him about the correct interpretation of law. But Delaware is a member of the larger compact, and has refused to pay all of its assessments, and there is no way to collect the rest from Delaware.

Mr. AIKEN. And there is also the West Virginia case.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; as the Senator from Vermont says, there is also the West Virginia case.

However, I have referred to the refusal of Delaware to pay, and I have said there is no way to force Delaware. I am very certain that is correct, for over and over again the interpretation has been made in our discussions that that is the way the situation would be. I would hope we would have sufficient legislative history, by means of this exchange, in order to make sure that that is the way it will be. A State cannot be obligated for sums it does not agree to.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then let me say to the Senator from New Mexico, and also to the Senator from Vermont, that it is now agreed that the legislative history of this matter is that section 207 could never constitute a legal basis for a claim against a State.

Mr. AIKEN. Or against the Federal Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, against some State, but not on the basis outlined.

Mr. ALLOTT. But the States that would be included would only be included of their own volition.

Mr. ANDERSON. However, unless a State came in of its own accord, it could not be assessed. If a State comes in of its own accord, it can be subject to an assessment.

Mr. ALLOTT. And if under this paragraph a State has come in of its own volition, rather than by virtue of the fact that a majority of the States worked out such an arrangement and, as a result, the remaining States were brought in, it would be subject to the assessment. In other words, a State which came in of its own volition would be subject to the assessment; but a State which did not come in of its own volition could not be bound by such an assessment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the Senator from Colorado said that if a State came in voluntarily, it would be bound by the assessment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. But if a State did not come in voluntarily, it would not be bound.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator from Colorado, and I think the

legislative history should be clearly set forth at this point.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the point I wished to have brought out, because in the case of *West Virginia* v. *Simms*, 95 L. Ed. 713, West Virginia came in voluntarily.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the two cases need to be examined simultaneously. West Virginia came in voluntarily, and therefore has had to pay. Delaware did not agree to its assessment and therefore would not have to pay.

Mr. AIKEN. West Virginia came in under the compact.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is the Ohio River Sanitation Compact.

Mr. AIKEN. Probably the Senator from Ohio was the Governor of his State at the time when this matter arose and West Virginia refused to pay its part.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont whether his question has been answered.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. However, I have a further question to ask.

Mr. LAUSCHE. First, Mr. President, on this question will the Senator from Colorado yield, to permit me to make a comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio, to permit him to make a comment on this subject.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has been stated that only the States which voluntarily join in the program will become liable for the expenses incurred in the operation of the regional council. Section 207 states, however, that each commission shall determine the proportionate share of its expenses which shall be borne by the Federal Government and by each of the States.

I am somewhat fearful that this language is quite mandatory, and that any discussions of the nature of the one we are having now, even though made with the best and most honest of intentions, could not change the meaning of clear and unequivocal language. I should like to have the Senator from Colorado comment on that point.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall be very happy to do so, because I raised this question. If we could lay this matter aside for a few minutes, however, I think the insertion of one or two words—and in that connection we would be thankful for the Senator's help—might clear up this matter.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the wording will be made so clear that it cannot possibly be misinterpreted at a later date, because I am in favor of the proposed legislation as a whole.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not question the right or the responsibility of the commission to fix the assessments against the various States; I only point out that if a State has not agreed to accept the arrangement, it does not have to pay the assessment. That point has been clearly established. If a State wishes to pay the assessment, it can do so.

However, the question asked by the Senator from Vermont was whether the assessment could be enforced against Vermont. I say that it is clear, under the Delaware case, that it could not be enforced against Vermont, for if a State does not enter into the arrangement, it does not have to accept the assessment; and Delaware has not agreed to the assessment, and therefore does not have to accept the assessment.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator's statement is valuable for the record; it shows that the statements we have previously made do not destroy the power of the commission, under section 207, to determine the proportionate share of the expenses which shall be borne by the Federal Government and the proportionate share which shall be borne by each of the States; but unless a State is a member of the commission on a voluntary basis, there would be no means of enforcement of the assessment, and it would not constitute a legal liability.

Mr. ANDERSON. So far as I am concerned, I should like to have the matter rest in the way the Senator from Colorado has put it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. AIKEN. This clarification should be quite helpful. Of course, there is no certain way to prevent some persons from misinterpreting any act of Congress. Misinterpretations have been made before; and no doubt they will be made again.

I wish to refer to another point: As I understand, if a majority of the States in a region or in an area—and, incidentally, what is the difference between a region and an area? Has that question been brought up yet?

Mr. ALLOTT. Not yet.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the able Senator from Colorado will propose that the word "region" be changed to the word "area." In that way, the wording will be the same; and I shall accept his amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I am thinking in terms of New England, where there are six States. As I understand this measure, three of them could establish a commission and could require the other three States to become members—inasmuch as it is clear that half of the States in an area can set up a river basin planning commission. But I also understand that it is impossible to get out of the commission without the consent of the majority of the States involved. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Again, I am not trying to hedge on an answer; I only say that the Senator from Colorado has proposed an amendment which will put it on the basis of half of the States, instead of a majority of the States; and we are prepared to accept his amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Therefore, I think the correct answer would be that if half vote to go out, the other half would be permitted to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Could half of the States go out by themselves? For instance, in the last 2 or 3 years there has been a perfectly preposterous proposal to establish a compact in New England and to bring in the six New England States. It has not been enacted into law as yet. Nevertheless, the legislatures of four States accepted it—the legislatures of the three southern States and New Hampshire. Maine and Vermont never did accept it. Under the proposed legislation we are considering today—which is a very great improvement over the proposed New England compact—it would still appear to be possible for four New England States to set up a commission, and the other two would become part of the commission, even though they could not be legally assessed or required to pay toward the cost of something they did not want to get into, in the first place.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it is fair to say that four States can set up a commission, but each State is autonomous. They could not drag in Maine and Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. They could not?

Mr. ANDERSON. They could not. There is no authority to take in those two States. Even though an attempt might be made to set up a project on a six-State basis, if only four States agree to setting it up, those four would be the only ones in the plan—unless the others come in.

Mr. AIKEN. Vermont is a party to several regional compacts, which operate amicably and effectively. However, we do not wish to take a chance on getting dragged into something which would clearly be to our detriment.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. The Senator from Vermont has raised a question I was going to ask and which I will try to develop a little further. There is considerable apprehension in the State of Wyoming. As the Senator from New Mexico recognizes, the State of Wyoming might be involved in four major river basin projects, and a couple of less proportion. We are in the Columbia River Valley, the Upper Colorado River Basin, the Missouri River Basin, and in the Snake River compact. With Utah we are in the Bear River compact.

What would happen if the State of Wyoming chose to go along on a project in one particular area but not the three others? Would we be involved in all of them?

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope I am correct in saying to the Senator that the States that set up projects in areas which the State of Wyoming might not express a desire to join could go ahead with their own work and do their own planning. The State of Wyoming could not be forced into those other commissions. For example, if Wyoming decided to stay only with the Colorado River Basin, that is the only project to which the State would make a contribution and the only one to which the State would be bound.

Mr. SIMPSON. What about the Federal contribution to the State of Wyoming with respect to the one it chose to join?

Mr. ANDERSON. If that is what the State expressed a desire to do, that would be it. States have been determined in

the assertion of their own rights. That is why the language is different from that contained in the bill S. 2246. We have had to recognize that the States do have strong feelings. They may wish to join the State of New Mexico in the Colorado River compact but not in the Pecos River compact. Therefore, after much discussion, I am quite sure I am correct in saying that the State of Wyoming could join whatever commission it wished to join, and would be regarded as responsible for assessments in that particular area and in that particular area alone.

Mr. ALLOTT. To clear up this point for the legislative record, and in response to the question of the Senator from Wyoming, if we assume that the State of Wyoming is involved in four separate basins—perhaps it is five—then it could be a member of four basin commissions or it could be a member of one basin commission, as it chooses.

Mr. ANDERSON. Whichever it desires.

Mr. ALLOTT. Whichever it desires.

Mr. SIMPSON. I have a question which either the Senator from Colorado or the Senator from New Mexico may wish to answer: What is the situation with respect to river basin compacts under the purview of this enactment?

Mr. ALLOTT. I would be happy to answer that question if it meets with the approval of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be happy to have the Senator from Colorado answer that question.

Mr. ALLOTT. The bill is clear. I shall read into the RECORD page 2, section 3, subsection (a) and subsection (b) of the bill, so that the answer may be clear:

> 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.

It is my understanding—and I am sure it is the absolute intent of the author of the bill—that nothing in the bill can, in any way or in any manner, modify any present existing State law with respect to water, or can modify any existing compact or agreement between the States with regard to water.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator from New Mexico concur in that understanding?

Mr. ANDERSON. I concur completely with what the Senator from Colorado has said. This language has been picked up and repeated in the report. Immediately ahead of it appears the following language:

> Avoid any attempt to adjudicate or affect State and Federal authorities over water and related land resources, or to displace any established agencies, or in any way alter existing interstate and State-Federal arrangements or compacts, such as the Colorado River compact with its upper and lower Colorado Basin divisions.

We went out of our way to be sure to be understood, in exactly the way the Senator from Colorado has stated it.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Colorado. I wonder if I may now intrude some questions—not objections, but questions—with respect to the State of Wyoming because we are involved in so many of these compacts it is vital to us, as I know it is also to the State of Colorado and other Western States such as Idaho and Montana.

I have not been able to check my objections to the bill. If the Senators from Colorado and New Mexico will indulge me and try to answer a question, perhaps they could give me the benefit of their experience.

I raise the following question first of all:

> One of the most important of these revisions would be a provision that wherever a river basin has been divided into subbasins by an act of Congress or by an interstate compact to which Congress has given its consent, each such subbasin shall be treated as a separate river basin for the purposes of this act.

That is on page 99 of the hearings. The Senator from Colorado has adequately answered that question. Reading further:

> This suggested change to S. 1111 would provide better planning coordination on those particular river basins which encompass different regions where the physical, economic, and social conditions of the upper basin States may be vastly different from those of the lower basin States.

Then I raised the question of national resources:

> The procedure by which a river basin commission is established could be strengthened by making provisions by which a majority of the States in a given river basin would have to be in concurrence on the establishment of such a commission.

Is that taken care of in the bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. To answer the question of the Senator from Wyoming, we are really operating backwards at this moment. An amendment will be offered which will contain the language which was read by the Senator from Wyoming, or similar language for the same purpose, as suggested by the Governor of Wyoming and by the Senator from Wyoming, as well as by Governor Love of Colorado and others. I shall offer that amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. The language I read a moment ago from the report specifically pointed to the Colorado River compact, and then pointed to the Upper and Lower Colorado River Basin to show that we had a subbasin. We are not going to disturb that situation either. That is why I am prepared to accept the amendment which the Senator from Colorado will offer. We fully concur that the protections for the subbasins should remain.

Mr. SIMPSON. I know that the Senator from New Mexico is desirous to have the legislative history disclose these points.

I have one additional question which gives us considerable concern. Perhaps the Senator from Colorado could tell me if he will propose an amendment with respect to the following language:

> Other aspects which are of great concern are the procedures by which the State's financial assistance allotment will be computed under title III. It appears that the Council will determine the need for comprehensive planning and the need for financial assistance of any particular State and further, if a State's program does not meet the approval of the Council the Council can discontinue any further payments until such time as the State's program is carried out in accordance with the Council's wishes.

That language appears to place the States under the direct control of the Federal Government or risk the loss of any financial assistance under the act.

Mr. ALLOTT. I can only give my own impression. I do not have an amendment to that particular part of the bill. I did not have time to prepare an amendment or to have a study made of an amendment which would take care of this. However, the bill will go to the House.

My own point of view agrees with that of the Senator from Wyoming. That is probably one of the weak places of the bill, from my standpoint.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank my friend.

The point I wish to bring to the attention of the Senator from Wyoming is found on page 21, under "State Programs."

Mr. SIMPSON. In the report?

Mr. ANDERSON. In the bill itself. That is section 303, wherein it is provided:

> The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—

and then there are set forth the qualifications. I believe it is the intention to say that the Council cannot capriciously toss these things aside.

Mr. SIMPSON. If the Senator will pardon an interjection, that is the section which disturbs us, because it seems to be contrary to what the Senator just stated. It seems to give the total authority to the Council.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is difficult to assume that if a State turned in a plan it would not be a comprehensive plan with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources. If the plan covered those things, it would automatically mean the State would get its share of the money. If there were turned in some program which would not do that, the Senator from Wyoming and I would not wish it paid for, anyway.

We tried to say that the discretion of the Council to turn them down, would be tied to the requirement on the States to do certain things. We believe those things are reasonable.

The Council of State Governments has examined this language carefully and is completely satisfied with this language. They believe it does exactly that.

Mr. SIMPSON. I know the Council of State Governments has. It was the statement of the Council of State Governments with which we took issue.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sorry; I did not recognize that.

I say to the Senator from Wyoming that we tried. We carried this language to them. We tried to make sure that every State official examined it and was satisfied with it. We now have language they have been satisfied with. I believe it is satisfactory.

Even though it does seem to say that the Council may hold back money, it cannot do so if a State puts up a program as set forth from line 20 on page 21 over to the top of page 23. These are the types of programs which the Senator from Wyoming would support if he were chief executive of his State again. This is exactly what we want the States to do.

Mr. SIMPSON. The Senator from New Mexico has done a thorough and exhaustive job, of which he is so capable, on this particular measure. I am not taking issue with the work of the committee. When the Senator from New Mexico tells me something I believe it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to have me yield at the moment, I should like to proceed to a consideration of the amendments. I believe they can be dealt with rapidly.

I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and ask for immediate consideration. The amendment pertains to page 6, line 19, and page 16, line 7, of the bill.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 19, after the word "by" it is proposed to insert the following: "a majority of".

On page 16, line 7, after the word "by" it is proposed to insert the following: "a majority of."

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have heard the arguments made that under the financial aid provisions of the bill States could be compelled to abandon their own views and to conform to what the Federal Government suggests. I direct the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] to page 21, to section 303, which provides:

The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is submitted 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.

It tells what the State must do.

On page 23, under section 304, it is provided:

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.

My query is: Does not this language, giving the Council the control over the purse strings, give to the Council the positive and absolute power to compel compliance by the State with the Council views on what should be done? I should like to ask both Senators that question.

Mr. ALLOTT. I will reply to the distinguished Senator; and I know the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will wish to reply also.

When I discussed this matter previously, I believe the Senator had not yet come to the Chamber.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. This is, in my opinion, one of the great weaknesses of the bill. The Council is composed, as the Senator knows, of the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, the Army, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

All those individuals are Presidential appointees, whose nominations are subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The powers of which the Senator spoke are listed on page 23, and it is absolutely correct to state that they are to be given to the Council. They are extensive. They could amount to a choke leash, if the Council were arbitrary enough to exercise the powers in an arbitrary manner.

I know the Senator from New Mexico will say, "We must presume that those people are going to be reasonable." I suppose we must make such an assumption.

There is one attempt made to lay out guidelines for the action of the Council, which the Senator read, and which of course is particularly subsection 1 of section 303, which states that—

The States must provide 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—

The Senator left out, in my opinion, the most important part of the paragraph: "with all Federal, State, and local agencies having responsibilities in affected fields."

This last phrase, in my opinion, is the real guide that is to benefit the council. The council must approve a State program if it meets these guidelines. The only trouble is that we cannot bring a council into court if we think it has abused its discretion.

The Senator has very well put his finger on a sensitive part of the bill.

I yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], because he may have a different view.

Mr. ANDERSON. When I went into the Department of Agriculture I discovered that the Extension Service had much power over great groups. An extension director who wanted to do so could have made it tough on any individual State extension service. But a hundred years of experience in the Department of Agriculture shows that under administration of the Morrill Act it has not done so. Once in a while a director got out of hand and he was fired; but the States and the land grant colleges did not get into trouble.

The relationship to the States and to the land grant colleges has been extremely good, although there is power given if the land grant colleges do not do the things they are supposed to do, to withhold funds.

The purpose of this language is that, for example, if we started with development of the Pecos River, joining with the State of Texas, and funds were granted for that purpose, and then we decided to develop the Mimbres River, that would be in violation of what we said we were going to do. This language would stop that. It would be an example of the State not doing what it said it was going to do. Funds cannot be wasted by a State on a frivolous program.

I recognize the difficulty of guaranteeing the integrity of an official. It is difficult to make such a guarantee. But, generally speaking, with this particular language, the administrator must put up the money, and he must make sure that the State does what it said it would do. I am not sure whether the Federal Government could be sued.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Looking at section 305, which deals with the Federal share, it reads:

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. * * *

I shall not read on. Does the provision for imposing a share of cost deal with the cost of a project to develop the water resources, or the cost of making plans?

Mr. ANDERSON. Planning only.

Mr. ALLOTT. It has to do with the State's planning.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I does not deal with the project?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; we could not justify it on that basis.

Mr. LAUSCHE. While the experience of the Senator from New Mexico with the Department of Agriculture may be comforting, I had experiences with respect to a situation in aid to the handicapped, under the Federal aid program, under which 87 of the 88 counties in the State complied. One county, Harrison County, said, "We will not let the U.S. Government tell us how we shall employ our personnel to administer the program." I begged Harrison County to comply. It asserted its sovereignty and independence, and refused to do it. The bureaucrats said the county was going to comply or the State of Ohio would lose all of the money to which it was entitled.

When Governor Davey, now deceased, was the head of our State, Ohio had several million dollars taken from it for failure to comply with some picayune and arbitrary provision that was asserted. That is the other side of the picture.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad that did not happen in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, do the amendments now pending refer to page 6 of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. They refer to page 6 and page 16, do they not?

Mr. ALLOTT. Page 6 and page 16.

I refer, first of all, to page 6, line 19. The question here is the power to administer oaths and whether or not this power shall be exercised. The amendment requires here, and in the same situation with respect to the Commission, on page 16, the insertion of the words "a majority of them." It means that a majority of the council and a majority of the Commission must endow the power to administer oaths and determine that the taking of testimony under oath is necessary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in behalf of the committee, I am glad to accept the amendments. I ask the Chair to put the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of amendments and ask for their immediate consideration.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 7, line 20, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 8, line 11, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 8, line 16, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 9, line 4, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 10, line 8, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 10, line 18, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 11, line 1, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 13, line 12, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado amending the bill in eight particulars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 2, beginning with the word "Whenever", strike all through line 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "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 upon a finding of need recommend to the President that such planning as is otherwise authorized by law proceed."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendment. I thank the Senator from Colorado again for his tolerance and willingness to arrive at an adjustment. He wished to strike out additional language, but agreed not to do so when it was pointed out that some of the language might be desirable to retain.

The amendment as now proposed is satisfactory to the committee, and I am glad to accept it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 10, after the word "or", strike "agreement of", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not less than one-half".

Mr. ALLOTT. The purpose of the amendment is to deal with the several matters which were discussed by several Senators, or were the subject of inquiry by several Senators, with respect to the ability of States to terminate the Commission.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 16, strike the word "recorded.", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "set forth in the record.".

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement about this particular amendment, to establish some legislative history with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

It is my understanding and comprehension of the bill that there will not be any votes in the ordinary consideration of matters before the Commission. To this end, this language has been placed in the bill, in subparagraph (d) on page 12:

> 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.

Then, at the end of the same paragraph, it is provided:

> 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.

My question related to the word "recorded."

I do not know whether "recorded" puts this provision in the category of requiring a vote or not. The word is indefinite. Perhaps its meaning should be made clear.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator from Colorado. I had a different view. I thought "recorded" might mean that the result was put into a transcriber and forgotten. But when it is "set forth in the RECORD," I understand it. I am therefore happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would have been prepared to leave the bill as it was if the Senator's version had been accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 11, after the word "portion", it is proposed to insert the word "thereof".

On page 13, line 15, after the word "portion", it is proposed to insert the word "thereof"; after the word "revision", insert the word "thereof".

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. On behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 25, after the word "shall", it is proposed to insert the following: ", in accordance with the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof,".

In page 17, line 5, beginning with the word "In", it is proposed to strike all through line 8.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this amendment merely seeks to clear up and define some of the housekeeping duties of the Commission. I believe it would clarify the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think the amendment is better. Therefore, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, line 5, it is proposed to strike the figure "66⅔", and insert in lieu thereof the figure "50".

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the share which Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands would obtain of the Federal Government's contribution. In view of the large amount of money that the Federal Government spends to support both of those areas, I have suggested that the sum of 50 percent be inserted in lieu of 66⅔ percent.

Mr. ANDERSON. The committee is prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, line 23, it is proposed to strike the period, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not to exceed $7,500,000 for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years thereafter."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have offered this amendment because, as I have said many times on the floor of the Senate, I do not believe in open-end authorizations. The amendment merely places a limitation of $7,500,000 upon the expenditures of each of the first 3 fiscal years.

Mr. ANDERSON. It does not, however, mean that we are saying there shall be no more appropriations at the end of that time, but leaves the question open to congressional review at that time?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. The statement of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct; but the bill as it was written provided for an open-end authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk for immediate consideration an amendment pertaining to page 8, line 1. I call the particular attention of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 1, it is proposed to strike the period and insert in lieu thereof: "*Provided*, That for the purposes of this Act wherever a river basin has been divided into subbasins by an Act of Congress or by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, each subbasin shall be treated as a separate basin."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the amendment is offered to allay the fears of many persons, including myself, as to the extent to which the Commissions could include other places and vast areas of land. It relates also to the colloquy which was conducted earlier with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and other Senators.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, throughout the colloquy, I have been saying that this is what the bill means. Therefore, I certainly would be in no position to oppose the amendment. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico concerning one further amendment which I have prepared in the alternative. My feelings are not too strong about either proposal, but I do prefer one. The amendment relates to page 10, line 6, the membership of the commissions.

As the bill is now constructed, the President could appoint an almost indefinite number of members to each basin commission. It is not necessary to explain this in detail as it will become evident by reading the bill. The amendment I propose to offer reads as follows: At the end of line 6, strike the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof: "*Provided*, That the total Federal membership so appointed shall not exceed the State membership as hereinafter appointed."

Mr. AIKEN. Including the chairman?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will add "including the chairman."

I also have an amendment which reads: "shall not equal or exceed."

I prefer the one I first read. I should like to have the reaction of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall have to say to my friend from Colorado that I would not be in favor of that amendment. I shall tell him why. The amendment presumes there would be a vote. There would not be a vote. I do not want to have anything in the bill that would indicate there might be a vote.

A river compact might be entered into by only 2 States. Therefore, that project would be limited to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of the Interior. I should like to be certain that representatives of the Federal Power Commission and various other groups concerned were present.

I hope the Senator will not press the amendment, because I think it would do what we do not want to have done. I think it would establish two classes of voters, Federal on one side, and State on the other. This would result in a shift in position that neither of us would like when we were finished with the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I concur in the view that there shall not be voting. I do not think it is necessary to draw this proposal out in this way; but I suggest to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that in the case of a given river compact, several departments could be involved; for example, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and perhaps also the Federal Power Commission. Even, in some instances, the Interstate Commerce Commission might be involved. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare might be concerned.

In almost any instance, there could be an overwhelming majority of persons who represented solely the executive branch of the Government.

Frankly, I am aware of the problem that the Senator from New Mexico stated; that in a two-State or a three-State compact, there might not be the representation that was desired. For example, in the case of a two-State compact it might also be a necessity to have the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and perhaps the Federal Power Commission represented. At the same time, if there were a compact among two, three, or four States, I can readily conceive that the number of departments of Government that might have an interest, or that could be defined by the President to have an interest, in the particular basin could be composed of five, six, or eight persons.

Therefore, even if no vote were cast by the representatives of the Federal agencies, their presence there could overawe and dominate in connection with the activities of the commission.

Perhaps the Senator has in mind a better way to handle this matter. Both of us realize that this measure must be dealt with by the House of Representatives, which will work its own will on it. However, I do not believe we should overlook this point, and I do not think the State governments which have examined it should have overlooked the possibility of complete dominance by the Federal Government members of the commission. I am frank to state that I do not know how to work out the matter other than in this way.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that although the commissions have a certain number of members who represent Federal Government agencies, they do not determine, by vote, the course to be taken.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the very point I make.

Mr. AIKEN. Furthermore, because of the necessity for cooperation, it would be necessary for the representatives of

the Federal Government and the representatives of the States—whether 2 States or 10 States are involved; perhaps there would not be 10, but there might be—to agree. I believe the situation would be different if only two States were involved and if a number of Federal Government agencies were represented on the commission, and if the decisions to be arrived at were reached by majority vote. Frankly, I had not thought before of this problem.

Mr. ALLOTT. This is the point the Senator from New Mexico has made in regard to a voting situation. I am frank to state that if there were a two-State or a three-State compact and if five or six Federal Government agencies were represented on the commission, the Federal Government representatives could dominate the commission, merely because of their numbers; at least, there would be that tendency, in connection with the necessity to arrive at a consensus. This is one point about which I am very much concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I recognize the Senator's concern; and I, too, am concerned. However, in the Missouri River Valley there are 10 States and only 6 or 7 Federal agencies, but those representative States would not be able to dominate the Commission. In other areas, the preponderance of numbers may be opposite, but it makes no difference. There is no vote. These Federal Government agencies supposedly will help the States and will advise with them.

In dealing with water pollution, the Federal Government agency which deals with water pollution will not try to dominate; instead, it will try to help the States.

So I hope the Senator from Colorado will not press for the adoption of his amendment, because all along it has been agreed that the agencies of the Federal Government would not dominate, but would only try to be helpful to the States.

If there is doubt on that point, I am sure the House will try to eliminate it and to clarify the situation. However, I feel sure that the debate we have had today on this point, including the participation in it by the Senator from Wyoming, shows that the agencies of the Federal Government will not dominate, but, instead, will only try to help the States in their consideration of what to do.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I find myself in an embarrassing situation, in that I have drawn up these proposals in alternative form, but I now find that neither the Senator from New Mexico nor his legislative assistant has seen them. I am very sorry about that.

Mr. ANDERSON. But of course I have not accused the Senator from Colorado of anything in that connection.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understand; but I wished to have copies of these submitted to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, in view of the legislative history we have made in regard to this matter and in view of the fact that I have stated clearly that I think a problem exists in this connection, and that I believe this matter should be dealt with by the House, I shall not press for the adoption of either of these amendments, but shall simply permit the RECORD to remain as it is now.

I do not know whether there are other amendments to be offered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield briefly, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This measure is to be known as the Water Resources Planning Act of 1963. After the studies have been made and the plans have been evolved, is it contemplated that in the future the Federal Government may enter the field of expending funds to provide facilities, including conduits and other equipment, for the provision of the water, as contemplated in the plan?

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall be glad to attempt to answer the question, or I am quite willing to defer to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator. The Federal Government is in the field; and by this measure it is merely proposed that in the future an attempt shall be made to plan these matters carefully, rather than to rush haphazardly into them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the planning council and the planning commissions under the bill have authority to recommend the type of projects to be developed in order to provide the water that will be needed?

Mr. ANDERSON. They would pass on the suggestions made by the groups in the field; but the U.S. Congress will deal with that question when it reaches it. This measure will not in any way diminish the power of Congress to decide whether it will or will not build a conduit or a dam or similar structures. We merely provide in this bill that planning shall be made for the future, rather than to proceed only on a year-by-year basis. This measure is in no way a guarantee of Federal Government financing of any description in the future, and that matter has no part in this bill. So I am glad the Senator from Ohio has raised the question, which had not occurred to me.

However, the approval of projects in the future is in no way a part of this bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I had in mind the point that it is recommended that Ohio join a regional operation for the construction of a conduit from Lake Erie into the interior, to carry water. It is possible that if such a plan is evolved, the Federal Government might step in, in the future, to help finance it. However, I think that point needs no answer.

Mr. ALLOTT. This bill does not contemplate such action. The question of whether the Federal Government might help finance such projects is an entirely independent matter, and is entirely aside from this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Surely.

Mr. ALLOTT. But the planning might be a concern under this bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, will this measure constitute a "nose of the camel under the tent," so that in the future that would be the objective?

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to repeat the statement made a moment ago by the Senator from New Mexico. Under the Department of the Interior, there are reclamation projects; and under the Corps of Army Engineers there are docks, flood-control works, and so forth—many of them on the Great Lakes. These projects are for the benefit of the people of the United States. However, this measure would not in any way change that picture.

If the Senator from Ohio will examine page 2 of the bill, he will find there the answer to his question. I read section 2:

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.

The key to that paragraph lies in the words "shall be planned."

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I believe we should make clear two other points of legislative history, and then I believe we will be through with the bill.

I refer to page 6, subparagraph (c). The clause is repeated at other places in the bill. Subparagraph (c) reads as follows:

(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.

The same phrase is used later in the bill with respect to the Commission, except that the word "shall" is used rather than the words "may be made."

I raise the question now because I asked the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, to what the words "to the extent permitted by law" referred. I asked him specifically whether or not the language would result in an invocation of the executive privilege of the Federal Government. I have discussed the question with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. He agrees that it would not. I say that it would not. The only purpose that the language could be used for would be to preserve security.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

I call attention to the use of the word "shall." The States asked for that. They wanted to make their material available. But there are certain areas of the country in which there might be placed a military installation or an installation of some similar nature. The project might be operated by a mining company that did not care to make all of its records public. We thought that those considerations should be noted. But the provision is not intended to invite the use of executive privilege.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure that if any Senator thought that the legislative history should be otherwise, he would say so now. I presume that what the Senator has said is correct.

On page 8, in subparagraph (b) of subparagraph (1), appears the following language:

(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;

A legislative history should be made on the question to show that the word "coordination" does not mean control of local and State plans. It merely means "coordination." Perhaps I am only emphasizing the point, for we ought to know the meaning of English words. However, that is not always true.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator. I agree with his understanding of the meaning of the word "coordination." It means that the Commission would take the local plan which the locality has the right to propose and see that the larger plan properly accommodates the local plan. That is what is meant by "coordination," and nothing else.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I address myself to the Senator from New Mexico.

I refer to page 8(b)(3). The language of that subparagraph provides that—

(b) Each such commission for a region, river basin, or group of river basins shall—

(3) Recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning and construction of projects.

That language holds great value. I should like to state my views on the question to the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Colorado. I have served on the Committee on Public Works, which, as Senators know, authorizes the Corps of Engineers projects. One of the problems is the question of priorities. The Corps of Engineers undertakes surveys. At times projects which are not as valuable to a river basin in terms of the conservation of water or flood control as others precede in development those which should be undertaken first.

I believe that the provision to which I have referred offers an opportunity to correct that situation. A commission would be working in the basin itself, and that commission would be able at least to give its advice to the Congress in relation to priorities in that river basin. At least the Congress could consider that advice. From my experience as a member of the Committee on Public Works I do not believe that there is any source to which we can now look for the establishment of such priorities on even a Corps of Engineers project.

Mr. ANDERSON. One of the reasons why the committee was established in the first place on the motion of the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] was that we were trying our very best to establish priorities. I know that the Senator from Montana had in mind that we should start a system of priorities. The Public Works Committee was adequately represented by Senator Kerr, who was an eloquent spokesman for the proposal, and by the then chairman of the committee, Senator Chavez. Many members of the committee were present. They stressed the very point which the Senator from Kentucky has now made; namely, that many times projects are given top priority which should not have been given first consideration. The language merely suggests that it might be desirable to set up the priorities to see what they are like. The Congress would then have the right to do what it would wish to do. At least we would know what the priorities ought to be.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad that the point was developed. We are all aware of the fact that when public works authorization bills come before the Senate, some question their value. Perhaps at times Senators have reason for doing so. I include even those Senators who have served as members of the committee. We know that the Corps of Engineers has performed these duties and performed them well. But it is not required by the Congress to establish priorities. We establish the priorities upon the basis of the best information that we have.

The proposed language offers some reasons for a more orderly development of the priorities in a river basin. I am glad to see that provision.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I could not agree more wholeheartedly with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, particularly in view of the budget situation in our country at the present time. If the Chief Executive of our country, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Members of the Congress—I do not leave us out—would make up their minds about a reasonable system and basis of priorities for the things our country needs and would consider them in a logical order, I believe the budget of our country could be reduced by about 25 percent a year.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment and a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New Mexico.

Recently the Senate passed the bill (S. 649) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and establish a Federal Water Pollution Administration. The Senator from Iowa happens to be a member of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution.

I detect a possible overlapping or perhaps even a conflict with the bill which is now pending insofar as water pollution activities might be concerned.

For example, the bill points out that the various river basin commissions serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate and local plans and for the development of water and related land resources.

Technically that language could conflict with the provision in the Water Pollution Control Act, which we have passed, and in which we have provided that the Water Pollution Control Administration, operating in the office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, will do that very thing insofar as water pollution activities are concerned.

On page 9 of the bill which is pending, it is also provided that the commissions would foster and undertake studies of water problems in the various regions. This would perhaps technically conflict with the duties of the Water Pollution Control Administrator of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for which we have provided.

I should like to establish a bit of legislative history, so that it will be clear that there is nothing in the bill intended to overlap or duplicate, or conflict with the duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and of the Water Pollution Control Administrator which are provided for in S. 649.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the question of the Senator from Iowa. I say to the Senator that that is exactly why the language is in the bill. We expect that this will coordinate plans. We expect that the water pollution control groups will develop their own plans. This group will not do the planning. After the water pollution control groups have developed their plans, somebody will coordinate them with the Department of the Interior, which may be developing a dam in the area for the irrigation of the area or for the development of water power. Whatever else may be done by the Army Corps of Engineers, or by anyone else, it should be coordinated with what has wisely been written into the bill for the preparation of water pollution control programs.

That is exactly what is intended. We wish to make sure that there will not be a conflicting interest, but instead a coordinating interest. That is what the Senator from Colorado well established a short while ago. "Coordination" has meaning and purpose. We mean that they shall coordinate the plans for the development of water with the plans made for water pollution control projects, plans made for flood control projects, and all other plans the Government has to avoid duplication and overlap. We do not wish to have one agency going in one direction and another agency going in another direction, with no regard for each other.

I am glad the Senator from Iowa has raised this point. He has stated precisely what we hope to accomplish.

Mr. MILLER. There is no intention to have the commissions to be established under the bill duplicate the work of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and in particular of the Water Pollution Control Administrator, for which we have provided in S. 649, recently passed

Mr. ANDERSON. For the sake of the record, I am happy to say there is no such intention at all.

Mr. MILLER. I did not believe there was any such intention, but I think it is wise that we have built a legislative history.

Mr. ANDERSON. I quite agree. I only wish I could think of all of these things myself, but I cannot. I therefore appreciate it when some other Senator brings up a point, as the Senator from Iowa has done.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. I have listened to the colloquy with respect to the bill and with respect to the amendments to the bill which have been agreed to. I still have considerable misgivings about future prospects under the measure. Though I am eager to try to find a way to persuade myself to vote in favor of the bill, I am worried about the context and worried about the possibilities for taking away water rights of the West and putting them under the supervision of a Federal agency, without too much being said by the States themselves.

I wish to make my position crystal clear to the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New Mexico. I shall vote against the measure, even as amended.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the senior Senator from New Mexico. It has taken us some 2½ hours to dispose of these matters. Without his understanding cooperation, I am sure it would have taken us the same number of days to accomplish the same things.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. It has been many months since I have seen a bill as thoroughly explained as this bill has been, with as many questions raised as were raised in regard to this bill, and with the record made as clear as the record on this proposal has been made.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and all other Senators who have participated in this debate, whether they vote for or against the bill, are entitled to our thanks, because the discussion has been clearcut and well set out, so far as the intent and the congressional interpretations are concerned. It has been an excellent presentation.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana. I merely wish to say, since there will not be a record vote, I shall vote against the bill, so as to preserve my position with respect to the bill when it comes back from conference.

I am ready for a vote on the bill.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise in support of the legislation before us today which would attempt to bring about the best possible development of the land and water resources of this Nation by the establishment of a Water Resources Council and River Basin Commissions.

I feel that legislation of this type is an excellent first step in the direction of conservation and intelligent planning to save the remaining natural resources of our Nation.

Mr. President, while I support this legislation I do so with the knowledge that it has little application to my State of Connecticut or to the New England area.

Though small in size the six New England States do not represent merely a single river basin area but rather a complex of several river basins not necessarily interrelated.

Because of this I and Senators RIBICOFF, PASTORE, COTTON, SALTONSTALL and PELL cosponsored S. 1434 calling for a New England water and related land resources compact in an effort to create machinery which would consider the whole of New England as an interdependent geographical unit for the purpose of properly developing and managing our remaining natural land and water resources.

Similar legislation in the 87th Congress passed the House but affirmative action was not secured in the Senate and for this reason we have introduced S. 1434 in the 88th Congress.

In view of the interest and support for legislation involving the conservation of our natural resources expressed here today I hope it will be possible for early action to take place on S. 1434 particularly in view of the fact that four New England States, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island by action of their legislatures have already ratified the northeast compact and agreed to participate in it and are only awaiting congressional approval to put the compact into effect.

Mr. President, I again want to express my support of S. 1111 and hope that my colleagues who have expressed such concern and interest over the conservation of our land and water resources will also support S. 1434 when it is considered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, and all the other cosponsors of S. 1111, for the good work they and the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have done on the most important nonhuman natural resource, next to the land itself.

Too often we have approached the water problem piecemeal, but the sponsors of this legislation have considered six types of the water problems that confront the Nation; namely, supply, distribution, natural quality, pollution variability, and floods.

One facet of supply has been attacked by the desalinization projects. In the summer of 1961 Secretary of Interior Udall spoke at the dedication of the Freeport, Tex., desalinization plant, as President John F. Kennedy pressed a button in the White House that turned into the water mains of the city of Freeport, fresh sweet water from the Gulf of Mexico, from which the salt had been removed in the Freeport plant.

The bill before the Senate provides for Federal-State cooperation, and for scientific research, and for comprehensive water development and management for major river basins in the United States.

In pushing this legislation, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is carrying forward the conservation program so well supported in the 87th Congress, and by the Senate in this 88th Congress. Let us hope the other House will pass this bill, and the water research bill previously passed by the Senate this session. This precious commodity of water must be saved, conserved, purified, and properly distributed for our growing population and our developing technology.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no 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 (S. 1111) 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,

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 oats when it is determined by a majority of 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 area, 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: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this Act wherever a river basin has been divided into subbasins by an Act of Congress or by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, each subbasin shall be treated as a separate basin. 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 upon a finding of need recommend to the President that such planning as is otherwise authorized by law proceed.

(b) Each such commission for an area, 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 area, 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 area, 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 cordinating 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 area, 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 an 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 area, 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 area, 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 not less than one-half 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 studies, 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 consesus 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 set forth in the record.

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 thereof or necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which such commission was established. Before the commission submits such a plan or major portion thereof or revision thereof 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 view, 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 a majority of 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, in accordance with the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof, 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.

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 submitted 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 such 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 50 per centum: *Provided*, That in no event shall the Federal share exceed a State's allotment under section 302.

(b) 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 suceeding 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 to 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 titles I and II and the administration of title III not to exceed $7,500,000 for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years thereafter.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to say again what I have been trying to say throughout the afternoon. I greatly appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Colorado. The character of the amendments he has produced shows the care with which he has done his homework and the zeal he has put into the endeavor. I pay tribute to him for a fine job, well done.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico.

CONGRESS MUST ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have before me three editorials from this morning's Washington Post that are of such high caliber that I shall ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD in connection with these very brief remarks.

The first is an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "Congress Must Act." All I want to say is "Amen" to every sentence of the editorial. I think the Washington Post has "laid it on the line" for the Congress.

I applaud and congratulate the editor. I think he has outlined the course of action Congress should follow when he says, in the last two sentences, speaking of the people:

> They have a right to ask their Representatives and Senators to do as they would do in the conduct of their private affairs. The work of the Nation is not less important.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CONGRESS MUST ACT

Congress, on the very eve of the holiday season, faces a legislative chore sufficient to engage it for weeks of a normal session and for months of a session proceeding at the speed with which it has moved this year.

Civil rights, the tax bill and the appropriation bills are on the top of its pile of work, but there is a lot more unfinished business. Congressmen, like the rest of us, relish a holiday interlude. But the country is entitled to say to Senators and Representatives who protest at continued unremitting toil: "You asked for work when you hired out." That they did, and the work they hired out to do has not been completed.

If Congress takes a customary adjournment with so many of its tasks unfinished there will be a ghost at every Christmas board, as well as a turkey. Or to use a more current metaphor, there will be two turkeys—the one the Congressmen are eating and the one that represents the session they have just quit.

The work that the Congress came here to do is unfinished. The people have a right to ask Congressmen to finish it. An administration does not have the right to insist that Congress approve everything for which it asks. It does have a right to ask that Congress dispose of the program one way or another. The public too has a right to expect that Congress will vote on the matters before it; a right to demand that it permit the administration program to come to a decision.

Congressmen, individually, may feel it is unjust to blame them. No doubt the session has been wearing—perhaps more wearing than when the legislative machinery moves more swiftly. They may say that it is not their fault, but the fault of the rules and the system. But the House makes its own rules. The Senate makes its rules. If the rules preclude expeditious action, why hasn't each body changed its rules? It is to be hoped that next session Congress will at last take a look at the structural defects that have made it one of the most lethargic legislative establishments in the history of democratic government. Now, Congress will have to finish this session's work with the rules as they are. Whatever the defects of the rules, they can still act if Senators and Representatives are sufficiently determined

to act. The time has come to end what amounts to a congressional sit-down strike.

The session should proceed on an emergency schedule. Absences in either Chamber should not be allowed lightly. The whole legislative program should be pressed on a crisis basis. There should be no thought of a long holiday recess or adjournment. Private citizens, so far behind in their personal endeavors, would content themselves with a rest on Christmas Eve and Christmas Day and then get on with their work. They have a right to ask their Representatives and Senators to do as they would do in the conduct of their private affairs. The work of the Nation is not less important.

A WORD FOR WASHINGTON

Mr. MORSE. Next, Mr. President, I refer to an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "A Word for Washington." The editorial points out the longstanding position of the President of the United States as a great friend of the District of Columbia and a longtime supporter of the right of self-government.

I want to give the brief testimony that as a member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, the present President of the United States, when he was majority leader of the Senate and when he was Vice President presiding over the Senate, never failed to give me full and complete cooperation on any District of Columbia matter that I put to him when he found my case meritorious; and I was careful not to present any case that was not meritorious.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

A WORD FOR WASHINGTON

As President Johnson observed, the United States both deserves and requires a National Capital that reflects the country's standards of civic beauty and decency. Overcrowded schools, disheveled welfare programs and patchwork city planning makes an unhappy contrast with the shining marble monuments and the aspirations that they symbolize. Mr. Johnson has reassured this city that he shares its concerns.

He has asked Mr. Horsky, his adviser for National Capital affairs, to remain at the White House. Two programs of immense importance to the city's future, the development of an urban transit system and the campaign against juvenile delinquency, are both being managed from outside the structure of the municipal government, and both have obvious implications for the parallel national programs. The case for a special presidential adviser continues to be valid. The White House is continually forced willy-nilly to intervene in city affairs, and one prefers that intervention to be knowledgeable and consistent.

Above all, President Johnson has recognized that Washington remains destitute of the first and basic civil right: the right to self-government. At a time of rising hope for home rule, the President's brief and direct statement offers new encouragement to his neighbors.

WIRETAPPING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I congratulate the editor of the Washington Post for the editorial entitled "Sanctuary." It is one of the most succinct, concise, devastating statements in opposition to wiretapping that I have read in recent years. I hope that every Member of the Congress will read it. I hope every Member of the Senate will read it prior to further consideration of the so-called omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia. I hope Senators will also read it when they give consideration to why the senior Senator from Oregon, as a member of the District of Columbia Committee, has undertaken a study of policies of the Metropolitan Police force.

I congratulate the editor of the Washington Post for what I consider to be his unanswerable argument in opposition to wiretapping.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SANCTUARY

Suppose you went into a phone booth to call your boss and convey some business confidence to him; suppose you called your wife to explain why you would be late for dinner and got into a quarrel with her; suppose you called to make a date with a girl. And suppose you happened to pick a phone booth where the Internal Revenue Service had installed a listening device with which to overhear and record all that you said.

Apparently the Internal Revenue Service does just this on occasion. Its agents did it last spring in the case of a woman they suspected of participating in the operation of a lottery. They listened to what she said by means of a "bug" installed in the phone booth from which she made a call and then had Metropolitan Police officers arrest her as she came out of the booth. How many other callers who happened to use that phone booth were overheard remains unknown.

General Sessions Court Judge Harry L. Walker, before whom the woman was tried the other day, ruled that the eavesdropped conversation was not admissible as evidence against her. We think that the public welfare is protected by this ruling. If police work is made somewhat more difficult by preserving the privacy of telephone booths, communication between free and law-abiding citizens is made much easier. It is worth something to the community, of course, to have lottery operators detected and prosecuted; but it is worth much more to be confident when one enters a public phone booth that he can talk in private.

The police seem to understand very little about privacy and to care less; but it is of the essence of a free society that they be made to respect it.

NEW VOICES IN THE SOUTH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a news article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post reporting on the great speech delivered by LeRoy Collins, former Governor of the State of Florida, in Columbia, S.C. The heading of the story reads: "Rout Forces of Hate, Collins Urges South."

If anyone has any doubt about the fact that new voices are being heard in the South—and I have made that observation for some time past now—he need only read this news article relating to this great speech delivered by former Governor Collins.

I have written for the complete speech, and I shall discuss it at a later time.

I read an excerpt from this news article:

"How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?

"All those evil happenings have been the products of environments where hatred has been preached and lawlessness extolled—environments which you and I know are foreign to the South for which we care deeply and are repugnant to most southerners."

Collins said it was obvious that desegregation was inevitable but that too many southern politicians hoodwink the people by pretending it is not.

" 'That all men are created equal' is not an empty cliche," he said. "It is a mighty idea that is the keystone of our Nation's whole meaning and perpetual commitment.

"It is an idea that can never be stopped—not by custom—not by prejudice—not by hate—not by murder—not by armies—not by any mortal force.

"It may be thwarted—it may be delayed but it will keep coming on and on, for it has the invincibility of simple truth, justice, and right."

What a great southerner. What a great American. What a refreshing new voice to be heard in the South. I congratulate Governor Collins.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ROUT FORCES OF HATE, COLLINS URGES SOUTH

(By Robert E. Baker)

LeRoy Collins appealed to southerners last night to rise up and defeat the forces of hate and bigotry in their midst.

"It is time the decent people in the South, with all their might and strength, told the bloody shirt wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry," Collins said in an address to the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce in Columbia, S.C.

Collins had been invited to address the businessmen as president of the National Association of Broadcasters. But the 54-year-old former Governor of Florida told them he had been brooding over his Southland, especially since the assassination of President Kennedy.

In his speech, released in Washington, Collins said too many southerners have remained silent and allowed extremists to speak for the South.

"And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these Claghorns?" asked Collins.

"How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?

"All those evil happenings have been the products of environments where hatred has been preached and lawlessness extolled—environments which you and I know are foreign to the South for which we care deeply and are repugnant to most southerners."

Collins said it was obvious that desegregation was inevitable but that too many

southern politicians hoodwink the people by pretending it is not.

"'That all men are created equal' is not an empty cliche," he said. "It is a mighty idea that is the keystone of our Nation's whole meaning and perpetual commitment.

"It is an idea that can never be stopped—not by custom—not by prejudice—not by hate—not by murder—not by armies—not by any mortal force.

"It may be thwarted—it may be delayed but it will keep coming on and on, for it has the invincibility of simple truth, justice, and right."

Collins said that President Kennedy was a heroic person who thought in terms of generations and of what America must be for the children of today and tomorrow.

"I say to you tonight," Collins said, "that above all else it is the moral duty of our generation to plow under racial injustice everywhere in the United States and to plant new opportunities for the generations which will come along after us and reside in this green part of our old planet."

SELF HELP

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Self Help, an Iowa organization born of the desire to improve the lot of people in underdeveloped countries, was the subject of an article by Associated Press Writer Carol Johnson in the November 20 editions of the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette. Miss Johnson sums up the reasoning behind this organization's founding in the lead paragraph, and I quote:

One man's strong belief in Christian good works and the principles of capitalism is the foundation of an organization devoted to helping people in the world's developing nations improve their standards of living.

The article goes on to detail how Self Help reconditions used farm machinery for shipment to areas where the need exists. Its helping hand now stretches into 32 countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

As I have remarked before, the end result of this program is that machinery is purchased by the recipient, thus giving him a sense of responsibility and purpose, a stakehold in his future as a capitalist, with the incentive to produce which such a status provides.

This is private enterprise in action on the foreign aid front, and it shows what can be done if one has the determination to do it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Self Help in 32 Countries," be placed in the RECORD.

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

SELF HELP IN 32 COUNTRIES

(By Carol Johnson)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In a world rapidly becoming overpopulated and with people arising to demand self-government as independent nations, the problem of food is acute in some countries. To help alleviate some of these agricultural ills, an organization, Self Help, Inc., has been started in Iowa, one of the richest farm areas in the world.)

WAVERLY.—One man's strong belief in Christian good works and the principles of capitalism is the foundation of an organization devoted to helping people in the world's developing nations improve their standards of living.

Called Self Help, Inc., the organization reconditions used farm machinery and other equipment, largely obsolete by American standards, for shipment to areas where it is needed. Such equipment now is located in 32 countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

The project began when Vern Schield, 60, farmer and industrialist in this community, observed in travels to 69 foreign countries the recurring problem of agricultural underproduction and a resulting lack of sufficient food for the population.

"Some of the most productive soils and climates of the world produce almost nothing," Schield said. "The work is all done by hand and the crops are poorly tended. Farmers need power equipment that will increase each man's productivity."

Schield saw an answer to the problem in the used equipment he had seen on Iowa farms—such as old tractors, hand corn shellers, and treadle sewing machines which were obsolete in America but potentially useful in other nations.

Schield gathers used machinery and rebuilds it at his Schield Bantam Manufacturing Co.

At this point Schield's belief in private enterprise comes into play. The rebuilt equipment is not given away, but is sold at low cost.

"Give a man a tractor or even so much as a hammer, and he won't take care of it," Schield said. "But if he pays for it—no matter how little—then he has a stake in it."

Self Help works this way. Missionaries, schools, foundations, organizations such as the Peace Corps and individuals let Self Help know what equipment is needed. Self Help collects the needed items either through donations or purchase, rebuilds them and ships them.

The only charge to people getting the equipment is the original cost of the equipment to Self Help plus the rebuilding costs. The missions or organizations which place the orders usually pay for shipping.

The money paid to Self Help for the equipment goes into a revolving fund for more purchases and repairs.

Since Schield started Self Help in 1950, financing has been a major problem. In many years he provided up to $10,000 of his own money for the program in addition to establishing it in the Bantam plant.

Self Help was incorporated in 1959. Its executive director, John William Baccarini, said the organization has been receiving more help in the form of donations of equipment and funds from individuals, firms and foundations.

Another source of help for the organization comes from 80 to 90 Future Farmers of America chapters in Iowa and Minnesota which gather and rebuild equipment in their vocational education classes.

Self Help now sends a carload of machinery abroad on an average of every 30 to 45 days. Baccarini estimated sales of a quarter of a million dollars' worth of equipment in the last 15 months. The machinery was sold at one-fifth to one-third its actual value, he said.

Baccarini emphasized that Self Help doesn't compete with commercial manufacturers to sell equipment in developing nations.

Self Help operates only in those areas where people are too poor to buy new American-made machinery. New American products are in most cases too expensive and advanced, and in many cases too big, for use in foreign countries.

Self Help has developed a special compact tractor at a sales price of $675 for use on these smaller farms.

Other items rebuilt and shipped by Self Help range from windmills to typewriters and washing machines.

Schield retired this year and sold his Bantam Co. But he remains active in the Self Help program and recently visited Peace Corps projects in Central America.

IDIOT'S BROOD

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very able editorial appearing in Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., of Washington, D.C., on November 29, 1963, entitled "Idiot's Brood."

The editorial deals with the philosophy advanced first by Gunnar Myrdal, to utilize Federal power to enforce the integration of the races.

I should like to read a short excerpt from the editorial, as follows:

Forced integration of the races was never contemplated by the U.S. Constitution and as far as human history is concerned never was countenanced by even the most tyrannical power.

It would seem that abstract thinking on this problem compounds idiocy the way the philosophical storms swept the medieval monasteries.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in its entirety may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

IDIOT'S BROOD

It cannot have failed to reach many Americans over the past 10 years that we are playing fast and loose with the future of this country by making a political football out of public education.

It seems to us that we have strayed far from fundamentals of human behavior by our actions on the matter from the very beginning. First, we have Jim McGranery, an interim Attorney General, throwing the Brown case into an avid, social-minded Supreme Court, for the settlement of the integration issue. To prove the point, the writings of Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish leftist, were used as text for the education of the Court.

Myrdal fled to the United States when the German pincers embraced Norway and Finland. No one knew when they would close, and Myrdal was the top friend of Stalin in Sweden. Being a pink, Myrdal got a glorious reception in Washington and got a fine job writing about the Negro problem until the danger at home was passed.

At least one of his staff during that period is high in administration circles at present. The integration decision was a foregone conclusion once the case was presented and from that moment on the public schools of the Nation were in a state of harassment and peril. The children became political pawns in the deadly, cold-blooded game of power politics.

If an adult nation cannot handle its education problems without airborne and armored troops, a private SS Korps of U.S. marshals and a continuous conflict between the central authority and the States, then this Nation is ripe for seizure of power from within and without and the last stand of the individual is gone.

Forced integration of the races was never contemplated by the U.S. Constitution and as far as human history is concerned never was countenanced by even the most tyrannical power.

It would seem that abstract thinking on this problem compounds idocy the way the philosophical storms swept the medieval

monasteries. If the monks were guiding the thinking today, they would be in a vast controversy as to whether the color of a man's soul is white, black, yellow or brown. The fact that no man has ever seen a soul would make no difference. The fact that integration is unnatural to man, makes no difference to those engaged in the current political struggle.

What, now, happens to the pathetic and innocent victims of this barbaric struggle? What of the schoolboy and schoolgirl of today, who with dawning intellect sees himself or herself tyrannized over by an insane society?

What must be the wonderment of those who are trucked across cities to meet integration standards? Is this child, thrust by cowardly politicians into a van, forced into contact with an alien race, going to turn out to be a good citizen?

What standards prevail? Does the integrated class slow down to the pace of the slowest child or does it leave in its wake the wails and tears of the slow when the standard is that of the quick?

Where is the damage done? It undeniably is done to the old established neighborhood school, the bedrock of modern education. When children from one neighborhood are flung upon another, it is an unkind and unsettling experience. This is advancement, visiting this upon children, too young to defend themselves? No matter which way the matter works, the children suffer. They are subjected to alien influences at an age just beyond the cradle, an age when wisdom, guidance and circumspection should be the rule.

The use of children in picket lines and demonstrations has long been a weapon of the Communists. It is out of place on the streets of a free country. Likewise the use of children and the schools is a despicable weapon of politics.

WIDESPREAD SUPPORT FOR LIBERALIZING CHILD CARE TAX DEDUCTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am indeed pleased by the widespread support that has developed throughout the Nation for my amendment to the pending tax bill to liberalize the child care tax deduction.

On December 6 I will have the opportunity of testifying in support of my amendment before the Senate Finance Committee. My amendment carries out the recommendations made last January by President Kennedy in his tax message, as well as the recommendations of the President's Commission on the Status of Women on which I served.

The child care tax deduction contains a totally inadequate $4,500 income ceiling for the combined income of husband and wife which was adopted as part of the 1954 Tax Code. Under the terms of my amendment this income ceiling would be increased to $7,000 per year as well as providing a deduction of $1,000 where there are three or more eligible children.

I am indeed pleased by the support contained in an editorial dated November 20, 1963, in the Columbia, S.C., newspaper, the State. Mr. President, as this editorial points out, there is presently a tax discrimination against the womenfolk and it should be corrected. The editorial further states:

Here is a true instance of denial of equal rights—and one which directly affects working women of all ages and all races in all parts of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place at the conclusion of my remarks the editorial entitled "Unfair Tax Laws."

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

UNFAIR TAX LAWS

Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, liberal widow of the late liberal Senator from Oregon, generally is too far out in left field for our political tastes—but we give her full support on one point:

She contends that working mothers should be allowed tax deductions for housekeepers.

There is, in the Internal Revenue Code, a provision for "child care" deductions for working mothers who must work yet who must also see that their children are tended during the workday. But there are limitations on this type of deduction, and the deductions close out completely at a given point of earnings.

In short this child care deduction is provided only as a help for the family; not as a reasoned and equitable tax provision.

Income tax laws, so far as we know, do not spell out the philosophy of tax deductions. But it would seem reasonable to conclude that deductions are intended to allow a measure of relief for taxpayers who incur necessary expenses in the business of earning a living.

And since earning a living involves earning enough to pay taxes, it would seem that the Government should be willing to play fair in the matter of deductions. But even without reference to fair play, it is simply good business for the Government to encourage the earning of good wages in order that those wages might produce tax revenues.

The woman who stays at home, whether by choice or by necessity, may be performing a useful function as housewife and homemaker but she is contributing nothing in the way of taxes.

If she goes to work, voluntarily or involuntarily, she not only becomes a breadwinner but a taxpayer. Furthermore, she becomes an employer herself by paying a cook, maid, or babysitter to mind the house or tend the children. It is here that she is penalized, for our tax laws make meager provision for her deducting the expenses she incurs in order to become a taxpaying worker.

This is a tax discrimination against the womenfolk, and it should be removed. Here is a true instance of denial of equal rights—and one which directly affects working women of all ages and all races in all parts of the country.

ECONOMIC CONVERSION LEGISLATION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the distinguished editors of the Washington Post have again called attention to the desirability of planning for possible shifts in our economy due to changes in the Defense Establishment. It is quite clear that at a time when we are investing 10 percent of our gross national product in defense spending that we need to plan carefully for shifts, stretchouts, or reductions in our defense contracts. There is also a need to plan for the day when communities may be losing part or all of their defense installations.

Toward that end I have introduced legislation to provide for such planning on the local, State, and Federal level. Our colleague from Michigan, the distinguished Senator HART, has introduced related legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post on this subject in the issue of December 2, 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEFENSE DISLOCATIONS

Senator McGOVERN is espousing simple prudence in urging Congress to create a National Economic Conversion Commission. The purpose of the Commission would be to cushion the dislocation caused by reductions or shifts in defense spending. These reductions and shifts are occurring all the time and are not contingent on reaching a disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union. Technology and defense are always in a process of evolution, and Congress has an obligation to consider the impact of these changes on the American economy.

Mr. McGOVERN and the nine other Senators supporting his bill would have the Conversion Commission supervise the creation of operating conversion committees in all plants where 25 percent or more of the work involves defense contracts. The need for an approach like this does not have to be labored; every Member of Congress is familiar with the desperate protests that come from the constituency whenever the end of a defense contract is even rumored.

One solution to the problem would be simply to keep the industries going on a make-work basis; indeed, this is one argument for giving Government support to the construction of supersonic transport aircraft. But as Mr. McGOVERN and others have pointed out, the make-work solution ignores the very real problem of distortions in the economy caused by concentration of research in the Government sector.

Senator HART, in a proposal paralleling Mr. McGOVERN'S, suggests the formation of a Commission on the Application of Technology to Community and Manpower Needs. The name is self-descriptive; Senator HART would have the Government encourage the exploration of ways of using our technological skills on such troublesome problems as urban transportation or air pollution. Both proposals are an attempt to meet a continuing problem; both warrant serious consideration.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN VESSEL CONSTRUCTION EXPENSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 462, H.R. 82, which is to be made the pending business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 82) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska may yield to me, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield with that understanding.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the need—and there is a real need for H.R. 82—arises out of application of section 502(f) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended.

The bill now before the Senate was carefully considered by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, was reported, and was passed by the House. It has been carefully considered by the Senate Committee on Commerce, and has been reported for the second time. It is before the Senate now in the form suggested last fall by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], when a companion bill was under discussion at that time.

Mr. President, it was the judgment of Congress more than 20 years ago that the executive branch of Government should be given power or authority to allocate ships for building in yards which might not necessarily have submitted the lowest bids. For many years that section was not employed, probably because during all that time the Government had the ships that were being built under subsidy arrangements constructed for its own account in various yards throughout the country.

This system was altered in 1954, and thereafter the ships were built for the account of the private operators.

Six ships were allocated, since the law became effective in 1938, to yards other than those which had submitted the lowest bids.

For example, two vessels were allocated for Moore-McCormack Lines and two for the American Export Lines. East coast shipyards had submitted the lowest bids. In the judgment of the Maritime Administration, it was necessary to have those ships built on the west coast, in order that there might be maintained a viable and functioning shipbuilding industry.

Because of this, the two companies were subjected to additional costs. Inspection staffs had to be taken across the country, and the ships, when completed, had to be delivered to their home ports. The total amount under consideration in that respect was about one-half million dollars.

Two ships were allocated for the account of the American President Lines. In those cases, a saving was effected insofar as the American President Lines was concerned. The bill now before the Senate provides that the Government shall, in respect of future allocations, if there are any, reimburse the owner-operator if he is subjected to additional costs by reason of having ships built at a point distant from his home port.

The bill also provides that if a saving is effected, it shall be paid to the Federal Government.

It should be remembered that all of this is not for the benefit of the owner-operator in any case; it is for the benefit of the U.S. Government, so that for national defense purposes there will be a shipbuilding industry on all coasts, where it is needed.

The allocation provision is one method by which Congress sought to insure that this would be a fact.

It seems to me, after careful consideration of the bill—and I was the acting chairman of the subcommittee when this matter was considered last year and again this year—that the bill does nothing more than provide equity and justice. We must remember at all times that in respect to vessels which are built under a construction subsidy, the American company which is going to come into possession of any particular vessel is not the gainer; it can go abroad and buy that ship at any time for half the price at which it could be built here. The subsidy is not for that company's benefit, but is a means of keeping the American shipbuilding industry in existence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Can the Senator give us the names of those ships, the years in which they were constructed, and also the construction cost and the amount of the subsidy paid in each case?

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the Senator wish the names of the ships?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; so the ships can be identified.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not seem to have that information at hand. The two ships that were allocated to the American Export Lines were allocated to the National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. of San Diego, Calif.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What year was that?

Mr. BARTLETT. That was in 1958, I believe. Delivery was made in 1961. The ships could be readily identified from the records of the Maritime Administration. I see that we have the names of the two ships. The first of the two allocated ships to be delivered was the *American Agent*. This ship left San Diego on January 9, 1961, and proceeded to Portland, Oreg.

The second was the *Export Aid*.

The ships allocated for Moore-McCormack are not listed here by names. Two ships were allocated for the American President Lines. They are not named either.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In what years were they constructed? Does the Senator have the amount of the construction cost and the amount of the subsidy which the Government has already paid on those ships?

Mr. BARTLETT. That was between 1958 and 1961. That was when they were delivered. I will obtain that information shortly for the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The two ships for the American Export Lines were ordered in 1958 and delivered in 1961. When were the Moore-McCormack ships contracted for and delivered?

Mr. BARTLETT. My information is that the allocations were made in the same year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. How about the American President Lines ships?

Mr. BARTLETT. The ships for the American President Lines were allocated to the Bethlehem Steel Co. at San Francisco, and the date of the allocation is not noted. The period was roughly the same for these six ships.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under the bill, as I understand, the American Export Lines would collect $150,000 for one ship, and $120,000 for the other ship. Is that correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. American Export would be reimbursed in the amount of $270,000. Moore-McCormack would be reimbursed approximately in the amount of $260,000. American President Lines would pay back to the Government in the neighborhood of $41,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Has the President Lines agreed to pay this money back?

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand so. Whether they do or not, the law, if the bill is enacted into law, would not be applicable unless this arrangement were made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But can a law be passed at the end of 1963 that would retroactively impose an obligation upon the American President Lines for $41,000? It is now 5 years later. Can we retroactively pass a law that would impose an obligation on this company as of 5 years earlier? If the company did not agree what could be done about it?

Mr. BARTLETT. Section 2 of H.R. 82 reads:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be effective with respect to any contract entered into under the provisions of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and the Secretary of Commerce shall, with the consent of the other parties thereto, modify any such contract entered into prior to the date of the enactment of this Act to the extent authorized by the amendment made by this Act, except that the Secretary shall not agree to any such modification which would result in a payment by the United States unless, within one year after enactment of this Act, provision has been made for payment to the Secretary of an amount equal to the total of any amounts which would be due the United States under such contracts entered into prior to the date of enactment of this Act if all such contracts were modified in accordance with the amendment made by this Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does that mean that neither American Export Lines nor Moore-McCormack Lines could collect any refund until after American President Lines has paid back the obligation? Or would American Export Lines and Moore-McCormack be

allowed to pay $41,000 for them into the Federal Treasury and automatically collect in return $530,000?

Mr. BARTLETT. Would they be permitted to do what?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Could Moore-McCormack Lines and American Export Lines pay the $41,000 if American President Lines refused to do so and thereby establish eligibility for their own refunds? My question is on the assumption that the American President Lines objected. The first section of section 2 provides:

> The Secretary of Commerce shall, with the consent of the other parties thereto.

American President Lines apparently entered into this contract in 1958. Under the law it does not owe the money now. Yet under this bill it is proposed to permit the Secretary of Commerce to collect the money if the parties agree. I would not agree to it, and neither would the Senator from Alaska, if the proposal were not a law 5 years ago.

What I want to know is: Are the payments to American Export and Moore-McCormack contingent upon American President Lines as a contracting party, paying its own $41,000; or could the other two companies, which have a $530,000 stake in the program, pay the $40,000 and have $390,000 left?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska allow me to amplify that point?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. I would add to the question asked by the Senator from Delaware: Is it not true that the bill was drawn—at least, the members of the committee from both sides of the aisle so considered it—to provide that unless the parties, both those that were to receive from the Government and those that were to pay to the Government, voluntarily complied, those who were to receive would not receive anything until those who were paid, paid? It would not in any sense be retroactive, and no action would be taken prior to the date of enactment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Precisely so. Whatever the Senator from New Hampshire might say in response to the inquiry made by the Senator from Delaware—and it is a logical one—the fact is that the question will be academic, as I understand, because the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] proposes to offer an amendment to cover this very point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad to hear that. I would certainly support such an amendment, because it sees to me that without it there would be no provision which would make the action mandatory. As I read the language, it clearly provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall modify the contracts retroactively only with the consent of the parties involved.

Section 2 provides that the payments shall be contingent only upon the fact that repayment has been made to the Treasury for an amount equal to the amount that was due from the American President Lines. As it is written it is not clear who must pay.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator's interpretation is absolutely correct. The committee so phrased the language, and it was inserted in the bill and adopted, to provide that the United States would be certain to be made whole before any money would be paid out by the United States.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to interpolate further that if the bill had been phrased in any other way than to provide for agreement of all parties, it would have been unconstitutional, because we could not force some one to pay, as the Senator from Delaware has so well expressed it. So, again, it all boils down to a simple proposition. Personally, I think a good way to have handled the situation would have been not to make it retroactive at all, but to have all parties agree that those who owed should pay, and that those who suffered could receive, provided the procedure worked both ways and that it was so provided in the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is absolutely correct. Speaking about retroactivity, the fact is that two companies, Moore-McCormack and American Export, protested vigorously, and violently, and pronounced themselves as being shocked when the allocations were made. They did not want the ships to be built at ports farthest from their home ports. They wanted them to be built where the lowest bids were submitted. But they had nothing to do with that. The Government said that it would build the ships on the west coast. The law had been in effect for about 20 years. Allocation had never before been performed. It was now.

I submit that these companies, if they are to be treated fairly—this construction was done for national defense purposes—should be permitted to be reimbursed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To make the record clear, I agree that to have awarded the contract to the west coast since the lower bid was from the east coast was wrong. But that is not the point we are debating today. The fact that the contracts were awarded to the west coast at prices higher than the lowest bid did not cost these companies any more money; it only cost the taxpayers more.

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, no.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just a moment. The taxpayers paid the subsidy on the ships when they were built on the west coast. Yes, the taxpayers paid the difference between the construction costs of the ships in American shipyards and what the costs would have been in foreign shipyards. When the ships were built on the west coast at a higher price than the price on the east coast, the taxpayers paid this higher cost.

It is true that from their standpoint the companies would rather have had the ships built on the east coast. The bill before us deals only with the extra cost of moving the ships from the west coast to the east coast. But I point out that had the ships been built in foreign shipyards the companies would have had to pay the transportation costs of moving the ships from Tokyo or from Europe. But I am not too much concerned with the fact that they had to pay for bringing them from the west coast. That is why I asked to have the record show what the total construction cost of the ships was, what the amount of the subsidy was, and how much the shipping company paid.

Mr. BARTLETT. That information will be available for the Senator in a moment. Research is being pursued vigorously at the moment.

The Senator was correct so far as he went, but he did not go far enough in his statement. He apparently assumed that the total cost of the vessels was paid for by construction subsidies. It was not, of course.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; I referred only to the differential in cost between the cost of building the ships in an American yard and the cost of building them in foreign shipyards. Construction subsidy covers only the difference.

Mr. BARTLETT. But the private companies, Moore-McCormack and American Export, were subjected to additional costs by reason of the allocations, just as the taxpayers were. The total added cost to American Export Lines amounted to $270,000; for Moore-McCormack it was $260,000. I cannot tell the Senator now what the added cost to the taxpayers was because I do not know the exact amount of the construction subsidy; but I hope to have that information soon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This bill only covers the $270,000 cost of transferring the ships from the west coast to the east coast, where they were to be used. The point I first made was that the difference in the contract price as between the east coast and the west coast was paid in its entirety by the taxpayers, because the point from which to figure the subsidy was, first, what it would have cost to build the ships in a foreign shipyard.

The second is, what it cost to build the ship in an American yard. The taxpayers pay the differential.

When a ship was built in a west coast shipyard, the costs were higher than for construction in an east coast yard; and accordingly the taxpayers paid the entire amount of the extra cost.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; and when the case is narrowed to those terms, I agree with the Senator from Delaware. However, I know he will agree with me that that has nothing to do with the interest of the private company for which the ship is being built; it is confined exclusively to national-defense considerations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps it has nothing to do with this bill, but I emphasized that point because the Senator from Alaska said the cost of construction on the west coast would be greater than the cost of construction on the east coast. I merely emphasize that that is not at all an argument in support of this bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. The company had to pay the inspection costs, which were higher for the owner-operator, of course, by reason of the allocations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Those factors were taken into consideration in connection with the construction. If

the company had had the ship built in a foreign yard it would have had similar extra costs. I am not using that as an argument against the bill, but I point out that we should not shed tears for the shipowner because the ship was built in a west coast yard—after all, the company got the ship on the same basis as if it had been built in a foreign yard. The taxpayers were the ones who paid more.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. I have already noted that the shipping companies expressed their protest, but under the law they could do no more than protest. They are required by law to build replacement ships, and they are required by law to have them built in the yards designated by the Secretary of Commerce. They have no choice.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are required to do that by law only so long as they wish to receive the operational subsidy. If they choose to disregard the construction subsidy and the operational subsidy they can build and can operate the ships 100 percent as they see fit. It is only when they wish to have the U.S. taxpayers pay half of the construction costs and half of the operation costs that the companies face these requirements. They say they want to operate on the basis of the American free enterprise system, but they also want the Government to underwrite the costs. If they receive the construction subsidy and thereafter receive the operational subsidy these requirements go into effect.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; and this applies to practically every company under the construction subsidy, for without the operational subsidy they could not operate, and they would have to go out of business. Only this morning we were told, in connection with a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Ohio, that the operating costs for American flag ships are three to five times higher than those for foreign flag ships.

In that connection, I read from the report, as follows:

> Furthermore, they have no control over the allocation, and no control over the added costs which result. The shipyard allocation is made for national defense reasons, but it does not add to the value of their ships, or confer any direct benefit on them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What point does the Senator from Alaska make in that connection?

Mr. BARTLETT. The point I am seeking to make—although apparently I did not succeed in making this clear—is that the allocations are beyond the control of the company or companies for which the ship or ships are intended.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Why should they not be? If the Federal Government is, first, going to pay the difference in the cost of building the ship in an American yard as compared to the construction cost in a foreign yard, why should not the Government decide in which yard the ship should be built?

Mr. BARTLETT. Because the cost would be added.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Sure the cost of the construction in a U.S. yard would be twice the cost of construction in a yard in Tokyo, Japan, but the taxpayers are paying this difference.

Furthermore, let me ask whether interest is to be paid on this refund.

Mr. BARTLETT. There is to be a flat payment, without interest.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Without interest?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; no payment of interest is contemplated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does the bill provide that no interest will be paid?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; but I cannot imagine that the Secretary of the Treasury would pay interest, when there is no specific authority to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So there can be a question of whether the Federal Government also owes the interest. If we state that retroactively we owe them the $530,000 I am not sure whether that will be with or without interest unless the bill specifies that it will be without interest.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the Senator from Delaware wishes to offer an amendment to that effect, I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that the Senator from Ohio has an amendment. Later it can be spelled out in the bill that there will be no payment of interest. I will prepare such an amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not think there is even a possibility that interest would be paid. I see no necessity for the inclusion of such an amendment, although I would not have any objection to it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to ask whether the estimated cost of $150,000 for extra inspection and $120,000 for delivery costs of the two ships of the American Export Lines will be the only additional costs to the taxpayers.

Mr. BARTLETT. These are the costs to the company.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but now it is requested that these be paid from the Treasury.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

I also wish to ask about the 6-percent differential in connection with the construction of the ships.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There has been a construction differential of almost 50 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. But there is a 6-percent construction differential as between construction in a west coast yard and construction in an east coast yard.

Mr. BARTLETT. Those were national defense allocations.

Mr. ELLENDER. So for the two ships constructed for the American Export Lines, the total cost to the taxpayers will be $270,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. For the one company.

Mr. ELLENDER. And for the two ships?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. For the two ships for the Moore-McCormack Lines, I notice from the report that the costs are estimated at $140,000 for inspection services and $120,000 for delivery purposes, or a total of $260,000. Are those the only additional costs on those two ships?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And as for the two other ships—those for the American President Lines—it is estimated that there was a saving of $41,000; and I understand that amount will be deducted from the entire sum asked for by means of this bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator's interpretation is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the entire cost for those six ships will be around $500,000?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the purpose of giving a little of the historical background, let me point out that on page 37 of the hearings is set forth a letter written by the American Export Lines, Inc.; and on page 38 there appears a letter written to the Federal Maritime Board by Frazer A. Bailey, who was representing the ship operators.

It is very interesting that in the letter of January 7, 1958, the American Export Lines, Inc., protested the building of these ships on a coast opposite to its situs because, it said, the cost of moving the ship would be greater to itself.

It did complain in the letter of January 7, but subsequently, on February 13, 1958, the following letter was written to the Federal Maritime Board:

> GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to your allocation under section 502(f) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, we are today executing a contract with the National Steel & Shipbuilding Corp., of San Diego, Calif., for the construction of two cargo vessels. Two additional cargo vessels are being contracted for with New York Shipbuilding Corp., which submitted the lowest responsive bids in response to our invitation.
>
> We understand that the basic objective is that, where an allocation is directed by the Federal Maritime Board with the approval of the President, all extra costs instant thereto should be borne in full by the Government. In the contract which we are executing today, we believe it is known and understood that the following items are not to be so paid for by the Government:
>
> (a) extra costs of delivery of vessels from the allocated builder's yards over costs of delivery which would otherwise be incurred, and
>
> (b) extra costs instant to inspection for the account of export at the second builder's yards located on the Pacific coast.
>
> We further understand that the Federal Maritime Board and the Comptroller General would agree to the equity of including in the present contract a provision for reimbursing us in full for these extra costs, but for the fact that it is not specifically authorized by existing law.
>
> For that reason we are writing this letter to withdraw our request of January 7, 1958, for a reimbursement clause in our construction-differential subsidy agreement, pending passage of authorizing legislation.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad the Senator read from that letter because it is naturally a powerful argument for the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is powerful and yet it is also negative, because this complaint in effect said, "We will go ahead with the existing law. We will not object to your granting this contract to the nonlow bidder, but we still feel that in equity we are entitled to reimbursement."

Mr. BARTLETT. They wish to do what the Senator from Ohio and I would do, perhaps, in similar circumstances. We are dealing with people who have power, so we are not going to write a fancy letter. We would say, "If this has to be done we acquiesce—though certainly not gladly—but we depend upon your fairness and your sense of justice. We depend upon Uncle Sam to deal fairly with his citizens." That is what we are trying to do now. Six years or more after this letter was written the House acted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The mystifying thing, regarding the correspondence, however, is that all the correspondence on this item, both in the Maritime Commission and in the company, is gone except for these two letters. I cannot understand that method of doing business, and why these two letters were available and no other letters.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further——

Mr. BARTLETT. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us say there is some equity to this claim, but in a substantial degree it is in the form of a special relief bill. It is not so labeled. There is no legal obligation on the part of the Government to pay the proposed $530,000, less $41,000.

I filed minority views on the measure, and they are set forth on page 13 of the report.

I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD. They show my views on this item. At a later time I may discuss it in detail.

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

MINORITY VIEWS OF MR. LAUSCHE

As a result of my longstanding objection to bills providing for retroactive payments by the Government, I must record my opposition to this measure, H.R. 82. Stated as a general principle, I believe it unjustified for a private person or company to take willing action under the existing and known statutory ground rules and then, when a loss occurs, seek to have the Government provide reimbursement.

When the ship operators made applications for subsidies they knew of the existing law under which the then Maritime Board might award the contract to a shipbuilder who was not the low bidder. They knew that a possibility existed that an applicant carrier on the waters of the Pacific might find himself in the position that the low bidder for the building of a ship was on the east coast and the higher bidder on the west coast, and that the Maritime agency, in the interest of national defense, might make the award to the west coast company.

In this illustration the ship operator of the Pacific would, of course, be benefited because it would not be necessary for him to move the ship after it was constructed from the east to the west coast.

The converse of this situation, of course, could have occurred under which the ship operator would have suffered a loss—the award for the construction having been made to a shipbuilder whose situs of business was on the coast of the United States directly opposite to the home situs of the ship operator. In this latter situation there would have been an additional cost imposed upon the shipowner.

The existence of these possible situations was known to the applicants for subsidy at the time the applications were filed. It simply does not come with good grace to ask for a modification of the law after the application was filed and the agreement made.

Any other course represents an unwarranted drain on the Treasury (particularly at this time when the deficit is likely to exceed $9 billion) and a form of Federal paternalism contemplated neither in equity, morality, nor the Constitution.

In the case of the legislation at hand, a retroactive payment would be made to subsidized ship operators for the additional costs of subsidized vessel construction when the award had been granted to a shipyard other than the low bidder. This is an old story in the merchant marine. A less than exhaustive review of the last few years reveals retroactive provisions on legislation passed to increase the ceiling on construction subsidy and on a bill to permit larger sums to be paid on traded-in vessels. This is an industry that has successfully converted itself into a ward of the Congress.

Perhaps the fault really lies in the original decision to provide Government aid. Once the web of subsidy is started, there can be no end to the efforts of the beneficiaries to make sure there is a symmetrical dole at great and continuing cost to the public. H.R. 82 is no exception. Under existing maritime subsidy laws a vessel costing $10 million to build can, and usually does, receive a subsidy of $5.5 million with the remaining $4.5 million paid by the operator. Should national defense reasons indicate that the ship be built in a yard other than the low bidder, the Secretary of Commerce may allocate the contract to the needy yard and the Government pays the difference between the cost of the ship in the low-bid shipyard and the one actually receiving the award. However, this allocation may be to a yard more distant than the low-bid yard thus increasing somewhat the costs of inspection and movement to the eventual owner. Such additional costs approximate $125,000 on each of four ships that were in fact allocated; a sum that might well be made up if the carriers resorted to their usual commercial function by obtaining cargo for at least that portion of the return voyage necessary to get the ship back on berth. Instead, in this case before the Senate it was found easier to seek legislation authorizing retroactive subsidies. Where does the Government's beneficence end and the subsidized company's obligation begin? Is there not some point where men and their entities learn to make the best of their present circumstances rather than rush to the Federal Government for a handout that can be ill afforded? If the logic of H.R. 82 is to prevail, is not legislation in order to pay pre-FHA homebuilders the difference between their present interest rate and that possible under FHA?

Events during the course of the committee consideration of this bill well illustrate the reasoning that leads to a never-ending subsidy. The Department of Commerce recommended that the bill contain a retroactive provision requiring that an operator who saves from an allocation return to the Treasury the benefits of that action. One company did in fact achieve a savings through a favorable allocation, an event that made the latter recommendation of the Department totally unacceptable to it. The sum involved was roughly $41,000. For almost two sessions of Congress the industry fought for a bill retroactively paying to operators $500,000 but not requiring the payment of $41,000 to the Government. The underlying rationale of this posture must be either: (a) equity is a one-way street or (b) the industry can only impress Congress with its needs if it is united. Finally, when no action became likely, the side to gain $500,000 was able to convince the company that had saved $41,000 that a $459,000 net gain for the industry was worth a reevaluation of position. Accordingly, the committee was notified that that source of opposition was withdrawn.

And, in the final analysis, the industry was able to divert attention to how much rather than meeting the question why. Totally overlooked has been the fact that the operator entered a contract for a vessel to be constructed with full knowledge of all subsidy provisions including that provision (sec. 502(f)) authorizing the Secretary to allocate the construction award. Since the Secretary has the dual responsibility to foster a strong, economically healthy merchant marine as well as preserve shipbuilding, it must be assumed that his decision, and the statutory provisions supporting it, did not contemplate any such increment to the subsidy program as would be added by this bill.

I will cast my vote against H.R. 82.

FRANK J. LAUSCHE.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I should now like to convey to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the information that he desires.

First, the two ships allocated for Moore-McCormack were the *Mormac Cape* and the *Mormac Glen*, the total cost being $23,750,000. The amount of the subsidy was $11,630,000.

The two ships allocated for American Export Lines were the *Export Agent* and the *Export Aide*. The total cost was $23,760,000, and the amount of the subsidy was $11,590,000.

For the American President Lines there were built the *President Lincoln* and the *President Tyler*. The aggregate cost for those two ships was $32,960,000, and the subsidy involved was $16,800,000.

All of those ships were allocated for 1958 and all were delivered in 1961.

I believe that is the information the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] desired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, speaking for the minority on the committee, I completely endorse the position stated by the Senator from Alaska who is also a member of the committee.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to correct an unforeseen inequity to shipowners which results when the Government, for national defense purposes, assigns the construction of a new ship to a shipyard which was not the low bidder.

The background can be stated briefly. The basic policy of the Merchant Marine Act requires that ships built with a construction subsidy should be built by the lowest responsible bidder, and this bill would not change that policy, nor would it have any effect on it. However, the law permits an exception to the low bid policy. In cases where the Secretary of Commerce determines that certain shipyards need to be encouraged, he may assign, or allocate, the construction of a

vessel to a shipyard which was not the lowest bidder. This exception has its roots in the national defense needs of the Nation. Defense considerations require that the Nation have effective and adequate shipyard capacity on all our seacoasts, Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf. The Secretary of Commerce was given the authority to allocate vessel construction in order to assure that adequate shipyard capacity was maintained in all these essential areas.

The need for the bill arises because recent experiences with the allocation of vessel construction have disclosed that it places unexpected and unfair burdens on the vessel owners, who, after all, are not really parties to the decision as to where the ship will be built. These added burdens have involved the expenses of maintaining additional inspection teams at distant shipyards and the cost of transporting the finished ship from the shipyard back to its home port.

The bill will authorize the Government to reimburse the vessel owner for these additional expenses—expenses, I emphasize, which do not bring any benefits to the shipowner, but which were incurred solely as a result of a policy decision by the Federal Government in the interests of our national defense.

The bill has been carefully considered and revised by the Committee to make it perfectly clear that only the net increase in costs will be reimbursed, and to assure that the Federal Government is the beneficiary of any savings if the allocation results in reduced costs to the shipowner.

Mr. President, in my view, those who are damaged by the policy acts of the Federal Government are entitled, as a matter of simple justice, to some reimbursement for their added expenses. That is all this bill would do, and I believe it should be enacted.

I add a comment; and it should not be considered in any way a criticism of my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], for whom I have the most profound admiration and with whom I stand 9 times out of 10 on the floor of the Senate. In his separate views, written with his usual clarity and grasp of the situation, the Senator inadvertently, in my opinion, at one point said something a little unfair and unjust to the ship companies involved. He commented on the fact—which, on its face, if it does not deserve would at least attract comment—that originally the companies which had been damaged were seeking their compensation and were not seeking the kind of retroactive measures which would cause the Government to be reimbursed for cases when the companies had been the beneficiaries.

That is a rather natural situation. Those of us who have been involved in business transactions know that company A, as a matter of common decency in fair competition, would not go before a congressional committee to advocate forcing company B to pay something to the Government. We could hardly expect them to do more than present their own case.

For that reason I believe we should not draw any inference that there has been anything more than plain, simple seeking of justice by these companies.

The important fact about the bill is that the procedure has been followed for a long time, and for future benefits the bill should be passed. I am not discussing the need for maintaining a subsidy for shipyards. I am not at all sure that the way to correct the situation would not be to enforce the "low bidder" policy, and not permit anyone to say, "We are going to build a ship in some particular shipyard for the sake of a subsidy to the shipyard."

That is the policy. That is written into the law. That is not before the Senate and not before the Congress today.

The parts of the bill which would be retroactive are so designed that the ship companies would not receive payments for the past unless those who owed the Government paid their share. That is to be reinforced by an amendment which I understand will become a part of the bill, to be offered by my distinguished friend the Senator from Ohio.

It would be a pity if the bill did not get on the statute books, for benefits in the future. The procedure has continued long enough. In my opinion, it would be only fairplay to pass the bill.

As the ranking minority member of the committee, I reinforce everything my friend the Senator from Alaska has said.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire. My recollection is that the Senator sat faithfully through the long hearings, in both years during which the bill was considered. I could not agree with him more completely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk; and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD. I shall describe its contents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

On page 3, line 18, beginning with "provision" strike out all through the end of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) all such modifications of contracts entered into prior to the date of enactment of this Act which would result in a payment to the United States have been agreed to, and (2) each applicant agreeing to such a modification has executed and filed with the Secretary an affidavit that he has not and will not receive any payment of any kind for agreeing to such modification or as reimbursement of such payment to the United States. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, before I enter into a discussion of the amendment, I wish to point out the reasons why I believe the bill ought not to be passed.

In 1958, when the construction of ships was under consideration, there existed a law which provided for a subsidy and giving the Government the right to assign the building of the ships where it determined proper, if circumstances were such that the interests of the country warranted granting the construction to a company which was not the low bidder, the granting of the contract being made on the basis that it was necessary to keep a shipbuilding company alive on the east coast, the west coast, or the gulf coast.

When the ships were awarded for construction, the owners of the ships knew exactly what the law provided. They knew a possibility existed that the award of a contract would be made in one instance so as to benefit financially the operator and in another instance so as to damage the operator.

Having in mind that situation, the operators went along with the law and received the subsidies described by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

While I am on that subject, I wish to state that the subsidy to the Moore-McCormack Lines was $11,630,000; to the American Export Lines, $11,590,000; and to the American President Lines, $16.8 million.

Now I read from my minority views:

As a result of my longstanding objection to bills providing for retroactive payments by the Government, I must record my opposition to this measure, H.R. 82.

Since coming to the Senate, I have seen retroactive bills passed on a number of occasions, always to the damage of the Government, never to its benefit. This will be the first time the Federal Government has received the benefit of a retroactive bill. Even in this bill, the Government will receive only $41,000, while it pays out $530,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, does he agree with me that the principle is more important than the money involved here?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think my principle is. Retroactive laws are never good, and they are especially not good when applied to the Federal Government always to its damage, but never to its benefit. That is the reason why I express my opposition to the measure.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I cannot refrain from warning the Senator that we are to have a tax bill that will be retroactive. The retroactivity involved in this bill is a mere drop in the bucket compared to what will be involved retroactively in the tax bill. I wondered how the Senator felt about the principle as it would apply to the tax bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The same principle is involved. The retroactivity will apply, not to the benefit of the Government, but to the benefit of others. There will be no retroactive phase in the tax bill that will impose a burden on the taxpayer to pay to the Federal Government.

So I think the situation, again, is that retroactive laws are always passed to put a burden on the Government, and never to its benefit.

I continue to read from my minority views:

When the ship operators made applications for subsidies they knew of the existing law under which the then Maritime Board might award the contract to a shipbuilder who was

not the low bidder. They knew that a possibility existed that an applicant carrier on the waters of the Pacific might find himself in the position that the low bidder for the building of a ship was on the east coast and the higher bidder on the west coast, and that the maritime agency, in the interest of national defense, might make the award to the west coast company.

In this illustration the ship operator of the Pacific would, of course, be benefited because it would not be necessary for him to move the ship after it was constructed from the east to the west coast.

The converse of this situation, of course, could have occurred under which the ship operator would have suffered a loss—the award for the construction having been made to a shipbuilder whose situs of business was on the coast of the United States directly opposite to the home situs of the ship operator. In this latter situation there would have been an additional cost imposed upon the shipowner.

The existence of these possible situations was known to the applicants for subsidy at the time the applications were filed. It simply does not come with good grace to ask for a modification of the law after the application was filed and the agreement made.

Any other course represents an unwarranted drain on the Treasury (particularly at this time when the deficit is likely to exceed $9 billion) and a form of Federal paternalism contemplated neither in equity, morality, nor the Constitution.

In the case of the legislation at hand, a retroactive payment would be made to subsidized ship operators for the additional costs of subsidized vessel construction when the award had been granted to a shipyard other than the low bidder. This is an old story in the merchant marine. A less than exhaustive review of the last few years reveals retroactive provisions on legislation passed to increase the ceiling on construction subsidy and on a bill to permit larger sums to be paid on traded-in vessels. This is an industry that has successfully converted itself into a ward of the Congress.

The two bills I have mentioned were passed and made retroactive. In both of them benefits were provided retroactively to the industry. The bills that were passed were, of course, also made prospective; but the retroactive feature is the principal part of which I complain.

Reading further from my minority views:

Perhaps the fault really lies in the original decision to provide Government aid.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] made some mention of that.

Perhaps the fault really lies in the original decision to provide Government aid. Once the web of subsidy is started, there can be no end to the efforts of the beneficiaries to make sure there is a symmetrical dole at great and continuing cost to the public. H.R. 82 is no exception. Under existing maritime subsidy laws a vessel costing $10 million to build can, and usually does, receive a subsidy of $5.5 million with the remaining $4.5 million paid by the operator.

I may want to correct this statement somewhat, because the subsidy goes to the shipyard, and not the operator; but it is a cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think the Senator has made an incorrect assumption, which may or may not be important. I point out that the subsidies are not uniformly at the rate of 55 percent. That is the ceiling which may be paid. My understanding is that more vessels are constructed with a less than 50 percent subsidy than with a subsidy in excess of 50 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad the Senator has mentioned that fact, because it brings to my mind another thought. When the subsidy law was enacted in 1936, it was contemplated and expected that in the course of time the differential in costs between building ships in foreign countries and in the United States would be eliminated. It was anticipated that the time would come when our shipbuilding yards would be able to compete with foreign yards.

In 1936 the maximum subsidy was designated to be not more than 50 percent of the cost of the ship. I believe in 1961 we were notified that the differential was not reduced, but was aggravated. So in 1961 a new law was enacted, making the maximum payment not 50 percent, but 55 percent.

Strangely, at the hearings it was stated that this differential in all probability would grow worse as time went on.

Getting back to my minority views, on page 13:

Should national defense reasons indicate that the ship be built in a yard other than the low bidder, the Secretary of Commerce may allocate the contract to the needy yard and the Government pays the difference between the cost of the ship in the low-bid shipyard and the one actually receiving the award. However, this allocation may be to a yard more distant than the low-bid yard thus increasing somewhat the costs of inspection and movement to the eventual owner. Such additional costs approximate $125,000 on each of four ships that were in fact allocated; a sum that might well be made up if the carriers resorted to their usual commercial function by obtaining cargo for at least that portion of the return voyage necessary to get the ship back on berth.

I have, in substance, related my reasons why the bill should not be passed. If it is to be passed, I ask that an amendment to it be adopted. Three ship companies are involved. One is to be paid $270,000 retroactively, and the other is to be paid $260,000 retroactively. That makes a total of $530,000. One company, the American President Lines, is to pay back $41,000. The Senator from New Hampshire has made the statement that the $41,000 cannot constitutionally be demanded. In other words, we cannot make a law retroactively requiring a party to pay back to the Government something that it did not owe under the original contract. The bill now provides that the $530,000 shall not be paid until the $41,000 is paid back to the Government. My amendment contemplates requiring the two recipients, the one of $270,000 and the other of $260,000, and also the third company, which is to pay to the Government $41,000, to file affidavits to the effect that no understanding has been reached and no payments have been made by the recipients, or are to be paid by the recipients, to the one that is to pay $41,000 to the Government. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree with the Senator from Ohio to accept the amendment. I should like to say, however, that in many ways I regret that the amendment has been offered, and that the Senator from Ohio felt it necessary to offer it, because it implies the likelihood of conniving and doubledealing and the entering into practices that I do not believe responsible American businessmen would ever engage in. I can understand the American Export Line and the Moore-McCormack Line using their persuasive powers to induce the American President Line to pay the $41,000 to the Government, and it would be surprising to me if they did not do so; but I cannot imagine their going any further and saying, for example, to American President Line, "If you pay the $41,000, when we get our $530,000 from the Government, between us we will see that you will be made whole."

I do not believe that American businessmen would for a moment dream of operating in this manner. However, if the Senator from Ohio feels it essential to add this amendment to the bill, well and good, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I would not have offered the amendment if it were not for the fact that for the past several years the company which is to pay back $41,000 has specifically declared that it would not pay it. The objection to passing the original bill was that in the instances where we lose, we pay; in the instances where we ought to gain, we do not get back the money. Within the last year there has been a change in attitude; and, to make sure, I have offered the amendment.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. The distinguished Senator from Alaska, who has the task of guiding the bill on the floor of the Senate and representing the majority of the committee, has agreed to accept the amendment. I am not disposed to object. It is essential that the bill be passed, and I am not disposed to object in any way. I am willing to agree that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio be accepted, so far as I am concerned, representing the minority of the committee.

I commend the Senator from Ohio for the vigilance that he so characteristically always exercises in looking after the Government's interests.

However, before I agree to accept the amendment, I believe the record should be set straight. I hold no brief for any steamship company, and I hold no brief for the Committee on American Steamship Lines, which represents the industry. However, the tone of the debate would indicate that there was something dishonorable or sub rosa in the whole transaction, and this I could almost say, I resent, not only on the part of the members of the committee, but also on the part of the companies and their associations who have appeared before us.

I wish to repeat something I said a few minutes ago. If the distinguished Senator from Ohio or the distinguished Senator from Alaska or the distinguished Senator from Delaware happened to be the president of the Moore-McCormack Lines—and I doubt whether any of us

would ever be offered that position—and if we appeared before the committee, does anyone think that we would come before the committee, representing our stockholders, and say, "We have been unjustly put to costs, and deprived of certain sums of money, and we hope that this committee will reimburse us; at the same time, we want you to collect from our competitor, the American President Lines, what they got from Congress"?

We know that no representative of a steamship company will come before a committee urging Congress to collect what some other steamship line should pay. That is our job. It is a job that we should try to do, and it is a job that the Senator from Ohio is making sure will be done.

I believe the bill is perfectly sound. If the proposed amendment would make it any more ironclad, I will go along with the Senator from Ohio. I want to see the Government get whatever it should get. I am not worried about who pays it or what the circumstances are or what is paid. If the Senator from Ohio feels that the amendment should be adopted, I respect his judgment and integrity so much I will agree to accept it.

From the very start, there has been no "monkey business," as we say in New Hampshire.

Mr. BARTLETT. And in Alaska.

Mr. COTTON. There has been nothing sub rosa, nothing dishonorable; there has been no desire to enable anyone to get something for nothing.

If the bill were not made retroactive, I am not at all sure that the ship lines involved could not proceed by having a bill of their own introduced by the Committee on the Judiciary, because they have been subjected to expense through no fault of their own by a policy of the Government.

So long as the RECORD clearly shows that there is no reflection either on the steamship lines that appeared before our committee or on the committee itself, I am perfectly willing to join with the distinguished Senator from Alaska and accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BARTLETT. For my part, I could not and would not regard the amendment as any reflection. I agree completely with what the Senator from New Hampshire has said.

I do not wish to take further time of the Senate unnecessarily; but I say to the Senator from Ohio, who remarked that this is always a one-way street—that the Government pays out, while the companies receive—that in 1947 or 1948 some ships were built under the construction subsidy program. In 1955 the companies were called in and told that they had received too much money. Late in the 1950's the companies agreed to reimburse the Government. So it is not always a one-way street.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That no interest shall be paid on any refund authorized under this Act.

Mr. BARTLETT. I accept the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for a division.

Mr. BARTLETT. 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. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. COTTON. I object.

Mr. BARTLETT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for a division.

On a division, the bill (H.R. 82) was passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO WAR RISK INSURANCE UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 502, Senate bill 927.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (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, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment on page 2, to strike out "February 1, 1962," and insert "the date of enactment."

Mr. BARTLETT. 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. BARTLETT. 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. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 927, I could do no better—no matter how detailed a statement I might make—than to refer to the explanation of the bill which is incorporated in the committee report. I refer to the report by the majority of the committee—even though there have been printed, in connection with the committee report, certain minority views.

The basic purpose of the bill is to allow U.S. citizens who own vessels built in U.S. shipyards with construction subsidy funds the same rights in respect to war risk coverage of these vessels as now are available not only to American owners, but also to foreign owners of such vessels.

The more I have considered the bill, the more it has seemed to me that a strange hodgepodge had developed over the years, and in some cases and in certain instances it does not make for logical treatment. Indeed, it does not seem to me to make good sense.

I could speak at great length about the merits of the bill. However, I think I shall concentrate upon one example which, to my mind, illustrates in the way that nothing else does the inequities which prevail under existing law.

Consider the passenger liner SS *America*. In the existing circumstances, the Maritime Administration makes it mandatory for the United States Lines, the owner-operator of that ship, to carry insurance in the amount of $6,400,000; but the war risk insurance laws provide that if war were to come, but prior to the Government's requisitioning of the ship for either title or for use, the insurance figure would drop to $4,556,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield, or does he prefer not to yield at this time?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I discussed this bill with the Senator when it was taken up by the Senate on a previous occasion. However, final action was not then taken on the bill; and it is now being considered by the Senate again.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think I was previously misinformed about the bill. In substance, the bill would give the owner of a subsidized vessel which had to be replaced the amount of his insurance, to be applied toward the cost of construction of a new vessel. But if the vessel were not to be replaced, the owner

of the subsidized vessel would not receive anything more than the depreciated value of the vessel when it went down. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. BARTLETT. The fact is that any insurance payments which are made must go into a vessel replacement fund, and cannot be used for any other purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I so understand. If the ship were not to be replaced—in other words, if the owner did not wish to have a new ship built, to replace the one he had lost—he would not be paid the full value of his war risk insurance, but he would be paid only his share of the depreciated value of the ship. Is that correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. Let us assume that the SS *America* sinks tomorrow. Then there would go into the vessel replacement fund, to be used for no other purpose, the amount of $6.4 million.

Let us assume, on the other hand, that an emergency has arisen, and that the insurance is whittled down, prior to requisitions for use or title, to $4,556,000. That amount would go into the replacement fund.

The third situation—and it is the third situation that has led me to believe that the bill is justifiable in every way—involves a vessel, say the SS *America*, to be precise in this instance, which is requisitioned by the Government for use under war conditions. In that event the insurance would drop to $437,000; although today the Maritime Administration insists that commercial insurance in the amount of more than $6 million be carried. Whatever the situation might be, the money that is derived from the insurance fund would go into a vessel replacement "kitty" as it were, which must be used for the one purpose only of building of another vessel to replace it.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Using the last example of the SS *America*, suppose we assume its owner had a certain amount of insurance on her and did not wish to replace her. Then what would he be entitled to get? When I objected before my point was—and I understand I was wrong—that he would not get more than he had invested in the ship.

Mr. BARTLETT. If his decision should be to go out of business for example, my understanding is that he could withdraw that money. But all the taxes normally applicable would be levied against that amount.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the Senator is correct in that understanding. That is not my understanding.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the Senator then explain to me his understanding?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My understanding is that if the shipowner does not wish to replace the ship, he cannot get the full amount of the war risk insurance, but he can get his share of the depreciated value of the vessel.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not believe the Senator is correct in that assumption.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not want him to get more than he had in the ship if he decided not to replace it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am positive about that. The money would go into a fund and would be segregated for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If he did not replace it.

Mr. BARTLETT. That decision would come much later.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I give an answer to that question?

This is a statement made by Mr. Gulick of the U.S. Department of Commerce, on S. 937, to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936:

> So as to provide that the valuation for Government war risk insurance purposes of American-flag ships that have been built with the aid of construction differential subsidy shall be the current domestic market value of the vessels without considering that the owners in return for the subsidy have agreed that, if the vessels are requisitioned in time of war or national emergency, the requisition price shall be not more than the owner's depreciated acquisition costs.

That language means that there are two different rights of insurance—first, the nonsubsidized ship, and second, the subsidized ship. The nonsubsidized ship is allowed to buy war risk insurance in an amount equal to the market value of the ship. The subsidized shipowner can buy war risk insurance only in an amount not in excess of the market value but equal to the book value; that is, the depreciated value.

Mr. BARTLETT. I believe that statement is subject to a slight correction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I be permitted to finish my statement?

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator permit me to finish my statement?

Mr. BARTLETT. Excuse me.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The subsidized shipowners desire to be placed in the same category as the nonsubsidized. When shipowners now accept the subsidy, they are bound to turn the ship over in case of war or emergency and to be paid the book value. On that basis the Government has said to those shipowners that all they should be entitled to by way of insurance is not the market value, but the book value.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; but that is not a correct statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is what the Department of Commerce has said on the subject.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—ORDER TO CONVENE AT NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding rule XII, there be a time limitation on the pending measure; that the Senate convene at 12 o'clock tomorrow; that there be a 30-minute period for routine morning business; that there be at least 2 hours of debate on the pending measure; and that the vote come not later than 2:30 tomorrow afternoon, the time to be divided between the Senator——

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Suppose the morning hour runs until 1 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I said "at least 2 hours of debate." As a part of the agreement, I ask that the time be divided between the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective on Thursday, December 5, after the hour of 12:30 p.m., during the further consideration of the bill 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, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], with the vote on final passage coming not later than 2:30 p.m.

Provided, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Provided further, That the Senate shall convene at 12 noon and the time from 12 noon until 12:30 may be used for the transaction of routine morning business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question which has not been answered to my satisfaction. What the Senator from Ohio has spoken of relates to subsidized vessels taken over by the Government and then lost. As I understand, the money received from the war risk insurance would go into a pot to build a new vessel. The owner of half of that vessel would not receive any cash.

If the owner desired to build a new ship, the money would be available.

However, assuming that he would not wish to build a new ship, what would the owner receive from the war risk insurance? Would he receive the depreciated value of the vessel at the time it was sunk? Would he get the fair market value of the vessel at the time it was sunk, or what would he receive? I do not wish him to get more than he would have in the vessel.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to answer the question in two parts. Admittedly, I was less than completely explanatory when the Senator first propounded the question. I might as well be frank in stating that I did not have the correct answer, although I thought I did.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The question is very complicated. I do not blame the Senator.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is a bit technical.

My understanding at the moment—and I propose to do further research on this subject before tomorrow—is that insurance money of this nature would go into the replacement fund and could not be used for any other purpose whatsoever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator's understanding is the same as mine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would go into a "pot." If they wish to build a new ship, the shipyard would get its share and the owner would get his share of the value of the ship which was sunk, toward the cost of the new ship.

Mr. BARTLETT. This would be his contribution, and then the Government would make the usual construction subsidy contribution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Up to the depreciated value.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator previously asked: Would the owner be entitled to the market value or to the depreciated value?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am interested in ships. I wish to help in any way I can. I wish to make sure that the owner of a ship, if he does not want a replacement, will not get from war risk insurance more than he put into the vessel originally.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is proper. Under the existing law he would get the depreciated value of the ship.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the proposed law he would be entitled to the market value of the ship. That would be a great difference.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree with a part of what the Senator from Ohio said, but not all.

Let us consider again the case of the *America*. That provides a ready means for identification of the entire subject.

In the first instance there is the situation as of today, in which the Maritime Administration compels the owner-operators of the United States Lines to insure the vessel commercially for $6.4 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Government would have half of the $6.4 million, if it were a 50–50 subsidy?

Mr. BARTLETT. No. This would all be for the benefit of the owner-operator.

Let us suppose an emergency should arise. The Maritime Administration would say, "We want your ship. We need it for war purposes. Prior to our requisitioning the ship, for use or for title, your insurance must be calculated upon two factors; the domestic value of the *America*, minus the amount represented by the subsidy that was paid in the construction of the *America*."

The two figures add up, in this instance, to $4,456,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the market value?

Mr. BARTLETT. Minus the subsidy percentage.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Minus what the Government has in it?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Let us consider a third situation. Let us assume that a war is in progress. Let us assume the Government has requisitioned the *America* for use.

Then the war risk insurance would drop to $437,000, which represents—and this is where I dissent from the opinion expressed by the Senator from Ohio—the residual or scrap value of the *America*.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to read what Mr. Gulick says on this subject. He is the authority.

> Mr. GULICK. We would like to answer some of the arguments industry made last year on behalf of an identical bill. One of these arguments is that we require commercial marine hull insurance on the *America* in the amount of $6,400,000, but that the *America* is eligible for Government war risk insurance only at the amount of about $450,000, and that these values are disproportionate. We think these different values reflect different conditions with regard to the probability of war and, therefore, with respect to the probability of the requisitioning of the ship at the $450,000 price.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Four million five hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Four hundred and fifty thousand dollars. It has been depreciated to $450,000, and the owner wants this depreciated ship, with the value of $450,000, to be insured by war risk insurance at $6.4 million. That is why every branch of the Government is against the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. And the owners want to pay the premiums to buy that insurance.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. They want to pay the premium; but if war should be with us the danger of the ship being sunk would be far greater than now, in time of peace.

Mr. BARTLETT. They cannot buy war risk insurance now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I read further from Mr. Gulick's testimony:

> Commercial war risk insurance is terminated upon the outbreak of war—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The *America* has an insurance policy. The moment a war occurred, the policy would be ended—

> outbreak of war between the powers mentioned and it excludes loss resulting from an event that occurs within 90 days of the outbreak of war which leads to war.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What would the nonsubsidized vessel get?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The nonsubsidized vessel is entitled to insurance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To war risk insurance?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; at its market value. The subsidized vessel can be insured under existing law only at its book value. The reason why it can be insured only at its book value is that the Government is allowed to take it over at the book value. If the Government is allowed to take it over at the book value, why should the insurance be at the market value?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If this bill were passed the company would be financially better off if the ship were sunk than it would be if the ship were returned to the company after the war.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand it they would have a ship worth $450,000, and if the ship were sunk they would get $6.4 million. Would that not be an inducement to have the ship sunk en route?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator say that again? Under what circumstances would they get $6.4 million?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The ship could be taken over under the law, could it not, for $450,000? If the Government should decide to take the ship from the company during time of war, is that not what it would pay?

Mr. BARTLETT. It would be chartered, under arrangements to be made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought the Senator said it would be taken over for $450,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Could they not requisition it for the depreciated value?

Mr. BARTLETT. That would be the amount of war risk insurance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am speaking of what it could be taken over for by the Government in time of war.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not say that; no.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me quote again what Mr. Gulick says:

> We think these different values reflect different conditions with regard to the probability of war and, therefore, with respect to the probability of the requisitioning of the ship at the $450,000 price.

That is a quotation, word for word.

Mr. BARTLETT. What does he mean, in the forepart of the statement? I find difficulty in understanding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What he means is that under the agreement when the subsidy was granted, the grantee agreed that in time of war the Government could take over the ship at its book value, as distinguished from its market value.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But a nonsubsidized vessel would be taken over at market value?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So if an unsubsidized vessel were sunk, the owner would get the market value?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And not the book value.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If a subsidized vessel were sunk under present law, the company would get merely the book value, and not the market value.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is exactly correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will inform the Senator from Massachusetts that the Federal Government has two routes open to it in the requisitioning process. It can—and almost always does in such circumstances—requisition for use. If it prefers, however, it has a right to requisition for title.

Then the ship becomes the property of the Federal Government. But that does not so often happen, I am informed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It happened that many ships were taken over in the last war. I have a report compiled by the Interstate Commerce Committee under date of April 1951 which gives a

list of all the ships that were requisitioned during the war along with the price at which the ships were later sold back to the companies. After the war the Government sold them back to the subsidized shipowners at a depreciated formula, about which they did not complain. Some were sold after the war for as low a price as $17,000 a piece, net. That was the valuation placed on the ships when we sold them back. The *Deltargentino* and the *del Brasil* were sold to the American-South African Lines after the war at a net price of $17,000 each. The construction cost of each of those two ships was over $3 million.

In my opinion the shipping companies are already adequately protected. It is about time we began to think about the taxpayers.

Besides, this bill is opposed by every agency of the Government on the basis that it is unfair to the taxpayers in general.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I assume the Senator from Alaska still has the floor. I should like to ask him the question to which I still have not received the answer. The Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Delaware, and the Senator from Alaska all say that if the subsidized ship is sunk it means the war risk insurance goes into a pot to replace the ship at its fair market value, and that money is a part of the owner's contribution to the new subsidized ship. What would happen, assuming that the owner did not want to buy a new ship or replace the old ship?

This bill may be a fair bill if the owner does not get more than he originally put into it, provided he does not want to build a new ship.

Mr. BARTLETT. I was informed a few moments ago by the Maritime Administration, in response to an inquiry, that there is no provision—none which has ever been exercised, at any rate—whereby the money from such a fund was used for other than replacement purposes.

It is a very interesting question, and a very important one. I propose tomorrow to have a more explanatory and, I hope, more useful answer for the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate that. I think it would be desirable in fairness to the consideration of this bill. I have always supported merchant marine bills, as the Senator knows.

Mr. BARTLETT. And very vigorously.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There ought to be an amendment in the bill, if necessary, providing that an owner who does not want to replace the ship will not get more than he originally had put into the ship.

Mr. BARTLETT. In line with what the Senator has been saying, it is the intention of the committee that those funds shall be used for replacement purposes; that they shall not serve to constitute a bonanza for anyone.

At the present time we are engaged in the biggest vessel replacement program in the history of the country. This country is building upward of 300 ships, at a cost to the companies of $2 billion, and with a further contribution by the way of subsidy which will come from the Federal Government.

I, no more than the Senator from Massachusetts, would want to create a situation whereby a man who owns and operates a vessel today could run away, figuratively speaking, with a large sum of money to which he would not otherwise be entitled.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My question is, if an unsubsidized owner is allowed to obtain the fair market value during wartime if his ship is sunk, under war risk insurance, why should a subsidized vessel owner, in which he has 50 percent and the Government has 50 percent, be permitted to get only the book value, rather than market value? Why should one get the fair market value and the other get only the book value?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think they should be treated alike.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wonder what the Senator from Ohio thinks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The proposal in the bill does not contemplate treatment alike.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Why not?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Because the Senator from Massachusetts has just pointed out that he normally has about 50 percent of the cost of the ship invested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. While the nonsubsidized owner has 100 percent invested.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct. This bill contemplates putting them on the same basis.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator mean 100 percent?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I read from page 7 of the hearings:

> The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 also makes it possible, by Government aid, for American owners themselves to acquire ships which are the product of American labor. Without such aid the ships could not have been acquired. For this support of the owners by the Government, the Government gets certain ownership rights. They are three, and they run with title to the ships by law.
>
> They are: One, the right to control disposition. The construction-differential subsidy ship can be sold only to a company which will document the ship under the U.S. flag for the first 25 years of its life.
>
> Two, the right to control the use of the ship. The CDS ship must not only be operated in foreign trade, it may not be operated in domestic commerce, except within the limits provided in section 506 of the act. If it is so operated within those limits, a fixed percentage of the CDS is forfeited.
>
> Three—

And this is the important one—

> the right to reacquire the ship by requisition. The Government retains the right to regain ownership at a fixed price. These ownership rights affect the ship's value for war risk insurance purposes and may not be ignored. There is a fundamental difference between commercial war risk insurance and Government war risk insurance.
>
> However, both must serve recognized insurance principles. Not only must the Government war risk insurance be based on a value which takes into account burdens on title and use which reduce that value, but it must be recognized also that the Government is a self-insurer of its contribution which made it possible for the ship to be constructed in the first place.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to reply to that.

The assumption made by the Senator from Ohio is that huge benefits flow as a consequence of Government financial assistance to the company which becomes the owner of the vessel. I submit that that is not the case. He is required to build domestically. He does so under a construction subsidy. Thereafter he is forced to place the ship on routes approved by the Maritime Board——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think he is compelled to sell only to ones that are approved.

Mr. BARTLETT. He is compelled to hire American seamen. Why does he do all these things?

He does it in order that Americans may be given employment on these vessels, in order that the shipbuilding yards under the American flag may be kept, if not in a prosperous condition, at least in a tolerable one.

What is being done is being done for the benefit of the Nation.

It might be his choice—and I understand that it could be—to go abroad and have the vessel built in Japan, for example, or in West Germany, and then to hire cheap foreign labor and staff the vessel with the cheap foreign labor; and then to take his chance in the world market, including the carriage of U.S. traffic.

However, he is not permitted to do these things. He is not permitted to do them because Congress has held that it would not be in the national interest for him to do so.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know it is the desire of Senators to recess for the evening, but I wish to make one point. I believe that the owner of a subsidized vessel, if he does not wish to replace the vessel—and I understand that the money goes into a pot, and he would get a vessel to the extent of the market value of the vessel if it were sunk—or even if he wishes to replace the vessel, he should not be entitled to more than he actually put into the vessel when it was originally built, and that is the fair market value. If those provisions are in the bill, it seems to me that the bill is protective. If such provisions were not in the bill, as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, the owner of a subsidized vessel would receive the whole 100 percent.

Mr. BARTLETT. Let me comment on that statement for a moment. Suppose the owner of a subsidized vessel has a ship that cost him $10 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is a subsidized ship. That means $5 million apiece.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is not a $10 million ship, however. It is roughly a $5 million ship on the world market.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. I wish to get down to the proposal that rightly concerns the Senator from Massachusetts. I wish to

read briefly from a letter written to me by Mr. J. D. Durand, of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, under date of April 30, 1963. It appears in the hearings at pages 35 and 36 of April 1.

I shall read a portion of the letter. I do not propose to read all of it, in order to save time. Mr. Durand writes:

DEAR SIR: A question has arisen whether, under S. 927, it would be possible for a steamship company to receive in war risk insurance more than that company had paid for a lost vessel, and, if this is not the case, whether the total of insurance proceeds and accrued depreciation on the lost ship might amount to more than the cost of the vessel to the owner.

After review of this subject we have concluded that it is practically impossible for a situation to arise in which war risk insurance proceeds from a lost ship would amount to more than the owner's cost of the ship. The only possibility, and it is remote, under which this could happen would be the case of the loss of a new ship, the market value of which, because of inflation, exceeded the owner's cost. For this to occur the annual rate of inflation would have to exceed the owner's annual rate of depreciation, of 4 or 5 percent. Even in this remote instance, however, the insurance recovered would not exceed the cost, to the owner, of a replacement ship.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would it not be possible to add an amendment to the bill providing that in no case shall the owner of a subsidized vessel, with war risk insurance, receive more than he had originally put into the ship?

Mr. BARTLETT. I shall be glad to take up this point with the Senator tomorrow.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the unsubsidized owner in control of the SS *America*, which has been used as an illustration, who put up the full sum, would be entitled to insurance amounting to $6,400,000. The depreciated value of the ship, according to this illustration, was $450,000. In building the ship, the subsidized owner put up 50 percent of $6.4 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He would be putting up $3.2 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. The rights given to the subsidized owner, under the suggestion made by the Senator from Massachusetts, would be far in excess of the rights given to the unsubsidized owner.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amendment could provide that the owner of a subsidized vessel which was lost in the war, and on which war risk insurance was carried, could not receive more than 50 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not wish to concur in the Senator's suggestion, but there is logic and strength in what the Senator has said. Of course that would mean a change in the whole subsidy law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for asking his very searching and useful questions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me that an amendment could be devised which would clarify these subjects, which, from an outsider's point of view—that of one who does not serve on the committee—are not very clear.

Mr. BARTLETT. I hope the Senator will make note of the letter from which I have read, which appears at pages 35 and 36 of the hearings.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE NEW PRESIDENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on November 28, 1963, the Philadelphia Inquirer published an excellent editorial entitled "The New President Speaks." The editorial points out 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 succession to that high office."

The Inquirer refers to our new President as "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."

I join in the sentiment expressed by the Inquirer and ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE 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 succession 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 ability.

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 left overs 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.

TALMADGE-HUMPHREY COTTON BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment this evening on proposed agricultural legislation which will be proceeding through the channels of Congress. I refer particularly to the cotton bill now being debated in the other body.

There is no disagreement as to the fact that the domestic textile industry is in trouble and that new cotton legislation is badly needed. The need for this legislation is revealed by the following:

First. Increasing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and CCC investment in cotton.

Second. The decreasing share of cotton in the utilization of the various fibers.

Third. Increasing Government costs.

Fourth. The decreasing share of world production of cotton by U.S. producers.

It was in response to these facts that I joined with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] in introducing the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act. I am pleased at the increasing editorial support this bill is receiving. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks two editorials from the Washington Post which deal with the cotton dilemma.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill would enable the cotton industry to get back on its feet and reduce U.S. Government outlays. It would eliminate acreage controls and instead assign to each farmer a domestic allotment in terms of pounds or bales of cotton. Instead of a steady reduction in utilization, we would get expansion. Instead of heavy Government costs for storage and export, we would get utilization through the free

market system. Instead of the "trickling down" of money to the producer, we would appropriate funds directly to the man who takes the risks and makes the whole industry possible.

It may seem rather peculiar to some Senators and to some citizens that a Senator from Minnesota should be interested in cotton as a product and in cotton production and cotton processing. I served for 8 years on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. During that time I was called upon to vote on cotton legislation and to listen to the testimony of cotton producers, representatives of the Cotton Council, and representatives of textile processors. I became familiar with some of the difficult problems that cotton producers face, and the problems the textile industry itself faces. Therefore, I sought to be of some help.

I found in the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] one of the most knowledgeable and best informed individuals in the Nation so far as agricultural policy is concerned, as it relates specifically to cotton. The Senator from Georgia developed a cotton program—the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act. I joined him in sponsoring that program in the Senate. I consider this to be progressive and effective legislation. It is legislation designed to aid the cotton producer and, above all, to permit the American textile manufacturer to compete in world markets.

It is time we stopped the use of acreage controls and quotas and regulations and compliance checks on the cotton farmer. It is time we made it possible for the efficiency of the private trader to move this commodity to the ultimate consumer. Then, and only then, will we be able to substitute "growthmanship" for "shrinkmanship," because what is happening now is that our cotton markets are shrinking while they ought to be growing.

The Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill would eliminate confusion and do away with hidden subsidies, and would again enable U.S. cotton to compete in foreign markets.

I am opposed to the cotton bill that is being considered by the other body. I am opposed to it because I do not think it would do the job that needs to be done; that is, to aid the cotton producer, on the one hand, and also to help the textile industry meet foreign competition, on the other hand.

The bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and me would be much more efficient in its operation and less costly, and would provide direct assistance to cotton producers and the textile manufacturer, because it would permit the textile manufacturer to buy cotton at a reasonable price and thus enable him to compete in world markets at world prices.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his interest in the cotton problem. While the cottongrowers of my State are divided as between the two measures, I am not now speaking on the bill. However, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator. His State does not produce cotton, but the subject is worthy of every leader, as he is a leader, on the national level.

When the American Colonies were first founded, after a few years tobacco became the main export crop. It remained the main export crop of the Colonies for 200 years, until some years after independence. But with the invention of the cotton gin, cotton became the major agricultural export. For a hundred years it brought in more money than any other export from this country.

The decline in the export of cotton has been a weakening factor in our whole economy and in our whole export trade. So it is a very fine thing that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has studied this problem which means so much to the overall American economy.

In my State, the value of the oil and gas produced is about five times the value of the cotton produced. However, far more people earn their living from producing cotton than the producers of oil and gas, because oil and gas move largely beyond the State.

Of all the families who earn their living in my State, far more earn it on the side of cotton. Cotton brings into my State about $800 million a year, out of a total of $1.5 billion in field crops. It accounts for more than half the value of all field crops. It is a very important commodity, grown from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific, with a great growth of cotton taking place in Arizona, New Mexico, and California, as well. It is a crop that means much in the enlargement of our exports. I think it is well worth the time of the distinguished majority whip to discuss it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas, particularly for his vast information about this important crop and the manner in which it affects the economy of his State and also of the national economy.

My interest is derived from the fact that I know that cotton is one of our major commodities. For a long time it was one of our major export crops.

I also know that the American textile industry is fighting for its life against foreign competition. On the one hand, we export American cotton and make available an export subsidy, so that our foreign competitors are able to obtain American cotton cheaper than our domestic producers.

On the other hand, the Talmadge-Humphrey bill would provide a production payment to cotton producers, which would permit them to make a good living. This payment will be the difference between the world price and what would be judged to be a reasonable and fair domestic price for the producers; and in the marketplace the American manufacturers could purchase American cotton at the world market price, so that our textile plants could compete with foreign production, using American cotton. Thereby our farmers could produce at a price which would be augmented by a payment to permit a family to make a decent living out of the production of cotton.

I realize that this measure is an innovation. I refer to it now only because in the morning press I noted a statement to the effect that the House is considering this problem and is considering a "compromise" cotton bill. I believe that when that bill comes to us from the other body, we should amend it by substituting the Talmadge-Humphrey bill. Otherwise, our producers will be in great trouble.

The administration finds itself in a sense supporting both these bills. I think the administration should decide which of the two it really wants. If the Bureau of the Budget considers both of these bills, I believe it will want the Talmadge-Humphrey bill; and if the Department of Agriculture will decide which of these bills will better serve the producers, I am sure the Department will favor the Talmadge-Humphrey bill. Furthermore, I am confident that the textile industry will find the Talmadge-Humphrey bill much the more desirable of the two.

I read now from an article, written by William M. Blair, and published today in the New York Times:

> The opening of debate brought the unusual situation of Mr. COOLEY telling the House that the cotton bill, known as the Cooley bill, was not what he favored. He said that he favored a compensatory payment system, but that he knew direct payments would not be authorized by Congress.
>
> Compensatory, or direct, payments would be the difference between the market price for cotton and a predetermined Federal support price. These payments would go direct to cotton producers.

Mr. President, most of those with whom I have talked say the Talmadge-Humphrey bill is the one which should be enacted. The farmers, the economists, the textile manufacturers, and the Members of Congress are saying that. However, word goes throughout the land that Congress will not pass it. I think it is time to stop playing games with agricultural legislation. What we want in such legislation is, first, to protect the free enterprise, agricultural, family farm economy of this country. That can be done through a compensatory payment system. Second, we want U.S. agriculture to be able to compete in foreign markets. However, that is not possible with artificially high prices. Therefore, we have to have a program which permits the free market price to be the price that is effective in world markets, and provides a domestic market price that will provide a decent standard of living to our farm producers, made available by the establishment of a direct payment to producers. Under the Talmadge-Humphrey bill, that payment will be the difference between the world price and what would be judged to be a reasonable and fair domestic price for the producers.

Mr. President, I find the cotton bill which is being considered by the other body much less desirable than the Talmadge-Humphrey bill. The cotton bill now being considered by the other body would be unnecessarily expensive, would

be most difficult to police, and would be fraught with all sorts of possibilities of abuse. That bill retains all of the old control mechanisms, and even adds a few new ones.

On the other hand, the Talmadge-Humphrey bill is designed to simplify the application of effective price supports for domestic producers and to intensify U.S. exports at competitive prices in the world trade.

Mr. President, I stand with the farmers, and I stand alongside the textile manufacturers. The textile workers need a cotton program which will give them equity and a chance to sell and to compete, with a profit. The Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill stands foursquare with the cotton producers, and provides the very best program possible for the cotton textile manufacturers.

It is essential that further analysis be made of the problem in connection with cotton legislation. We need reasoned judgment based upon facts, not emotion.

Some may say I have broken with the administration on cotton legislation. But I have not done so, Mr. President. I am attempting to use the great forum of the U.S. Senate to obtain a hearing for the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill, because it makes sense to every taxpayer, it is good for every producer, and it will permit our textile manufacturers to do business without a lot of Federal gimmicks, tricks, and gadgets, which are what the present cotton legislation is filled with, with the result that no one quite understands what it is all about.

Certainly it is time for us to take a good look at all of this agricultural legislation. We should begin with the cotton legislation. I have long been interested in agricultural policy. This year, I introduced a wheat bill which, I am proud to say, is cosponsored by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], who now is the Presiding Officer of the Senate. That bill will help our wheat producers, will save our soil, will provide incentive payments for compliance, and will encourage farmers to grow, on the diverted acres, crops which now are in short supply. I am happy that we are receiving much support for that bill from the farm organizations.

I shall also submit to the Senate a proposal for a blue ribbon commission to examine the entire agricultural policy of the United States, so that we can take a good look at what we have accumulated through the years and where we should be going as a great agricultural and industrial Nation, in the years ahead.

Furthermore, one of these days I want to look into what the Commodity Credit Corporation is doing. It is getting too large, with too many assets, with too many personnel, and with too many far-flung operations. So we need to examine it carefully. It has a very important and significant role to play, and I do not want my remarks to be interpreted as indicating that I am opposed to the Commodity Credit Corporation, for I do not know what the American farmers would do without the Commodity Credit Corporation. In that connection, I wish to repeat a statement I made on this floor 5 years ago. I said then, and I repeat now, that the Commodity Credit Corporation was established to supplement farm income, to aid the farm producer, to supplement the normal channels of trade, and not to supplant the normal channels of trade. At times I have had disturbing evidence that the mandate of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter has not always been followed.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was not organized to do the business of the cooperatives. It was not set up to do the business of the grain trade and the merchants in food and fiber. It was set up to help, not to take over. It was set up to make the marketplace more orderly, not more disorderly. It was set up to help improve the price structure for the farm producer, not to lower it. It was set up to withhold commodities from the market at times, not to dump them. Congress should see to it that the Commodity Credit Corporation operates within the framework under which it was designed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times by Mr. William M. Blair, a portion of which I quoted earlier, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HOUSE TOLD JOHNSON BACKS SUBSIDY FOR TEXTILE MILLS ON COTTON PURCHASES

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, December 2.—Congress was told today that President Johnson would give "100-percent support" to a bill to aid the cotton industry.

President Johnson's assurances, his first on a farm bill, signaled a major administration effort to push the measure through Congress. The measure had been accepted as a compromise by President Kennedy.

As a result of Mr. Johnson's support, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman began a new lobbying drive on Capitol Hill to gather votes.

He began patrolling Congress and holding conferences off the House floor. On previous occasions, the Secretary's actions have brought howls of "arm-twisting tactics" from Republicans and other opponents of his farm policies.

HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, Democratic chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, gave President Johnson's assurances as the House began debate on the measure. It would provide a subsidy to enable domestic textile manufacturers to buy U.S. cotton at the same price as foreign mills.

The bill would enable domestic mills to purchase cotton at a discount of 8½ cents a pound. This is the difference between the world price of 24 cents a pound, which foreign mills pay under an export subsidy, and the domestic price support of 32.47 cents a pound now paid by domestic manufacturers.

Cotton brokers would be able to sell cotton at the lower price and then be repaid in kind by the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Government price-support agency that controls surplus farm products acquired under the Federal price-support system.

The cotton bill is, in effect, a test for President Johnson, although the measure was not drafted under his sponsorship. That the administration attaches more than passing importance to the measure is seen in the role of JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House, and now next in line by law for the Presidency.

In effect, Mr. MCCORMACK is floor manager for the bill, a role nominally filled by Mr. COOLEY. Mr. MCCORMACK is working closely with Secretary Freeman.

The opening of debate brought the unusual situation of Mr. COOLEY telling the House that the cotton bill, known as the Cooley bill, was not what he favored. He said that he favored a compensatory payment system, but that he knew direct payments would not be authorized by Congress.

Compensatory, or direct, payments would be the difference between the market price for cotton and a predetermined Federal support price. These payments would go direct to cotton producers.

The bill would run for 3 years, with the domestic price support for cotton eventually reduced to 29 cents a pound.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 2, 1963]

THE COTTON DILEMMA: I

The House of Representatives will soon have an opportunity to revise the Federal cotton-price support program which has worked perversely in discriminating against American textile manufacturers and in exacerbating the surplus problem by encouraging the substitution of synthetic fibers for cotton. The gross costs of controlling cotton production, buying up surpluses, storing them, and subsidizing exports are now running at a rate of about $1 billion a year. Congress can adopt an alternative program which would sharply reduce the costs to the taxpayers and at the same time eliminate contradictions and perversities which are responsible for the failure of the present program. But unless a political deadlock can be broken, positive action during this session is unlikely.

To understand the cotton dilemma, one must review features of the existing price support and export subsidy programs.

Domestic cotton prices are now being supported at a level of nearly 32½ cents a pound through acreage allotments and the purchases of surplus stocks by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the Secretary of Agriculture estimates domestic consumption and export needs and translates them into acreage requirements. The national acreage allotment is then apportioned to States, counties, and individual farms on a formula which is based upon historical production. Each farm has a marketing quota; last year, after the farmers approved the quotas in a national referendum, the national allotment was set at 16.2 million acres.

Cotton has long been identified with the Southeastern States, but this popular image was long ago shattered. The Southeastern States where cotton culture originated now account for only 13 percent of the total production and the Delta States 32 percent. More than half the cotton produced—52 percent—now comes from the West and Southwest. This geographic shift has created a sharp disparity of political interests. Cotton can be produced at much lower costs in the West and Southwest than in the older Southeast and Delta areas and this fact is reflected in regional attitudes toward acreage controls and price supports.

The pegging of domestic cotton prices at high levels afforded protection to the farmers, but it made it impossible for American cotton to maintain its traditional position in the world markets. Since 1956 exporters have been able to obtain domestic cotton at the world price for shipment abroad.

But in establishing a two-price system, a dilemma was created. Domestic cotton mills now pay $42.50 more per bale than their competitors in Japan and Hong Kong, and despite the protection afforded by the tariff and import quotas, they are at a clear

disadvantage. Last year an effort was made to raise the tariff, but the Tariff Commission in rejecting that plea very properly ascribed the difficulties of the cotton textile industry to the inequities of the two-price system.

In addition to raising the cost of raw materials, the two-price system has accelerated the substitution of synthetic fibers for cotton, thus adding to cotton surpluses and increasing the difficulties of the depressed cotton textile industry.

Although there are formidable difficulties, the cotton dilemma can be resolved through a measure which will be discussed in a subsequent editorial.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 3, 1963]

THE COTTON DILEMMA: II

In dealing with the cotton dilemma, Congress is confronted with three choices. It can fail to act and thereby perpetuate a system which will impose an increasingly heavy burden on the taxpayer and continue to place American textile mills at a competitive disadvantage. It can adopt a bill sponsored by Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY which would compound the difficulties by adding a producers' subsidy to those already granted to exporters. Or it may make a sharp break with the unsuccessful past by adopting the forward-looking program proposed by Senators HERMAN E. TALMADGE and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

The objection to the Cooley bill is that it would increase the cost of the cotton programs without attacking the roots of the problem. Under its provisions "payments in kind" would be made to the cotton mill operators in order to eliminate the artificially created differential between the cost of cotton in this country and on the world market. Virtually nothing would be done to eliminate the cotton surpluses which are induced by the high support price and gains in productivity. The CCC now has more than 8 million bales of surplus cotton, and under the Cooley bill this stock might rise beyond the peak level of 1956–57. In addition, the producers' subsidy, running between 5 and 8½ cents a pound, would add at the very least $222 million to the cost of the program.

COOLEY's bill would be greatly improved by the incorporation of an amendment offered by Representative CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE which provides for a stepwise reduction of the price support levels from 32.47 to about 29 cents per pound. But the complexities of the triple-subsidy system would remain, and the poor, small-scale farmers of the Southeast would bear the brunt of a painful process of adjustment.

Senator TALMADGE's bill provides for a more radical and humane solution. It would dismantle the double subsidy system and take the Government out of the business of buying and storing cotton. In place of the price-supporting purchases by the CCC, the Talmadge proposal provides for income subsidies to farmers which are equal to the difference between the world cotton price and a percentage of the domestic parity price. The income subsidies would vary inversely with output thus providing the greatest assistance to the poorer farmers. Payments on the first 15 bales would be based on 80 to 90 percent of parity—or the difference between the world price and parity prices of between 32 and 36 cents a pound—and the payments would be scaled down to 70 percent of parity for production in excess of 30 bales.

TALMADGE's plan, which incorporates a national acreage allotment, would lighten the taxpayers' burden and at the same time result in lower cotton prices to both producers and consumers. It would increase cotton consumption and very probably slow down the incursions which synthetic fibers have been making into the cotton markets.

While the efficient cotton farmers of the West and Southwest would welcome a program in which they were free to produce more cotton, they will probably join the producers in other parts of the country in opposition to any plan which substitutes income subsidies for price supports. They fear the income support program can be more easily curtailed than one which manipulates prices. But this may prove to be a shortsighted view. In the committee hearings, Senator TALMADGE warned that: "With the political influence of the farmer steadily declining and the public becoming more conscious of the high cost of maintaining the present cotton program, it is imperative that we find a solution to the cotton situation and at the same time hold the costs within reasonable limits."

The Talmadge bill offers a reasonable hope for a permanent resolution of the cotton dilemma. Mr. COOLEY's bill, with the McIntire amendment, would immediately right an undoubted wrong to a major American industry and deal more justly with the textile manufacturers but at the cost of adding one subsidy to another. Congress ought to join the principles of these measures together in such a way as to accomplish an early relief to the textile industry and a gradual shift from price supports to benefit payments. Stopgap subsidies could then be paid to the domestic textile manufacturers at a diminishing scale. These subsidies could be phased out while benefit payments to growers were phased in, gradually abandoning the two-price system and replacing it with the Talmadge plan, under which neither price supports nor textile subsidies would be required.

(At this point Mr. MCGOVERN took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

THE VENEZUELAN ELECTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to conclude my comments tonight on a subject that is very close to the heart of the President of the United States and, indeed, to our beloved and late President Kennedy. I only wish that President Kennedy could have been with us to cheer the election results in Venezuela, because no man in our time has done more to encourage democratic institutions and the practice of democracy in Latin America—and, indeed, throughout the world—than the late great and beloved President Kennedy.

There is good news from Venezuela. Despite continuous violent harassment by Communists and Castroite leftist groups, the Venezuelan elections were held on schedule on December 1 and resulted in a resounding triumph for democratic forces in Venezuela. The election represents a smashing victory for President Betancourt's democratic coalition and for the new leader of Betancourt's Accion Democratica Party, Raul Leoni, who will now succeed President Betancourt in the Presidency. President-elect Leoni's victory is assurance that Venezuela will continue the same enlightened progressive domestic policy and pro-Western foreign policy that has characterized the Betancourt government.

I find the election results encouraging, too, in that they revealed that the Social Christian Party, headed by Dr. Rafael Caldera, has now become the second strongest political party in the country. That is, a responsible and democratic political party. Indeed, the Social Christian Party, which has been the junior partner in the Betancourt coalition government, scored the most impressive gains in the election, winning 23 percent of the total vote cast.

Mr. President, it has been my real privilege to know Dr. Caldera, as I have had the privilege of meeting the new President-elect, President Leoni. These are fine and good men, dedicated to the cause of democratic ideals.

The election revealed that in a wealthy, rapidly developing country like Venezuela, the two strongest political parties are precisely those two parties whose programs and objectives are virtually identical to the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

I cannot understand why there have not been more comments in the Senate about what has happened in Venezuela. I was pleased to hear the comments of the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING]. Other Senators may have spoken on the subject. When I think of all the complaints about the foreign aid program and the Alliance for Progress, I wonder why the Senate Chamber did not ring with cheers of success of the Alliance for Progress in Venezuela—a key country and a vital bastion of democracy in this hemisphere. Why did not more Senators rise and say that the Alliance for Progress has had a victory? Freedom has had a victory. No country has been more besieged and harassed by the forces of communism, terrorism, and Castroism than has Venezuela. Yet that country has come through. The leaders of liberal, progressive politics have gained a victory. The reactionaries were rebuked. The Communists were rebuked. The terrorists have been rebuked. The freedom-loving people have gained a victory.

The two victorious parties in this election represent the two principal reform-minded, non-Communist groups in Latin America, the Democratic left group in the Caribbean, and the Christian Democratic group in South America. These parties represent the hope of democracy in Latin America. President-elect Leoni is a member of that movement, the Democratic left, which has provided the principal leadership in the last decade for progressive constitutional forces in Latin America. It is this movement that has come forth with astute leaders like Betancourt, Jose Figueres, and Daniel Oduber in Costa Rica, and Luis Muñoz-Marín and Teodoro Moscoso in Puerto Rico.

These are people whom we know. They represent the real progressive democratic leadership in this hemisphere.

The Social Christian—COPEI—headed by Dr. Rafael Caldera, is typical of the Christian Democratic Parties, which, although a minor force in Latin America up until recently, are now rapidly growing in strength and are destined to play a major role in the political life of such countries as Venezuela, Chile, Brazil, and Peru in the next decade.

In fact, the Christian Democratic Party may actually save Chile from electing a pro-Communist government. I believe it will. I am convinced that the

forces of progressive democracy will win in the coming elections in Chile.

With the continued cooperation between Accion Democratica and COPEI—those two parties—that has characterized the Betancourt government in the past 2 years, Venezuela will be governed by a progressive government friendly to the United States, which will enjoy the firm backing, too, of the U.S. Government.

From the events of the past week, it is clear that the new Venezuelan Government will need the support of its friends in this hemisphere to repel external attacks originating in Cuba. The evidence is clear and indisputable that Cuba has smuggled arms to terrorists in Venezuela. The evidence has been presented to the OAS Council, which voted 16 to 2 to investigate the charges of interference by Cuba in the internal affairs of Venezuela.

I wish my position on this subject to be crystal clear. Our national policy should be one of clear, unequivocal support for taking the necessary steps to cut off arms shipments from Cuba and Venezuela. We can no longer condone Cuba being an arsenal for terrorism, revolution and chaos. It is about time, instead of merely worrying about governments of friendly countries being able to stay in power and resist violence, that we choke off the source of that violence.

We have stated before that we will not permit the Castro regime to subvert the democratic governments of its neighbors through armed aggression, whether covert or open. We have repeatedly stated this as our policy. Today we have a clear, carefully documented case of arms shipments into Venezuela. The Venezuelan Government has presented convincing photographic evidence of the smuggled arms shipments.

What is our response to the situation? I believe we should mean what we have been saying. We should take all steps necessary to prevent further arms shipments from Cuba into Venezuela. And I mean all the steps—whatever steps are required in terms of naval operations, or any form of activity to stop these arms from crossing over into the Caribbean areas and Latin America.

Mere words alone will be of little avail. The new administration headed by President Johnson should serve notice on the Soviet Union that we do not intend to see friendly governments like that in Venezuela subverted by terrorists armed from Cuba.

We ought to make that clear so that there can be do doubt as to our position. If action is needed to convince the Cubans that we mean business, then action should be the order of the day. Either we defend our friends in Latin America against armed subversion, or we may as well forget about a peaceful, democratic revolution in Latin American countries through the Alliance for Progress.

The Venezuelan Government has asked for support and assistance. We should provide it—now.

The Venezuelan Government has asked for support and assistance in the OAS. We should provide it.

I suggest that we energetically, wholeheartedly, and determinedly support the position of the Venezuelan Government in the Organization of American States.

I submit that we should let the whole world know we believe enough in free democratic government to protect the rights of people to enjoy the privileges of such governments.

It is one thing to talk about the invasion of Cuba. That, within itself, is fraught with many dangers. It is yet another thing to tell the Cubans and the Russians that we do not intend to permit them to invade, overtly or covertly, Central or South America. The sooner we make it crystal clear that we mean business, by whatever means is required, the better off we shall be, because other elections will be held in the months ahead.

Only 12 months ago I was in this area. I remember going to visit the trade union in Caracas. I was supposed to be there at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. I canceled my appointment due to a call which came from the American Embassy.

At 4 o'clock that afternoon a car went by the headquarters of the labor organization—the free democratic labor organization—and spewed machinegun fire over the building. I missed being there by 5 minutes. That did not make the headlines in the United States, but I know for whom those bullets were intended. A car moved down the streets of Caracas and sprayed the building with machinegun fire, from terrorists telling us we should go home.

I was warned that I should not go into the slums of Caracas. I was told I would be harassed, and might even be molested. I was also told that others who had gone there recently had had their cars fired upon. It did not seem to me that that was any time to back away, so we went. Fortunately, there was no violence.

If we are to support free democratic governments—if the Congress is to frown upon coups by military cliques—if we are to stand up and argue about foreign aid and all the limitations and mistakes of foreign aid, I suggest, when there is a victory for freedom in an election such as that in Venezuela, that we ought to cheer it, salute it, commend it, and extend the hand of congratulation and good fellowship.

There ought to be voices raised here in the Senate commending the people of Venezuela, who turned out in an overwhelming mass of support. Ninety-five percent of the eligible adult population voted. I ask Senators to compare that with statistics on elections in the United States. If 60 percent of the population, or 65 percent of the population, votes, it is a so-called election day miracle.

Ninety-five percent of the eligible voters of Venezuela—and they have universal suffrage—went to the polls, even though the Communists and the Castroites had threatened them with death.

At every polling box soldiers were to be stationed to protect the lives of the voters. A free election was carried out. There were opposing parties. The sanctity of the ballot was protected and preserved.

What do I hear in Washington? We had 4 weeks of debate, of griping, of arguing about the mistakes of foreign aid, about the weaknesses of the Alliance for Progress, about the fact that we were not doing well, about the fact that countries were turning their backs upon us.

Venezuela is only a few hours away, by modern jet airplane, from Cuba. Venezuela stands at the head of the Caribbean. It is a country in which this Nation has placed its faith and trust. Our former beloved and late President John Kennedy placed his trust in the country. He went there to visit.

Before President Kennedy left for Texas—on that fateful trip—the last words he said to one of his assistants at the White House was, "I worry over the safety of President Betancourt."

Yes, our beloved President Kennedy worried over the physical safety of the President of Venezuela. The President of Venezuela lives. Our President died.

In our suffering, our agony, our pain, and our grief, we might at least salute a friend of our late and beloved President who triumphed. Democracy won. Freedom won.

Also, we ought to let Castro and all his kind know that their terroristic campaign will be beaten down. We ought to tell Mr. Khrushchev to call off that bewhiskered little friend of his and put him back where he belongs, in cold storage—either that, or the United States, in cooperation with its neighbors, under the Rio pact and under the Act of Bogotá, will move to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent further intervention by armed subversion in the Latin American Republics.

I feel better, Mr. President. At least I have raised my voice in the Senate for freedom tonight. I have spoken for a people who are brave; a people who are determined to make democracy work. Their political leaders are willing to lay their lives on the line for freedom. Their political parties have carried on in the tradition of democratic governments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have certain editorials and articles relating to the substance of my remarks on Venezuela, President Betancourt, President-elect Leoni, and Dr. Rafael Caldera printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1963]

VICTORY IN VENEZUELA

Democracy is a novel experience in Venezuela, where President Romulo Betancourt became the first popularly elected Chief Executive only 5 years ago. Yet in defiance of Communist terrorists inspired by Cuba's Castro, Venezuelan voters turned out in record numbers to assure the succession of a new candidate. Dr. Raul Leoni, the choice of President Betancourt, seems most likely to emerge the winner, but the real victory belongs to the Venezuelan people.

While Dr. Leoni did not gain an absolute majority and will have to form a coalition government, it is clear that the voters want an orderly and peaceful succession. This is the real significance of the immense turnout. The electorate has spoken out against revolution or military rule. It has no desire to

embrace Castro's violent solutions, and it has refused to be cowed. The vote for democracy is a vote for a peaceful transformation of Venezuela's economic and social system along the lines of the Alliance for Progress.

Communist harassment and the constant threat of civil war prevented President Betancourt from carrying out his program of reforms. He had all he could do to establish and maintain constitutionalism and the preservation of personal liberties. Venezuela is fortunate in possessing its rich resources of oil, but the country must broaden and extend its economic base if it is to assure a higher standard of living for all its people.

This is the most challenging task facing the new Government. The defeat of the terrorists is not yet final. Encouraged by Castro, they may resort to even more violent tactics in an effort to frustrate and paralyze its efforts. But the resistance of terrorism displayed in the election suggests that peace can be won in Venezuela with the help of the United States and the other members of the Organization of American States. Peace is essential if the victory of the Venezuelan people is to be a lasting one.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 23, 1963]

THE SOCIAL CHRISTIANS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—The future of Venezuela may depend not so much on the army and police flushing out Communist terrorists as on a little-publicized crusade by liberal Catholics to wean the nation's youth away from communism.

Copei, Venezuela's Social Christian Party and junior partner in President Romulo Betancourt's coalition government, is challenging Communist domination of the country's students, and with considerable success. The Social Christians have won control of the state universities at Maracaibo and Valencia and are running a close second to Communists at Caracas Central University, the staging center for the anti-Nixon riots in 1958.

Nor is the clash between communism and liberal Catholicism limited to Venezuela. Throughout Latin America, Social Christians comprise the one anti-Communist force that talks the heady, idealistic language of youth.

The college student, who has exerted disproportionate influence in Latin politics for a long time, is now the focal point of the hemisphere's subversive movements. Moscow and Havana have failed to subvert labor, peasants, or even slum dwellers. They rely on the student.

This reliance has become absolute in Venezuela, where one of every four college students is pro-Communist. Furthermore, these young men and women form the core of terrorist units and often spend their vacations fighting as guerrillas in the hills. These youthful bombthrowers include the very Venezuelans who ought to be the country's future leaders.

The son of one anti-Communist state governor is a Communist guerrilla in the Falcon Mountains. The daughter of one of President Betancourt's personal associates is a Communist terrorist in Caracas. The list goes on and on.

Special factors encourage the gravitation of Venezuelan youth toward communism. The 1952–58 dictatorship of Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez concentrated on persecuting its democratic opposition—but let Communists run wild. As a result, they thoroughly infiltrated the faculties of universities and normal schools. The madcap provisional government that followed Perez Jimenez's fall compounded the damage by granting Central University an autonomy that makes it a sanctuary for subversives.

Even without this assistance, however, the Communists would be doing well enough with young Venezuelans. Latin America's middle class young intellectuals are tormented by the poverty and social injustice they see everywhere. They want an easy answer. The Communists give it to them.

Certainly, these students derive little inspiration from Betancourt's Accion Democratica (AD) Party. AD's magnificent political machine probably will push a lackluster candidate to victory in the December 1 election to succeed Betancourt (who is barred by the constitution from another term). But AD would run poorly in a poll of students.

Founded a generation ago as a revolutionary Marxist party, AD has dropped most of its socialist trappings. When it expelled its pro-Communists in 1960, most of AD's youth went with them. It is today an unexciting, mildly liberal party of older men, who prefer ornate offices in Miraflores Palace to launching crusades.

Not so the Social Christians. True, they cannot match the Communists and offer students the thrill of swaggering off to battle with a submachine gun. But they do offer social revolutionary doctrine to transform Venezuelan society. The Copei Party, organized in 1946 as a conservative clerical party, is well left of center today. Its youth is particularly suspicious of private enterprise, specifically American business imperialism.

Naturally enough, then, not all anti-Communists here are overjoyed with the rise of the Social Christians. Parish priests imported from Spain and conservative members of the Catholic hierarchy are appalled. American businessmen (plus some staffers from the U.S. Embassy) would much prefer the emergence of a middle-class party supporting private enterprise, but that kind of party would be anathema to Venezuelan youth.

And no matter how much the radicalism of the Social Christians here may annoy Washington, they can be counted on to take a hard line against communism. That's no small assurance in Latin America today.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 4, 1963]

OAS TO EXAMINE CARACAS CHARGES AGAINST HAVANA—INQUIRY ON ACCUSATION THAT CUBA FOMENTS TERRORISM IS VOTED BY 16 TO 0—BETANCOURT ASKS CURB—HEMISPHERE ACTION AGAINST SUBVERSION FAVORED AT EMERGENCY MEETING

(By Henry Raymont)

WASHINGTON, December 3.—The Organization of American States voted today to investigate charges that Cuba had smuggled arms into Venezuela to foster terrorism as part of a campaign to subvert democracy in Latin America.

The Organization's Council, at an emergency session, decided by a 16-to-0 vote, with 1 abstention, to set in motion the machinery of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance to deal with the Venezuelan accusation.

Under the pact, known as the Rio Treaty, a country guilty of aggressive intervention in the affairs of a member state can be subjected to far-ranging collective sanctions, including the use of armed force.

FEAR OF EAST-WEST CONFLICT

Although the immediate issue was alleged Cuban arms shipments to Venezuelan terrorists, several delegates served notice during the 2-hour meeting that they wanted firm action against the broader threat of subversion instigated by the regime of Premier Fidel Castro.

(In Caracas, President Romulo Betancourt called for a partial air and naval blockade of Cuba to prevent arms exports.)

Mexico, indicating that inter-American measures against Cuba at this time might set off a new East-West confrontation and imperil world peace, cast the lone abstaining vote.

Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay, which like Mexico still have diplomatic relations with Cuba, voted in favor of considering the charges after stressing that they were not passing judgment on the merits. Bolivia and Haiti were absent.

As a first step after voting to invoke the treaty, the Council met as an organ of consultation on behalf of the Western Hemisphere's foreign ministers. In this capacity, it designated an inter-American Commission to study Venezuela's evidence. The vote on the Commission again was 16 in favor, with Mexico abstaining.

Brazil voted in favor of the inquiry after demanding assurances that Cuba be given an opportunity to present her case.

The Cuban Government, although it has openly praised the Venezuelan terrorists, denied having shipped arms to them. In a communique issued last night, Cuba's Foreign Minister, Ral Roa, charged that the arms cache, discovered some weeks ago on a Venezuelan beach, had been placed there by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

Ilmar Penna Marinho of Brazil, emphasizing the gravity of the Venezuelan charges, suggested that the factfinding Commission be admitted to Cuba as well as Venezuela.

The proposal caused considerable surprise since the Castro regime has rejected every attempt at international inspection, either by the United Nations or by the Organization of American States, which excluded Cuba because of her Communist ties in January 1962.

Some diplomats here believed that an outright Cuban refusal to cooperate in the inquiry would make it easier for Brazil to justify for home consumption severing her ties with the Castro regime should such action be requested by the inter-American body.

Enrique Tejera, the Venezuelan delegate, suggested that diplomatic and economic sanctions would be the least his Government would demand if the investigation confirmed the evidence of Cuban intervention.

IMPARTIAL INQUIRY URGED

Tapping his desk with a pencil to emphasize his words and speaking in a slow, grave voice, he declared:

"We want the Commission to carry out an impartial, unhurried investigation. We agree with Brazil that the other party must be heard. But once all the evidence is in, Venezuela will demand a clear and heavy judgment, for it is no longer possible to allow a member of the system of nations to conspire against juridical institutions and to plot criminal acts of violence."

Mr. Tejera displayed 21 photographs he said were taken of the weapons. He also offered laboratory evidence of partly erased Cuban Army markings.

The envoy repeated his Government's charges that 3 tons of arms were found on an abandoned beach on Paraguana Peninsula, in northern Venezuela. Repeatedly he likened the cache to the terrorist methods used by the late Dominican dictator, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, that led to precedent-setting sanctions against the Dominican Republic in 1960.

Ward P. Allen, the acting U.S. representative, told the Council that his Government's technicians had verified the Cuban origin of the arms found in Venezuela.

He warned that the Castro regime could be expected to increase its subversive efforts as it faced increasing difficulties at home. But he suggested that only on the basis of the inter-American inquiry could the Council decide whether additional steps should be taken to increase the hemisphere's vigilance against Cuba.

USE OF FORCE DOUBTED

Other North Americans discouraged speculation about any imminent use of force against the Cuban regime. They conveyed

the impression that President Johnson would hardly welcome another world crisis over Cuba at the outset of his administration.

The U.S. officials were also cool to Venezuelan suggestions that military measures should be contemplated. Their feeling, shared by most Latin American delegates, was that the factfinding committee should complete its investigation before such steps were considered.

The Mexican delegate, in a brief statement, urged the Council to be mindful that "the principal mission of every regional organism is the contribution to the maintenance of peace."

A report tonight that President Betancourt had proposed a sea-and-air blockade came as a surprise to OAS delegates. They believed that, despite today's show of unity, the Council would vote against the measure if it came up before the investigating Commission completed its mission.

The Commission, appointed immediately after the meeting by the new chairman, Juan Bautista de la Valle of Peru, will be made up of Argentina, Colombia, Costa Rica, the United States, and Uruguay.

The Commission is expected to leave for Venezuela this week.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 4, 1963]

THE 1962 BLOCKADE RECALLED

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, December 3.—President Betancourt said today that he would seek a partial naval and air blockade of Cuba to prevent the export of arms to Latin America.

This was the strongest of the measures the Venezuelan President said he was asking of the hemisphere meeting in Washington.

He compared his proposal, which would involve the participation of members of the Organization of American States, to the blockade laid around Cuba in October 1962, to force the dismantling of the Soviet missile bases.

Mr. Betancourt, who spoke quietly and with apparent weariness, said foreign correspondents here for the election Sunday had overemphasized terrorism.

In response to a question he denied that the Government had political prisoners. There are 200 to 400 Communist activists in preventive detention, a constitutional procedure, he said.

There are also, "perhaps 100 terrorists caught with bombs and self-confessed slayers of policemen and military rebels serving sentences in jail," he added.

"You cannot speak of political prisoners here," he said.

President Betancourt said he lamented the kidnaping of Col. James K. Chenault, deputy chief of the United States military mission. He said that the police were in searching for him. Colonel Chenault was kidnaped 6 days ago by leftist terrorists.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 2, 1963]

RETICENT VENEZUELAN—RAUL LEONI

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, December 1.—The expected victor in today's presidential election, Dr. Raul Leoni, is a stocky, reticent man who moves slowly and with a certain self-absorption.

He has spent his life organizing the Democratic Action Party, and, when it was shattered, reorganizing it. In fact, it was only with today's election that the party came into its own. For party stalwarts, winning under Romulo Betancourt raises the question whether credit belongs to the party itself or to Mr. Betancourt, a man with a fiery personality.

Mr. Leoni, who is deliberately undramatic in manner and firmly entrenched in party councils, has been half hidden from public view. Today's election demonstrates that party organization rather than personality can win votes here.

Venezuelans who dislike Democratic Action—the upper classes, the professionals, the university students—find in Mr. Leoni the very qualities they find in the party. They consider him a hack and they consider the Democratic Action Party to be composed of hacks who use patronage and coercion to stay in power.

LEADERS RIDICULED

Domingo Alberto Rangel, who is in jail on terrorism charges, was once a top figure in Democratic Action, but left it. He was thinking particularly of Raul Leoni when, in a widely quoted phrase, he described the party leaders as "the tired oxen."

Dr. Leoni is not capable of such phrases, and on a platform he tends to mumble. But in private he has a diffident warmth and solidity that even his enemies recognize. He can sit through endless argumentative meetings and come out with what he wants.

Those who are close to him know, too, that he is a sensitive man. In an interview a few days ago, after some almost mechanical pronouncements about policy, he described the events that first turned him toward politics.

When he came to Caracas at the age of 14 from the backlands region where he was born, he saw his first carnival. He noticed that the boisterous processions kept circling a low, circular building. It was the rotunda where the dictator, Juan Vicente Gomez, kept his political prisoners.

STRUCK BY THE CRUELTY

The dictator would arrange for the carnival crowds to parade around the rotunda. Inside, the prisoners could hear the singing, shouting and laughing of the celebrating men and women outside.

"This was the cruelest thing I could imagine," Dr. Leoni said.

The future politician was born in Upata in the Guayana region on April 26, 1905. He attended the Central University of Caracas, where he became president of the student association.

In 1928 the association joined young army officers in an unsuccessful coup against the Gomez dictatorship. By that time a number of the future leaders of Venezuela—Mr. Betancourt, Dr. Jovito Villalba, Dr. Leoni and others—were working together.

The conspirators fled to Colombia, where Dr. Leoni and Mr. Betancourt ran a fruit stand for a while. After Mr. Gomez died, the group returned, only to be expelled again. When Isaias Medina became President they were allowed to come back.

Mr. Betancourt and Dr. Leoni then organized a political party that eventually became Democratic Action. In this effort Mr. Betancourt was the campaigner and speaker, Dr. Leoni the behind-the-scenes organizer.

Democratic Action and a group of young officers ousted President Medina in 1945, charging that he planned to rig the elections. Dr. Leoni became Minister of Labor. Democratic Action's solid control of organized labor is the result.

Dr. Leoni fled again when Col. Marcos Perez Jimenez took over in 1948 and went to work for the International Labor Organization. When the dictator fell, he returned and organized the campaign that made Mr. Betancourt President in 1959. Dr. Leoni was promptly elected president of the party.

During his last exile Dr. Leoni married Menca Fernandez, a woman of notable political astuteness on whom he has depended considerably for help and advice. They have five children.

PRIVATE PEACE CORPS AIDING LATIN AMERICA

(By Ernest A. Lotito)

Americans, generally speaking, are good organizers. They learn the art early as Cub Scouts and Brownies and practice it for the rest of their lives in the family, the PTA and on the church picnic.

Latin Americans are a different breed. "It's because they have never had a tradition of local responsibility," says Joseph H. Blatchford. "They evolved under the patron system of always looking to somebody above you to get things for you."

The 29-year-old Blatchford's mission is to instill the organizing spirit in the have-nots of Venezuela so that they will start doing things for themselves. The tool: A private Peace Corps known as ACCION (Americans for Community Cooperation in Other Nations), of which Blatchford is the founder and director.

Blatchford is a graduate of UCLA and the University of California Law School in Berkeley. He toured 30 Latin American cities with seven other collegians in 1958–59. He played tennis (he once played at Wimbledon), and the others played jazz.

It was then that the germ for ACCION was born, an idea that grew while he was at law school and culminated in his leaving for Venezuela the day after graduation.

"The organization has been working since 1961," said Blatchford, who was in town yesterday to drum up recruits and money. "We send men and women into an area to organize the people, to make a community of them.

"The goal is to get the average man to participate in his fate," he added. "We serve as the catalyst; they provide the manpower. We get funds wherever we can—from American companies here and in Venezuela, from local governments there."

An example of ACCION's accomplishments is a civic center built in the small town of Maracaibo.

"A volunteer called the townspeople together, and after several meetings they decided they wanted a civic center of their own," Blatchford explained. "Once they built it, other things followed. They graded roads, put in waterlines, and even set up a milk distribution center."

Stimulated by ACCION volunteers, Venezuelans are doing similar things all over the country. In Valencia, it is a school; in the Tuy Valley, a series of rebuilt homes; in Puerto LaCruz, a community center.

Volunteers are mainly Americans who enlist for 18 months and live with the people. They are paid enough to cover expenses.

Blatchford and ACCION are planning to branch out into other Latin American countries. He is looking for people who can organize and get things going.

Interested? Write ACCION, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

VICTORY IN VENEZUELA

It is a tribute to the courage of the Venezuelans, and to their resolve to uphold democratic processes, that such large numbers of them—about 96 percent of all the eligible voters—took part in Sunday's elections. They did so despite a Communist-directed months-long campaign of vicious bombings, murders, and other forms of terrorism designed to frighten them into staying away from the polls.

This violence, including last-minute threats to gun down anybody lining up to cast a ballot, has been the work of a Red-led underground organization that calls itself the Armed Forces for National Liberation (FANL). The organization, which is equipped with large quantities of weapons smuggled in from Fidel Castro's Cuba, can be counted upon to continue with its abominable activities in the weeks and months ahead. But in view of how the Venezuelan voters have defied it—almost contemptuously, with nose-thumbing mockery—it is likely to undergo a progressive decline in strength.

The election results are promising in that respect. Raul Leoni, his chief lieutenant, apparently has been chosen by a big plurality to succeed President Betancourt, who was debarred by Venezuela's constitution

from running for a second 5-year term. Unless some untoward event intervenes, Mr. Betancourt, when his tenure expires next March, will be a man of very special distinction: The first freely elected Chief Executive in his country's history to serve out a full term and turn over his office to a freely elected successor. And Mr. Leoni, with the FALN thus having suffered a major defeat in its attempt to wreck constitutional government, may be expected to intensify Mr. Betancourt's efforts to smash the terrorists completely.

This must surely be one of the prime objectives of the prospective new government. Another must be an unremitting drive to seal off Castro's Kremlin-supported tyranny. Mr. Betancourt already has taken a long step in that direction by calling upon the Organization of American States to unite in preventing Communist Cuba from committing further acts of aggression in the hemisphere. The Venezuelans have in effect voted overwhelmingly for such action, and most public opinion south of the Rio Grande is in the same sort of mood: It is anti-Red, and it would like nothing better than to see an end put to Havana's exports of hate, subversion, and terroristic aggression.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, December 5, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 4, 1963:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be senior surgeon

Walter F. Edmundson

To be surgeons

Maurice E. Snyder
Joseph H. Roe, Jr.

To be senior assistant surgeons

John T. Potts, Jr.
James D. MacLowry
John L. Overby
Joseph F. Piffat
Arthur T. Gronner
Norman J. Knorr
Matthew P. Dumont
Herschel M. Schwartz
Norbert J. McNamara
Denny W. Walters

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Stephen L. Bissell
Donald P. Lecklitner
John H. Reiber
Donald F. Stoick

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Santo A. Furfari

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Gerald E. Siefken
Paul B. Smith
Clarence C. Oster
Guntis Ozolins
Jack R. Farmer
Elmer G. Cleveland

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Darwin R. Wright
Wayne A. Blackard

To be scientist

Ibrahim J. Hindawi

To be sanitarian

Kenneth L. Pool

To be senior assistant sanitarians

John E. Regnier
Litsey L. Zellner
Michael B. Musachio
James M. Cox

To be assistant sanitarian

James F. Lawler

To be veterinary officer

James F. Wright

To be senior assistant health services officer

Victor R. Stoeffler

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1963

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rabbi Harold P. Smith, Congregation Agudath Achim of South Shore, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, emerging as we now do from the darkened valley of irretrievable loss, and rising, as we now do, from the throes of crushing adversity, we come to Thee for Thy divine blessings and guidance; for the restoration of spirit which can come only from Thy divine light.

Immersed though we be in somber thoughtfulness, we nevertheless see ample reason for gratitude and consolation in the demonstrated capacity of our great and glorious Republic to carry on, in our saddest and darkest hours, with strength and determination, with peacefulness and orderliness, with respectful relegation of party differences—all characteristic only of free world democracies.

We continue to pray, as we always shall, for the soul of our fallen leader, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. We pray also, from the very depths of our being, for the welfare of our newly risen leader, Lyndon B. Johnson. Bless him, we pray Thee, with long life, good health, and Thy divinely replenished resources, that he might continue, as he has started, with honor, vigor, and courage, to meet the weighty burdens and overwhelming responsibilities which have so suddenly been thrust upon him.

We ask, also, Thy benign blessings upon the Speaker of the House and upon all our esteemed legislators whose awesome responsibilities in these epochal times of unpredictable events call upon them to make decisions which affect the permanent destiny not only of their own countrymen, but of all mankind.

May they honor the deep trust we have placed in them by finding, this day, new vistas of insight which Thou alone canst supply; that they might shed a new and alleviating light upon the crucial issues which oft divide us one from another in these critical times when unity and good will are so vitally needed for survival.

Help us, O Lord, help us; that we in these blessed United States of America, shall indeed be united States, and that all of us shall approach and solve our problems with love and understanding, in a united state. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2467. An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak., and

H.R. 2905. An act 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 message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9291. An act 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.

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

H.R. 8667. An act authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. METCALF, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1565. An act 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;

S. 1931. An act to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians;

S. 1968. An act 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; and

S. 2279. An act to authorize the transfer of the Piegan unit of the Blackfeet irrigation project, Montana, to the landowners within the unit.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1243. An act to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be allowed to conduct its hearings during general debate for the rest of this week.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DISCHARGE PETITION ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next I shall file, under the rules of the House, a discharge petition to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of House Resolution 574 entitled "A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill." It is hoped that a goodly number of the Members of the House will sign that petition promptly so that we can get the bill on its way and passed and enacted into law. I know of no better monument to the memory of the late lamented John Fitzgerald Kennedy than to pass the civil rights bill.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may sit while the House is in session during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE CAPTAIN MICHAEL D. GROVES

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning for another sad task as a result of the assassination of our beloved President. I rise to announce the death, unfortunately, yesterday of Capt. Michael D. Groves, the commanding officer of the Honor Guard Company of the 1st Battalion, 3d Infantry—Old Guard—Fort Myer, Va., who was in charge of the military arrangements at the funeral of the President. From the time President Kennedy's body reached Washington, D.C., Captain Groves worked day and night to handle these arrangements and he directed the military honors for the President's funeral. Unfortunately, Captain Groves overtaxed himself and died yesterday evening at supper, as a result of acute cardiac congestion, at the age of 27.

He was responsible for the training and supervision of the body bearers, death watch, rifle firing party and caisson escort for President Kennedy's funeral in Arlington Cemetery.

Born in Detroit, Mich., his legal residence was Ann Arbor, Mich. Captain Groves is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Donald W. Groves who live in Cleveland Heights, Ohio; his wife, Mary Frances, and a daughter, Kelly Ann, age 3.

This is another tragic incident that has flowed from this recent assault on the Government of the United States. It is a sad occasion on which we wish to console his family and send our sincere sympathy in their bereavement. Captain Groves has died in the service of our country in a job well done.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 217]

Adair	Hall	Morton
Ashley	Hébert	O'Brien, Ill.
Becker	Jensen	O'Konski
Bromwell	Kelly	Passman
Cameron	Keogh	Powell
Clausen, Don H.	Latta	Rivers, Alaska
	Long, La.	Robison
Dawson	McFall	St. Onge
Fulton, Tenn.	McLoskey	Shelley
Gibbons	Mailliard	Sheppard
Gill	Matsunaga	Trimble
Glenn	Milliken	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 398 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

REVITALIZE THE AMERICAN COTTON INDUSTRY

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 further 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 motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 6196, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] had 49 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] had 37 minutes remaining. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the Dean of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 6196 is indispensable to the security of the Nation; vital to the future of our textile industry, and urgently necessary to the cotton growers of the Nation. If the textile industry and our cotton farmers are to survive, H.R. 6196 must be enacted.

Briefly, this is what the bill does:

First. It equalizes the cost of U.S. cotton between domestic and foreign mills.

Second. It authorizes $10 million a year on special research to cut growing costs.

Third. It moves maximum supports to 30 cents in 1964, 29½ cents in 1965, and 29 cents thereafter.

Fourth. It approves 10-percent higher supports—up to 32.47 cents—on the first 15 bales raised.

Fifth. It provides that if allotments on the 1964–66 crops exceed 17 million acres, half the excess would be divided among base allotments—the other half would go to farmers who want to overplant by 20 percent, selling the overplanted production at world prices.

The textile and apparel industries play a leading role in the economy of our Nation. One out of every eight manufacturing employees in the United States works in this industrial complex.

Additional thousands of employees are involved in the raising of cotton and other related activities. This industry clothes every man, woman, and child in the Nation. Its products are found in every room, in every home, and in every office of this land.

It has been frequently said that the textile industry, supplying over 10,000 separate items in support of our World War II effort, ranked second only to steel as an essential war industry.

When a condition develops that adversely affects such a vital segment of our economy, something positive must be done. Bad times have fallen upon this agricultural-industrial complex. It is so bad that its very future is endangered.

The causes for these difficulties and the circumstances surrounding them are several, but unquestionably the principal one is a direct result of acts of the Congress and Government policies resulting therefrom.

During the depression, the cotton farmers of America, along with all other major agriculture groups, needed and received Government help. The first step taken by the Government was to establish price supports.

The second step taken by the Government on their behalf was to eliminate foreign competition. Barriers against the importation of foreign-grown raw cotton into the United States were established, with the insignificant exception of less than 1 day's mill supply annually.

Price supports rose progressively so that in time they exceeded the free world market price of raw cotton. In other words, the assistance which our Government gave our cotton farmers in the form of price supports priced U.S. raw cotton out of the world market and resulted in drastic cuts in the export sale of American-grown raw cotton.

For 150 years, raw cotton constituted America's largest agricultural commodity sold overseas; it was responsible for our largest balance-of-payments exchange. In pricing cotton out of the world market by excessive price supports,

our Government created a major economic threat to the United States.

Congress recognized this threat and in 1956, with the expressed intention of recapturing America's traditional position in the sale of world cotton, we enacted a statute directing the Secretary of Agriculture to subsidize the exportation of domestically grown raw cotton so that it might be sold at the world price in the international marketplace.

These three actions by the Congress and the executive branch of the Government:

First, establishing price supports for domestically grown cotton.

Second, prohibiting the importation of foreign-grown cotton into the United States.

Third, subsidizing exported raw cotton—when combined with the overall agricultural programs of the Government protected and stabilized our cotton growing economy.

For these steps our Government is to be commended. These same three actions, however, when coupled with the reduction, to the point of near abolition, of U.S. tariffs on foreign cotton textiles entering this country, have had a drastic and nearly chaotic effect upon the domestic textile industry. Foreign textiles have been allowed to flood the U.S. markets.

The import situation is only half the story, however, so far as the bad effects of this Government-created condition in which our domestic industry finds itself.

Another effect of the noncompetitive price of cotton is that since the end of 1960 other fibers have had an increase in consumption equal to 2,652,000 bales of cotton in annual rate while cotton has had a decline of 52,000 bales.

If cotton had no competitive loss in the market throughout this period it would have received 55 percent of this increase. Cotton consumption in the first quarter of 1963, instead of being down from the last quarter of 1960 would have been 1½ million bales higher. In other words, cotton has suffered a competitive loss of 1½ million bales in a little over 2 years.

To know these facts and to permit the situation to continue uncorrected is unthinkable.

The U.S. Government requires domestic mills to pay $42.50 a bale more for domestically grown cotton than this same cotton is offered to foreign mills. This results in what is referred to as two-price cotton—the high price American mills have to pay for cotton and the lower price at which foreign mills may buy the same cotton.

When U.S.-grown raw cotton is sold to foreigners for $42.50 a bale less than Americans must pay for the same cotton, our domestic industry is at a terrific raw product cost disadvantage.

And, since foreign mills pay their labor 75 to 90 percent less in wages than do American mills, this gives foreign mills a labor cost advantage in addition to the raw product cost advantage they have over our domestic mills. Other production costs in foreign lands are also much lower than in this country.

Clearly it can be seen that the plight of the domestic textile industry is U.S. Government imposed. This condition has prevailed since 1956. The situation the industry finds itself in today is not caused by inefficiency, business ineptness, or the inability to survive in the free and competitive environment of doing business in the United States.

Today's effort to remedy this affliction to the domestic textile industry is not the first that has been made.

In 1955 the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute petitioned the Secretary of Agriculture for action under section 22 of the Agriculture 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 Department of Agriculture in February 1956.

In 1956, an amendment to the farm bill (H.R. 12) to impose import quotas on foreign cotton textiles was offered by Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia; it was defeated by a vote of 33 to 57. During the same session we saw the Senate reject two proposed amendments, in favor of import quotas, to the foreign aid bill. A fourth amendment, offered by Senator YOUNG of North Dakota, to limit imports of surplus agricultural commodities and their products not covered by a section 22 quota was narrowly beaten by a vote of 43 to 45. Another amendment applicable only to cotton textiles was offered by Senator JOHNSTON, of South Carolina; it too was turned down by a vote of 36 to 52. The only measure to aid our domestic industry that was passed by that session of the Congress was the inclusion of section 204 in the Agricultural Act of 1956. Section 204 authorizes the President to negotiate with foreign countries to limit imports.

Negotiations aimed at limiting imports from Japan which at that time accounted for the largest volume of cotton textiles imported into the United States began in 1956. In 1957 the negotiators agreed upon a 5-year plan for voluntary control of Japanese exports of cotton textiles to the United States. Since this agreement applied solely to Japan, when the Japanese restrained their shipments other textile exporting nations increased theirs.

In 1959, the domestic cotton growing 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 rejected the recommendations.

While these efforts were taking place cotton textile imports were climbing from 135 million square yard equivalents in 1952 to more than 1 billion square yard equivalents in 1962. Since 1955, despite a population increase of approximately 20 million, there has been a loss of nearly 200,000 jobs in the textile-apparel industries and consumption of domestic raw cotton and cotton products has failed to expand with the population.

It was against this background and with the knowledge of these conditions that President Kennedy took office in January 1961. He recognized the problem and its seriousness to our Government and our people, and he resolved to do something about it. He immediately appointed a five-man Cabinet Textile Committee, composed of the Secretaries of State, Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, and the Treasury, to inquire into the situation and to recommend to him what should be done. As a result of the committee's inquiries, President Kennedy on May 2, 1961, announced his seven point program for the assistance to the textile industry.

That very same month industry initiated action in the Office of Emergency Planning under the national security clause of the Trade Agreements Act. They presented the most detailed and extensive case ever filed with this office. The evidence was designed to establish the fact 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.

There were those of us in Congress who had observed for many months these deteriorating conditions developing in the agricultural-textile economy. I called together some of my colleagues who are most directly affected by this situation so that we might confer with and advise with the late President on ways to alleviate the situation. One hundred and twenty-seven Members of the House responded and we have met over the past 2½ years. Representatives of this group upon several occasions discussed the matter with our late President.

There has been, I believe, general acceptance and support of President Kennedy's seven-point program. One of these seven points deals with the abolition of two-price cotton. That is the major purpose of H.R. 6196.

Prior to developing the reasons why the enactment of this bill is necessary to the Nation as a whole, and to the cotton, textile, and apparel industries in particular, I wish to take just a moment to report upon some of the other points of President Kennedy's program which will put into proper context the absolute necessity of the enactment of H.R. 6196, a bill which will not injure this highly complex and interrelated program, but will, instead, preserve this critical segment of our economy from further internal erosion and unfair external competition.

Our late President recognized that an unrealistic and inequitable tax depreciation schedule was imposed upon the textile industry. He directed the Department of the Treasury to study the situation to take corrective action. This was done. As a result, I am happy to report that intensified modernization and purchase of new and replacement equipment are taking place, thus further perfecting one of this Nation's most efficient and advanced industries.

The contribution to be made to the industry by intensified research was also recognized by President Kennedy, and in accordance with his wishes the Congress made initial funds available for this purpose. Encouraging reports have been received from competent experts in the Department of Agriculture and the cotton-growing industry that with increased research into the costs of growing cotton over the next 5 to 10 years a reduction in costs may be anticipated of 10 cents per pound.

In November 1961 the Department of Agriculture, for a second time, in accordance with the fourth point of the program, sought Tariff Commission action to limit imports under section 22. President Kennedy widened the scope of this investigation by extending it to cover the effect of imports on all U.S. cotton programs. In spite of these measures by the executive branch the Tariff Commission in September 1962 once more ruled against relief for the domestic textile industry.

A 19-nation, 1-year cotton textile arrangement was negotiated in 1961, and a 23-nation, 5-year arrangement was negotiated in 1962. Both of these arrangements sought to control the flow of cotton textiles into the United States, but satisfactory enforcement of the arrangements by the United States has been rendered extremely difficult because of the raw cotton costs advantage enjoyed by foreign mills. The windfall profits which accrue to foreign manufacturers and domestic importers are such that they encourage every conceivable device for circumventing the terms of the arrangements. The advantage two-price cotton gives foreign mills, at the expense of U.S. mills, was aptly described by President Kennedy as "the unique burden" borne by the domestic textile industry.

Developments of this present legislation to remove the inequity of the Government-established two-price cotton program began at the direction of President Kennedy in late 1962, following the adverse decision of the Tariff Commission.

It is evident that H.R. 6196 came into being against a background of complex and involved political and economic conditions which have developed over a period of several years. Two-price cotton was created by the Government; two-price cotton must be abolished by the Government. The passage of H.R. 6196 will do just that.

The ultimate success of our late President's entire seven point program will be greatly enhanced by the passage of this legislation.

This bill was not casually arrived at. It is the product of extensive hearings involving every interest in the vast agricultural-industrial cotton complex. A sincere effort, and I submit a successful one, has been achieved to strike a delicate balance between the various and sometimes diverse elements of this industry, without doing violence to any. It is, I think, a tribute to the very fundamental nature of the American industrial and governmental system to recognize the successful coordination of individual interests in H.R. 6196 for the purpose of breathing new life into a great and vital industry.

I urge that the bill with the committee approved McIntire amendment be passed. It is the considered judgment of the industry, the Department of Agriculture and the Agriculture Committee of of this body that this legislation should be enacted in the form in which it has been presented to us. Such a delicate balance has been struck between all the diverse interests involved that to tamper with its present form will unquestionably seriously jeopardize the entire legislation. I encourage your support of H.R. 6196 with the belief that it is the best, if not the only, workable solution to abolish an injustice imposed by Government upon this indispensible segment of our domestic economy. I thank you.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, former Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with my good friend and colleague for many years, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in support of the bill H.R. 9196. I am hopeful that the Cooley bill will pass the House today because it maybe the last chance the many textile firms of this country have to live.

You who may be removed from the textile communities do not realize the hardship that has been imposed upon this industry in recent years. Only a month ago a large textile factory in my district closed, and I understand another one is threatened.

Mr. Chairman, these closings mean hundreds of people are going to be thrown out of work, hundreds of good, honest working men and women who only want a fair chance to earn an honest living. They are deprived of that opportunity because of intolerable conditions imposed by our Government.

These industries are not only forced to pay 8 cents a pound more for their cotton than the industries of Japan and European or other Asiatic countries, but they are also forced to compete with the cheap wages paid abroad which are very much less than in this country.

Why are we forced to do this? It is due in large measure to our foreign policy which demands that we make these sacrifices. I am hoping that we may be able to solve this problem and remove these artificial conditions.

But, if we are forced to pay this extra amount for our cotton, the burden should not fall entirely upon the people who work in the textile industry. It is an expense for the whole country and they should share in the expense.

I do not like a lot of policies in these various farm bills. Some of them have been very obnoxious to me. But we are faced today with one fact, and that is if we do not pass this bill the chance of survival of the textile industry is very limited. In view of that fact I make this plea on behalf of thousands of people who are employed in my district and whom I want to keep working. I believe it is good for the workers and I believe it will give American private enterprise a chance to flourish.

I join with my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, in support of this bill. It is the last chance of the textile industry to get a little justice from this Congress. I do not think anyone is so hardhearted or sectional minded that they would want to destroy the oldest industry in America. I live within a stone's throw of the place where the textile industry started. I know from the old citizens that it started in the city of Pawtucket, R.I., just across the river. The first textile mill was formed immediately after the Revolutionary War. The people of the country at that time knew they had to have this type of industry, and they have made continued efforts in its behalf.

The prompt passage of this bill will be hailed with joy by the thousands of people who work in the textile industry.

The textile industry was needed in the early days of our Republic. It is an absolute necessity both in peace and war. We must not sacrifice it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, there is virtual unanimity on two facts about the current cotton situation: First, that cotton is in serious economic trouble, and second, that something must be done to prevent further inroads by competing fibers into its markets. The disagreement and the controversy is centered on the question of how to solve a critical situation.

At the outset, let me say that I intend to vote for H.R. 6196 if the amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Maine is adopted. I am doing so in full recognition of the fact that the bill provides temporary additional cost to save the cotton industry.

It would serve no purpose for me to repeat the numerous facts which all add up to one thing—American cotton is in deep trouble. Most of its current problems stem from the fact that its price is too high to permit it to compete for markets. That its price is too high is the direct result of poor and unwise administration of existing cotton legislation by the current Secretary of Agriculture. To permit the present cotton program to continue as it is now being administered, would cost, in my judgment, far more than the cost of the program embodied in the legislation now under discussion.

H.R. 6196, if amended as proposed by the gentleman from Maine, offers the only practical and possible method for solving the cotton problem. It points the way toward a cotton program that permits the industry to realize its full potential and exist without dependence on Federal subsidy.

If we accept the fact that cotton's markets will not wait and that immediate action must be taken to prevent further loss of markets and contraction of the industry, there are virtually no alter-

natives to the proposed bill. I doubt that anyone seriously entertains the thought that price supports can be immediately lowered to a level that would allow American cotton to meet its competition at the "world price." Such a step would ruin the vast majority of cotton farmers across the entire belt. And the resulting economic consequences would be felt far beyond the farm level.

Likewise, elimination of the export subsidy would not solve the problem. Without the export subsidy, American cotton would be virtually eliminated from foreign markets. When we consider that cotton earns about $750 million yearly in foreign exchange, we realize that the national interest militates against such a move.

H.R. 6196 is aimed at improving the economic well-being of the entire industry. But if there is any one branch that stands to benefit the most from the long-run effects of the legislation, it is the producer segment.

Under the existing cotton program, as it is being administered, farmers face a dreary prospect. They are directly confronted with sharply declining markets, and swelling surpluses. If these conditions are allowed to continue, a further reduction in the statutory minimum cotton acreage allotment is almost inevitable.

On the other hand, H.R. 6196, with the amendment of the gentleman from Maine, offers a real opportunity for farmers to produce for an expanding market and actually increase their income from farming.

The gentleman's amendment requires a reduction in price supports from the existing level of 32.47 to 29 cents by 1966. It puts a ceiling on the level of price supports. At the same time, H.R. 6196 directs the Secretary of Agriculture, beginning with the 1965 crop year, to lower price supports to reflect reductions in costs of producing cotton. It also directs that a special cotton research program be instituted to reduce production costs.

This is the only sound solution to the present cotton problem. Costs must be cut if cotton is to compete for its markets without a Federal subsidy and without sacrifice of farm income. The benefits that will flow to farmers from such a program are clear.

The only question is: Can costs be lowered? The answer, I believe, is "Yes," and here is the crux of the matter.

A real potential does exist for much faster progress in cotton technology, especially in lowering the cost of production. Currently an interesting case in point is the boll weevil, which has long stood as the symbol of cost and trouble for much of the Cotton Belt. This is a highly specialized insect which feeds on virtually nothing but the cotton plant and is found mainly in North America. Yet only in the past several years has a research effort of realistic scope been launched against the boll weevil. Already several highly promising leads have been developed, raising hopes that this insect can be brought under much better and cheaper control, possibly even eradicated. There are many comparable opportunities, but the total research effort on cotton is a small one for the vast complexity of problems which exist. Documented testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture shows that adequate research could open the way to an average cost reduction of 11 cents a pound in the next 5 or 10 years. Should this effort be successful, the hand of the Federal Government could be taken off the American farmers back. This must be our ultimate objective.

Cotton production costs must come down, so that prices can come down. Then we can have market expansion, not market contraction. If we assume a static market and try to squeeze all we can from it by the supply-management technique of high price and low production, we will wind up with little or no market.

All the land, labor, and capital now employed in producing and handling cotton stands in serious jeopardy of losing its employment. And this is not the threat, sometimes found in food and feed, that one farm enterprise will be displaced by another. It is the threat that U.S. cotton will be displaced on its home market by industrially produced fibers and in the export market by these together with foreign cotton. In other words, we must contemplate the threat of a large net reduction in the markets served by American agriculture.

On the other hand, there is a great possibility of expansion in the markets for U.S. cotton, representing a net increase in the total output required of our agricultural system.

Of course, there are other competitive factors besides price in the contest for fiber markets. Quality and promotion are the most obvious of these. But on the current competitive scene the role of price is especially crucial.

Over the past 3 years cotton has lost about a sixth of its domestic market to competing fibers. It is clear that this shift was caused largely by a Government-supported rise in the market price of cotton, following and accompanying reductions in the prices of rayon and other manmade fibers. The shift is continuing, with no end in sight.

In exports, it is more difficult to measure the fundamental market changes which reflect real shifts in the competitive position of U.S. cotton. So many temporary factors obscure the basic trend. But at least this much is evident: A few years ago the trend was strongly upward, but today there certainly is no upward trend. There is much reason to fear that it is downward. Meantime the export market for U.S. cotton, even as it now stands, depends vitally upon a subsidy which causes a two-price system, making cotton available much cheaper to foreign than to domestic manufacturers and thus stimulating a tremendous expansion in imports of cotton products.

Our present export price for cotton may or may not be low enough to sustain a healthy continuation of this export market in future years. This is not as yet certain. But quite certainly this export price is part of a two-price system which is itself the target of ever-rising criticism and is unlikely to be tenable, politically or economically, beyond a limited time.

Thus the market for cotton, domestic and foreign, is in critical condition because of the domestic price level. It must be lowered, and the costs underlying it must be lowered.

I deplore the fact that even temporary and modest additional spending is required to provide the time needed for this industry to get on the road to the long-term goal. That it is needed is due to the unsound administration of the current cotton legislation.

But the fact remains that there is a compelling need to eliminate the two-price cotton system. Prices must come down quickly, but costs can only come down more slowly. To bridge the difference in timing, is the reason for a temporary Government program. There is little point in making the effort needed to reduce costs if our markets are to be irrevocably lost in the meantime. But likewise there is little point in further Government subsidy if it merely prolongs the agony of a dying industry or—even worse—if it carries us permanently into deeper dependence upon handouts from Washington. Either the cost-cutting effort or the temporary subsidy would be rather futile by itself.

Fortunately, the legislation, particularly with the McIntire amendment appended, provides the means by which not only the new but also the present Federal subsidies can be eliminated. On balance the good features of the legislation outweigh the bad. If we can move in the direction of freeing the cotton industry from dependence on the Government, we will have done it a great service. This legislation is aimed at that goal.

Let us be honest about this bill. The only alternative to it is a continuation of the incompetence of current agricultural programs which are destroying the freedom and opportunity of millions of American citizens.

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

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. I commend my colleague from Tennessee on his views and his statements. I join with him in support of this legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. BROCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Congress of the United States, many times in my 30 years of legislative life I have been in the position of standing on the floor and fighting for a cause that I knew beforehand was lost. I have that feeling today. It has been said that a speech never changes a vote, but persuasion does. I am afraid the speeches have been too few and the persuasion has been too much.

We have finally reached that stage where we have to make a decision on a far-reaching piece of legislation, one that I believe will kick open Pandora's box for many years to come in the most

serious type of legislative demand ever made upon a legislative body in the history of this United States.

Never in our history have we been asked to subsidize profitmaking, profittaking, and profit-corporate enterprise except in times of duress, emergency, and expansion where expansion was needed for the common welfare.

This legislation for the first time proposes that 35 mill operators in these United States will receive in cash—will receive 75 percent of a total of $350 million. Do not be fooled by the phrase "payments in kind" because when a textile mill has to buy its cotton, it either pays for it in cash or pays for it with a certificate of payment in kind from the Government. It cannot operate without cotton and cannot operate without any other ingredient in its product. Therefore, if it gets the ingredient by certificate, it is in lieu of cash and the certificate is cash.

While not underestimating the cost one way or another of this legislation, I believe the decision goes to a principle far and beyond any that has ever been propounded or expounded on this floor.

We all know about the domestic cost differential between foreign cotton purchases. But the same group that is demanding the passage of this legislation demanded the foreign export to help the cotton farmer in the United States grow cotton for cotton export and the taxpayers in every other section of the United States have paid a subsidy of $500 to $750 million a year—every year in order that we could keep our cottongrowers operating.

I want to say here and now that from the beginning of time agriculture has always had to be subsidized in one form or another. And I subscribe to that principle. I believe that agriculture has to be subsidized in one form or another. But I do not believe that this Congress can step from the necessity of subsidizing the cotton or the wheat or the dairy industry and then move over into subsidizing the processors, producers, and profit takers.

That is what we are doing. They are using strong and compelling arguments. They are saying that 45 mills have been liquidated in the past 5 years due to foreign competition. Who amongst all of us did not know a year ago that foreign competition was a disastrous, dangerous, and catastrophic thing in the economics of this Nation? If you did not know, it was because you did not listen, because I tried for hours, for days, and for weeks, talking in most cases to an empty hall, to warn you about the very danger that is contained in a foreign trade movement which has behind it the most unrealistic philosophy of trade ever conceived in the minds of any legislative body. The increase in imports has been from 100,000 bales in 1954 to 645,000 bales in 1962. They knew that, and they imposed that sickness upon themselves by their vote for the so-called will-o'-the-wisp of free trade.

Mr. Chairman and Members of this Congress, believe me, I have voted and I will vote again to support the cotton farmer, but in this instance the cotton farmer will be hurt. You are taking from the cotton farmers' share of the subsidy and you are going to give it to the mill operator. Any person in this Congress who has never read the story of cotton mills and their operations in this country had better read it before they vote today. I was told that the textile workers are for this bill and therefore I ought to be for it. I have a great deal of respect for the textile workers. In 30 years of legislative work it has always been my aim to vote for and to work for the lesser peoples and the little peoples of this Nation. I have yet ever to have had to apologize for any vote I have cast for any piece of legislation when it relates to the welfare of the farmer or to the welfare of the worker.

The textile workers were against my stand on trade last year, but here they have in their own letter a statement coming from their own president saying that the increased imports because of our trade policy are the reason for the Marland mill shutting down, throwing 453 workers out of work.

I want to tell you I am very, very, very appreciative of the fact that this is the first time in the history of my legislative career that the Farmers Union, and the Farm Bureau have gotten together in opposition to a piece of legislation on the floor of the Congress. And I want to tell you, that is no easy marriage.

Yesterday I heard a Member of this Congress talk about how the cotton workers wanted to stay in the economy. Believe me, my people want to stay in the economy. I have here a labor market letter received this morning from my district. Let me read one line. "A loss of 6,500 more jobs in this district caused the total employment to drop to an alltime low." And why were they out of work? Because subsidized oil killed off the coal mines; because plastics took the place of glass. And the cotton industry is in trouble today because synthetics are taking the place of the natural fiber, cotton.

This legislation is a war chest, and I say this for the record and I defy any Member of this Congress to prove differently. I can prove it by the record that was made before the very committee that brought this bill out. This legislation provides a war chest of $350 million to the cotton textile mills to fight the synthetic textile mills in America.

In our own report to this House, in a statement made by Mr. Hickman Price, the Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, he plainly and bluntly said:

> Indeed, the issue here is whether the use of cotton is to dwindle as a result of our own self-imposed action, or whether the use of cotton is not only to be maintained, but to be increased.

The American farmer, in good times and in bad, has been the basic customer who is with us in peace and war. That customer now needs the only customer he has, the textile mills. Is that industry to continue to be discriminated against by allowing the test tubes and the chemical engineers to develop competition? Because, if you are anxious about the foreign competition, the result could easily have been achieved by creating an 8½-cent-a-pound cotton content component duty against imports. Only 8 percent of the textiles in the United States are imported and 92 percent are domestic. It would cost exactly $27 million to equalize the cost of domestic cotton textiles to the American people with foreign textiles.

Why do we say that 6 million bales of cotton being exported at a subsidy of $42.50 are to be equalized by paying $42.50 on 8½ million bales of cotton?

We finally have arrived at that point where a decision is to be made on a very important question. While not underestimating the costs one way or the other on this legislation, I believe the decision goes more to a principle and a philosophy than it does directly to the dollars involved. We all admit that the present system of Government price supports for cotton create an inequity between American cotton users and foreign cotton users when they are thrown into trade conflict.

On one hand the domestic price is supported at 32½ cents a pound while at the same time the Government enables foreign mills to obtain American cotton at 24 cents a pound. This is roughly a 25-percent advantage given to foreign mills.

In dollars and cents it amounts to $42.50 a 500-pound bale. Sponsors of this legislation are using the politically important argument that this inequity has led to a tremendous increase in cotton products. They say that the increase has been from 100,000 bales in 1954 to 645,000 bales in 1962. They go on to say that skyrocketing imports have contributed to the decline of the domestic industry. Employment has declined from 246,800 workers in 1958 to 223,400 in 1962. In August 1963, it was down to 216,000 production workers. Forty-five mills have been liquidated in the past 5 years wiping out 20,000 jobs.

These are very strong and compelling arguments, however, they deserve more than a passing inquiry. And so, I would like to say in the words of an old political leader—let us look at the record: From 1947 to 1961 industrial production in the United States increased by 50 percent while textile production declined by 2 percent. During the same period, textile employment decreased from 1,325,000 to about 940,000. You can see that while production dropped 2 percent, employment dropped 25 percent.

Most of this was due, of course, to technical advancement, automation, and manmade fibers in the industry. The entire importation of cotton goods amounted to 8 percent of the domestic cotton used by our mills last year. It can be said that the proponents of this legislation are claiming that 8 percent of the domestic market supplied by foreign imports has disrupted the entire market so that U.S. mills, according to page 5 of the committee report is as follows and I quote:

> The economic structure of the American cotton industry now is in jeopardy.

In spite of this, the Tariff Commission has found, again quoting from the committee report, the Tariff Commission has denied a request for relief through an import fee that would equalize the cost

of raw cotton in foreign domestic goods. Let us examine just what this legislation really does. It will pay a subsidy direct to textile mills based on today's cotton prices and the last year's consumption of 8½ million bales of cotton of approximately $350 million.

The proposal of our late, lamented President to assess 8½ cents per pound on imported cotton content in manufactured products would have been assessed as against approximately 650,000 bales of cotton in cotton content amounting to approximately $27 million.

The real loss to the American economy, dollarwise, is the loss of $42.50 on every bale of cotton exported from the United States, which according to the latest figures, is estimated at 6 million bales which means that American taxpayers fail to collect from foreign cotton mills a sum of $255 million.

The passage of this act will not alter this fact, nor will it change this phase of the cotton subsidy program. We will still lose $42.50 on every bale of cotton we export, but this bill will add an additional loss of approximately $350 million to the taxpayers by equalizing the so-called world price to the domestic price.

If this is done for cotton, it necessarily follows that it can, and perhaps should be done for the flour mills, the peanut candymakers, the users of feed grains, and all other subsidized products that flow in the world trade at prices lower than the U.S. support price subsidy.

It is interesting to note that while the impact of imports, and I believe every Member of this Congress knows how I feel about unfair, low-priced imports, I repeat—the impact of the cotton imports, while only 8 percent of our total cotton textile production—nevertheless, according to the sponsors of this act, are responsible for the loss of 45 mills, and 20,000 jobs in 5 years.

Anybody that knows the cotton content of textile fabrics and the finished products sold in the marketplace must realize that while the cotton content is one factor that determines the selling price of a product, it is by no means the major or determining factor, and so we must look elsewhere for relief for the cotton industry since the wages, taxes, necessary and essential services—such as power, heat, transportation are all components of cost, and in each of these areas the differential between the import and the domestic product is much greater and more of a factor than the cotton cost.

Whether we like it, whether we want to admit it, the simple economic facts of life are such that the promise held out to the textile workers to the consumer and to the cottongrowers that all their troubles will be over if they pass this textile mill owner subsidy legislation is but an empty promise and we will be right back where we started with a lot less money in our Treasury if we pass this legislation.

I have not the time to deal in the statistical figures that prove beyond a doubt this is unsound legislation that will not even approach the goal it is intended to reach. Namely, a competitive level with foreign products. We pay at the present time a subsidy of $25 million on exported cotton and we also, using the same figures, are paying a subsidy on domestic cotton of $350 million. Under the terms of this act we would pay an additional amount from $320 to $350 million depending on the success of the reduction in the price program which would make approximately $900 million in total subsidy for the cotton industry.

This would be equal to, and above the total amount of the value of the cotton exports from the United States. In simple, plain language this House of Representatives is today asked to vote to add to an already burdensome program of subsidy, a sum that would make the total of the subsidy out of the pockets of the taxpayers greater than the value of the entire cotton shipment from the United States.

This is some of the reward that we reap from an unsound trade policy which is responsible in the first instance for the two-price system.

No matter how much we add to the subsidy program the American cotton mills will never compete on a price basis with foreign cotton mills in foreign markets or in our domestic market. Once we have admitted this then we must look for a solution, or better still, let us look and see if there is some other reason for the great push on this legislation.

If the sponsors of this legislation wanted to equalize the import cotton cost in order to make American cotton goods competitive—as the proponents claim that we would—then the simple procedure would be to pass legislation charging a customs of 8½ cents a pound on all imported cotton content. This would not have cost the taxpayers a red cent; would have given us $27 million-odd to put into the Treasury to help meet the domestic subsidy program and would have absolutely equalized the cost of the cotton content between imported and domestic cotton goods.

I find it hard to believe that this solution was discarded for the cumbersome, costly, and exorbitant program offered in H.R. 6196.

In searching for an answer to this provocative situation I read very carefully the committee report and on pages 7 and 8 I find the following excerpts from the speech of Mr. Hickman Price, then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and a man whom I remember well as one of the prime promoters of the free trade philosophy, the seven-point textile agreement and the Trade Expansion Act. This is what he had to say:

> We, in the Department of Commerce who are so keenly aware of the difficulties of our domestic textile industry in its struggle against competition, hope that the Congress will consider this legislative proposal favorably and enact it at an early date.
>
> But the issues before the Congress, in considering the proposed legislation is, if I may suggest it, more far-reaching than that merely of the correction of a monstrous inequity. The stake here is the long-term survival of cotton itself as an industrial commodity. The American cotton farmer in good times and in bad times has one basic customer who is with us in peace and in war. That customer is our own domestic cotton textile industry. If the industry continues to be discriminated against as it now is by a very much higher cost of its raw material than its foreign competition, it is inevitable that in the long run, with all the technology now available in today's world, that great customer will progressively switch to other fibers in the manufacture of fabric and apparel. If it is the policy of the United States to substitute the products of test tubes and chemical engineering for the American cotton farmer, then let us continue on precisely the same road that we are now on, because that is where we are going. If, on the other hand, the Congress says that the economy of this Nation should be a balanced one, including a prosperous cotton sector of our agricultural life, then make it possible for cotton's largest customer to continue the use of the basic staple and to increase it.
>
> Indeed, the issue here is whether the use of cotton is to dwindle as a result of our own self-imposed action, or whether the use of cotton is not only to be maintained, but to be increased.

I cannot help but note that for the first time we see a new element introduced into the argument for the passage of this legislation and while the import problem as we admitted before, is one to be considered, it appears that the Commerce Department spokesman has finally admitted that this legislation is aimed at equalizing competitive prices of cotton and manmade fibers. In plain words, that while $27 million would be sufficient to equalize the cost with imported cotton goods, the American taxpayer is going to be charged approximately $350 million to put cotton in a competitive equality with test tubes and chemical engineering.

As Mr. Price says, to balance the economy and to eliminate what he calls the declining of the uses of cotton as a result of our own self-imposed action, meaning of course, that the subsidy program has increased the price of cotton to where it is no competition with synthetic fibers.

Now, if this is the purpose of the legislation, then we ought to discuss that and make a decision as to whether Congress is willing to set up industrial subsidies in order that steel can compete with aluminum and glass can compete with plastics and coal can compete with fuel oil and gas.

Are we entering a new phase of Government spending unwilling. I am sure, unwillingly, except for those few who—like Mr. Price—have stated it in plain language, that this legislation is intended to save the cotton industry from the disastrous affects of synthetic fiber competition.

I have no stated position on this phase of this legislation, but I do not believe that this Congress ought to pass this legislation without knowing exactly what can be the results of its passage. If this is a bill to help the cotton industry fight the chemical industry, it ought to be so stated. The facts and figures in the case strongly tend to corroborate this belief since the disparagement between the amount of extra subsidy paid directly to cotton mill owners cannot be justified solely on the impact of cotton imports.

The truth of the matter is that the remedy insofar as the import impact is concerned is simple, and requires no new legislation. If we pass this bill today, we

are setting aside the findings and the opinion handed down by the Tariff Commission and we are declaring that the importation of cotton textiles is destructive to the cotton industry.

Personally, I lean toward that belief, but this legislation does not prove it.

Getting to that part of the report which tends to show the great advantages to the taxpayer who will be called upon to dig into his pocket to pay millions of dollars to textile mill operators, we find that the proponents of this legislation have put out information which has caused at least one large union in America to send out a fact sheet stating that the passage of this legislation will save the consumers $500 million a year and will create some 35,000 jobs for textile workers.

I will say this, as a personal belief and opinion, that the millions of dollars given to the textile mills will not be reflected in any 2 for 1 savings for the taxpayer who is, after all, the consumer. Second, unless there is a greatly expanded use of textiles of all kinds, jobs created—if any—in the cotton mills will be lost to the textile workers in the synthetic textile mills.

Again, in searching for the logic or reasoning behind such an assumption that by charging the taxpayers $1, we will return to him $2 in savings.

I find on page 7 of the same report, and I quote the following language from Mr. Price, statements which I have difficulty in equating to simple arithmetic, let alone the science of trade economics:

> We not only believe that this reduction will be passed on to the consumer, but we believe that because of the necessary distributive markups which are added as a percent on costs, the reduction will be magnified through the distribution channels. Such cumulative markups in the textile and apparel industries range between 100 and 135 percent.
>
> Utilizing the more conservative markup of 100 percent, and using an annual raw cotton consumption figure of 4.5 billion pounds, each cent of reduction in cost would amount to $45 million, thus magnified to a $90 million saving to the consumer. And this could be higher than $100 million per penny of reduction annually.
>
> This would, of course, not occur overnight because of the variable inventory lag. It may run, for example, from 3 to 8 months, in the case of cotton apparel.
>
> The intolerable inequity imposed on our domestic mills by the difference in cost of raw materials must be done away with, and the costs of payments, whatever they may be, to remove the inequity will find their way into the profits of the American taxpayer as, also, the American consumer. And I doubt that he would shirk the payment of $1 to correct this obvious unfairness in order to receive $2 back in his own purse.

I have difficulty, Mr. Chairman, in trying to equate a $90 million savings to a 0.01-cent reduction in the cost of cotton. Since the textile mills would not be able to pass on to the consumer this reduced purchase price, since the plea is made that the mills cannot sustain their present price structure without this subsidy—and when you realize that the domestic mills sell 92 percent of the cotton content products in the United States—it is hardly conceivable that the mills will pass on to the taxpayer that amount of money doubled that he is paid in taxes as a subsidy.

If this were economically true, and sound, then, Mr. Chairman, why do not we pay a subsidy of a billion dollars and the taxpayer then would save $2 billion in the purchase of cotton goods.

The only way that a subsidy can be used to reduce cost to the consumer at the marketplace is when the subsidy is absorbed by the National Treasury. This, I am sure, will be the ultimate results on any added subsidies passed by this Congress today, or any other time.

It might be interesting to know also, Mr. Chairman, that this subsidy plan will actually give more to the textile mills of the United States than they have been able to earn in any of the last 5 years. This is covered in an address by James E. Robison of Indianhead Mills, entitled "King Cotton's Ransom," which I recommend to be read by every Member of Congress before he votes on this legislation. For purposes of bringing this matter to your attention, let me give you the figures that will demonstrate the point I have just made.

In 1957 the cotton industry used 8,496 million bales of cotton. They paid a premium through subsidy of 38.4 cents a pound, or a total of $326 million. They show a profit on total textile mill products for that year of $306 million.

Skipping then to 1961, and I assure you that the figures are relatively the same, fluctuating with the subsidy payment and total consumption—by taking the figures of 1961—the industry consumed 8,200,000 bales bearing a subsidy of $30 a bale, amounting to $246 million, and made a profit of $261 million. Taking the figures of 1962 estimated at 8,750,000 bales at 42.5 cents, subsidy payment would amount to $371 million. Using the ratio between profit and subsidy on past performance, we will find ourselves in a position of giving textile mill operators a payment in kind, equal to their earned profit for all textile mill products within 10 percent either way.

This means further, Mr. Chairman, that when the textile mills make their next purchases and payment in kind, certificates will buy $371 million worth of cotton out of the surplus, adding that much surplus to the new crop. This is especially so since this legislation will allow increased acreage planting to flow into world trade at world trade prices without subsidy.

Are we to believe that with cotton surpluses already in our warehouses that we can sell more cotton and, in doing so, will we find ourselves faced with another appeal in a few years for an added subsidy for foreign shipments?

The claim of jobs needs a little more study before this Congress can accept a figure pulled out of the air. To say that this industry will increase employment by even one employee cannot be proven by the record because the total textile employment in the United States, including synthetics—as well as cotton textiles—is 940,000 with an industry producing within 2 percent of its 1947 figures when they employed 1,325,000.

When we realize that we will be taking employees from the synthetic plants, it is hard to believe that we will increase production in the cotton textile mills to provide jobs claimed by the sponsors of this act. The opposite may very well be true in that a combination of this windfall of 300-odd millions of dollars, plus the windfall given into industry under the expansion incentive plan, allowing tax credits for modernization and automation of plant facility may very well bring about a lessening of job opportunities in this industry.

I would gamble my reputation as a political prophet, and say to this House that if this legislation is passed as it is now written, it will go down in history as one of the most ill-conceived, ill-considered spending programs ever to pass the Congress. This, I believe, and I repeat as I did on this floor when the trade bill was before us. I said then, that I did not believe the trade bill would create job opportunities in the United States, that it would not create a balance of payments, and it would not increase our exports in any significant amount unless they were subsidized. In closing, I said I pray I am wrong, but I believe I am right—and today I say to you again, I pray I am wrong, but believe I am right.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a bad bill, one of the worst in my memory as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and as a Member of the House of Representatives. Basically this is a mill subsidy bill and nothing else. The legislative history so discloses.

The American Farm Bureau is definitely against this bill. The Farm Bureau says in a recent letter addressed to Members of Congress as follows:

> On behalf of the producers we earnestly recommend that you vote against this legislation. It will not solve the problems of cotton.

Here is a letter dated December 3, 1963, received from the Farmers Union. The first paragraph reads as follows:

> Farmers Union respectfully urges your active opposition to H.R. 6196. The enactment of this cotton mill subsidy bill is not in the best interests of farmers nor of taxpayers.

This is the first triple subsidy bill in agricultural history as far as I know. It includes a subsidy for the producers, an export subsidy and now it is proposed to add a mill subsidy. Those of you who have talked about economy in Government—and a lot of you have, although you do not always vote that way. Here is an opportunity for you to stand back of our new President who said the other day that he wants to reduce Federal expenditures. I commend him for it.

This bill is going to cost over $635 million more than the present cotton program over a 3-year period. How can anyone conscientiously vote for this costly bill when we are trying to cut down Federal expenditures? You are going to have a chance to go on record on a roll-

call vote, and we will see who is for economy when the votes are counted.

This bill also contains back-door spending to which most of us have been opposed.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would encompass and adopt the oft repudiated Brannan plan of production payments or compensatory payments which we have fought against long and hard throughout the years. Here it is again for another trial run. It is a bad proposal. The worst part of the bill is really the precedent that we will be setting if we adopt the Brannan plan. I hope you fully realize just what you are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I am more concerned about the precedent involved than anything else. Have we gotten to the point where we are going to bail out and subsidize every industry that gets into trouble?

I sympathize with the cotton mills of this country. I know the problems involved. However, the chickens are just coming home to roost; that is all. Those of you who so valiantly supported the Trade Agreements Act, well know what it is doing now to American industry. The proof of the pudding is in the eating and a lot of industries have already gone out of business. Those of you from the cotton belt who have gone all out for foreign aid are beginning to realize that something has happened to the cotton industry as a result of foreign aid. We have spent millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to teach people overseas how to plant more and better cotton with American taxpayer money. You are in trouble, and it is now proposed to bail out the mills, this will not solve the problem and we will be again confronted with the same problem after 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, if we accept the Brannan plan in this bill, I want to predict right now that we will have the dairy industry asking for the same kind of relief. The dairy industry is in trouble in this country. Why not bail them out in the same way when they are in trouble?

What are you going to say to the dairy farmers, what are you going to say to the cheese manufacturers, the butter manufacturers when they also ask for help?

Just now those of us from the cattle-feeding areas of this country are hearing from our farmers about the importation of beef from foreign countries which is really reaching great proportions, and the administration is not doing anything about it.

Mr. Chairman, in order to be fair to all industries we will have to take care of all of them and not discriminate as it is proposed to do in this bill. One of the cotton mills, believe it or not, is going to get approximately $20 million, even with the so-called McIntire amendment. They are going to be the real beneficiaries. The cotton farmer is not going to get much out of this. The consumer certainly is not. The cotton mills will get the gravy.

Mr. Chairman, a former Speaker of the House, John Nance Garner, once said, "Don't tell me what a bill says, tell me what it does."

The bill before the House today does this:

First. It increases the cost of the present cotton program by at least $635 million over the next 3 years for a yearly average of $212 million more than the present program.

Second. It adds new and expensive subsidies to "persons other than producers" in order to reduce the cost of cotton to U.S. textile mills.

Third. It authorizes these payments to be made in kind—that is, in surplus cotton. The Congress will not have control over the total amount of these payments or over the amount paid to any one recipient after this bill becomes law. This bill is both an authorization and an expenditure piece of legislation.

Fourth. It discriminates against areas of efficient cotton production—particularly in our Western States.

Fifth. It establishes a dangerous precedent for other commodities.

Sixth. It continues and expands Government domination over the cotton industry.

PRESENT PROBLEM SERIOUS

Mr. Chairman, I take a position in opposition to this bill because it is bad legislation, not because a serious problem does not exist. I believe that every member of the Committee on Agriculture recognizes that the cotton industry is in trouble at present.

The income of cotton farmers will be down this year for the reason that the Secretary of Agriculture has cut the national cotton acreage allotment from 18.1 million acres to 16.2 million acres without changing the level of support in dollars and cents.

Taxpayers' costs under the present program are heavy—some $612 million in the 1962–63 marketing year—and the August 1, 1964, carryover of all cotton is now expected to be nearly 12 million bales. The taxpayers of this country have over $1.6 billion tied up in surplus cotton.

The American textile industry is faced with a real dilemma. Foreign textile competition enjoys a price for its raw cotton at least 8½ cents below that available to American textile firms, and imported textile products have caused widespread hardship in the textile industry. The U.S. Tariff Commission has failed to grant relief to the industry, and the long-term agreement on textiles made in Geneva, Switzerland, has not been fully implemented by our Government.

In spite of our heavy export subsidy program, U.S. exports of cotton have dropped very sharply in 1962–63 and ran nearly 1.3 million bales behind last year.

Cotton as a fiber is rapidly losing its dominant place as king of the textile industry. Twenty-four years ago when the Government first became involved in the production control program on cotton, this commodity represented 81.6 percent of all fiber use. Last year, 1962, cotton held only 59.8 percent of total fiber use.

Because of dwindling cotton markets and the intense pressure on textile manufacturers to utilize automated equipment, many thousands of textile workers have lost their jobs. As the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America said in its January 1963 policy statement:

> The American people are paying three penalties for the outmoded cotton price-support program. First, they have to foot the bill for the Federal payments to cotton farmers in support of the inflated price of cotton. Second, they are taxed to provide subsidies amounting to $200 million a year to exporters of cotton products. Finally, they have to pay at least $600 million a year more for domestically produced cotton products than would be necessary in the absence of high support prices.

This bill seeks to solve the present problems of cotton by turning to the Federal Treasury for a new subsidy—a subsidy for the domestic textile industry to offset the effect of the other two subsidies in the cotton marketing structure. It will be, I believe, the first triple subsidy farm program ever enacted.

COST

Many times in the past when the House has debated farm legislation, there has been a great deal of argument about the cost of the pending bill. This time we can all agree, I believe, that the program will cost taxpayers more than the present program.

The proponents of H.R. 6196 say it will cost $118 million more in the first year, $88 million more in the second year, and $44 million more in the third year.

I contend the actual cost will average at least $212 million more during each of the next 3 years.

The reason for the difference in my estimate is that the proponents of H.R. 6196 do not assign any cash value to 950,000 bales of Government-owned cotton to be used as payment in kind. This cotton is now held in the inventories of CCC.

I feel in all fairness that this cotton has a real value—a value of at least 24 cents a pound, which is the present world price of cotton.

In addition, the bill proposes to make payments on cotton now held in private inventories. This payment could be and probably would be 8½ cents a pound. If it were not that much, there would still be two-price cotton which supposedly is to be eliminated by this legislation.

COST OF THE COOLEY COTTON BILL, H.R. 6196

The Cooley cotton bill, H.R. 6196, proposes to add new and expensive subsidies to the cotton program.

Everyone concerned with this legislation, both opponents and proponents, agree that the cost to taxpayers will increase under the bill. The question is, "How much?" According to estimates prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the total additional cost would be $635.9 million during the next 3 years.

In May 1963, Department of Agriculture witnesses appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to testify on cotton legislation. In its testimony the Department estimated that the cost of the cotton program with the Cooley bill would be $779.4 million

in 1964, or an increased cost of $228 million over and above the cost of the program under present law.

The Department's estimate was based on a 6-cent trade incentive payment the same as what would be provided under the McIntire amendment.

The table showing the Department's estimate presented to the Senate committee appears at page 42 of House Report No. 366 on H.R. 6196.

On October 14, 1963, the Department of Agriculture published a new estimate of the cost of the Cooley bill which assumes the adoption of the McIntire amendment. A copy of that table is attached.

You will note that this table shows an increased cost of $118.2 million in the first year, an increase of $87.9 million in the second year, and an increase of $44.3 million in the third year.

Please note that the table shows the additional cost of the trade incentive payments—$283.5 million in the first year, $259.9 million in the second year, and $236.2 million in the third year—being offset by the domestic value of 950,000 bales of cotton during each year—29.25 cents per pound times 950,000 bales—thereby leaving a "net cost" of the trade incentive payments of $144.6 million in the first year, $123.3 million in the second year, and $102 million in the third year.

This table also shows a "reduction in CCC stocks in addition to cash expenditures" of 950,000 bales each year. Stated another way, this means that in addition to the added cash costs of H.R. 6196, the value of 950,000 bales is added to the cost of the present program. Some proponents of the bill argue that these 950,000 bales of cotton have no value. Some opponents have said these 950,000 bales should be valued at $162.50 each, the cost at which taxpayers acquired them under the price support program—32½ cents per pound times 500 pounds per bale.

It is certainly fair to value this cotton at the world price of $120 per bale—24 cents per pound times 500 pounds per bale—because the Commodity Credit Corporation can always sell at the world price. It is not fiscally rational to assume no value whatsoever for this cotton.

Based on a valuation of $120 per bale reflecting the world price of 24 cents per pound, the value of these 950,000 bales becomes $114 million annually—$120 times 950,000. Therefore, the USDA table which shows a direct additional cash cost of $118.2 million in the first year, shows also an additional cost of $114 million representing the value of the 950,000 bales.

This, of course, means a total additional cost of $232.2 mllion in the first year.

The latest estimate of USDA showing additional costs of $232.2 million in 1964, therefore, is comparable with that agency's estimate in May which showed an additional cost of $228 million in 1964.

For the 3-year period, therefore, the additional costs of H.R. 6196 would be as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

1st year:	
Additional cash cost	118.2
Value of 950,000 bales	114.0
Additional cost	232.2
2d year:	
Additional cash cost	87.9
Value of 950,000 bales	114.0
Additional cost	201.9
3d year:	
Additional cash cost	44.3
Value of 950,000 bales	114.0
Additional cost	158.3
3-year total: Additional cost during the 3-year period, 1964–66	592.4

You will note that the Department's table does not include the one-time transition expenditure. The bill provides for "trade incentive" payments on all cotton in private inventories on the date of its enactment into law. The latest report shows private stocks at 1,023,000 bales. At the full subsidy rate of 8½ cents per pound, this payment would be $43,477,500. It could, of course, be lower if the Secretary set a smaller subsidy rate.

Grand total of additional cost

[In millions of dollars]

3-year additional costs during 1964–66	592.4
Additional cost in 1963	43.5
Total additional cost of H.R. 6193, as amended	635.9

SUMMARY

As seen from the figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture, the total additional cost of this bill as amended by the McIntire amendment would be at least $635.9 million for the next 3 years or an average of approximately $212 million per year.

The reason for this additional cost is simple. The bill with its proposed amendment would add a third subsidy to the present double subsidy structure for cotton. Under present law, U.S. cotton farmers are guaranteed prices 8½ cents a pound above world prices. Cotton exports are subsidized at 8½ cents. This bill proposes to subsidize the domestic textile industry to offset the effect of the other two subsidies.

Cotton: Comparison of major items of estimated expenditures under current legislation and H.R. 6196, based on assumptions listed below

Item	Current legislation, subsequent year	H.R. 6196		
		1st year	2d year	3d year
Support price:	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Middling 1 inch	32.47	30.00	29.50	29.00
Average of crop	31.72	29.25	28.75	28.25
Export subsidy rate	8.5	6.0	5.5	5.0
Trade incentive rate		6.0	5.5	5.0
Increased support on 1st 15 bales of cotton		2.47	2.95	2.90
Estimated expenditures:	*Million dollars*	*Million dollars*	*Million dollars*	*Million dollars*
Export subsidy on 5,000,000 bales	212.5	150.0	137.5	125.0
Cotton products payments	17.0			
Public Law 480 (excluding export subsidy), 1,500,000 bales	180.0	180.0	180.0	180.0
Carrying charges, interest, etc	82.8	74.2	65.7	57.1
Increased support on 1st 15 bales of cotton (5,000,000 bales)		61.7	73.7	72.5
Trade incentive payment:				
Gross amount (9,450,000 bales and payment rate)		(283.5)	(259.9)	(236.2)
Less amount of payment-in-kind paid from CCC stocks with no offsetting expenditure (based on 950,000 bales times average support price)		(138.9)	(136.6)	(134.2)
Net amount of trade incentive expenditure		144.6	123.3	102.0
Total of estimated expenditures	492.3	610.5	580.2	536.6
Net additional expenditures added by H.R. 6196, as amended		118.2	87.9	44.3
		Bales	*Bales*	*Bales*
Reduction in CCC stocks in addition to cash expenditures		950,000	950,000	950,000

NOTE.—The data for H.R. 6196 does not include the 1-time transition expenditures that would be incurred under this bill.

Assumptions:

1. Minimum allotment, 16,200,000 acres.
2. Harvested acres same as in 1963.
3. Yield per harvested acre, 460 pounds (5-year average of 1959–63 yields; 1959, 461; 1960, 446; 1961, 438; 1962 457; 1963, 500 (estimated)).
4. Domestic consumption:
   Under current legislation, 8,600,000 bales (same as estimated for 1963).
   Under H.R. 6196, 9,550,000 bales (950,000 bales increase because of reduced price); 100,000 bales will be from imports and city crop with no PIK payment.
5. Exports, 5,000,000 bales.

NOT IN INTEREST OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY

This bill is not in the interest of the American textile industry. I recognize, of course, that there is a great deal of interest and concern within the textile industry about the present serious problem and consequently, some in the industry are supporting this bill. The legislative history has already been made in our committee that these payments, which are called trade incentive payments, under the bill will be made to textile companies. As pointed out by Dr. Walter Wilcox, senior agricultural specialist of the Library of Congress, a number of textile companies in this country use more than 400,000 bales of cotton a year. I draw your attention to the

fact that a textile company using 500,000 bales in a year and receiving these "trade incentive" payments, would realize at least a $15 million subsidy from the Federal Government each year.

I also draw your attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], a member of the Cotton Subcommittee, and the letter you received from the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT], a member of the full Committee on Agriculture. Both of these Members have documented the effect of this legislation on individual textile companies.

I sincerely believe that the American textile industry should not be placed in a position of relying on direct Government subsidy for its economic survival.

BACK-DOOR SPENDING

This bill is, of course, financed by the device known as back-door spending. The Secretary under the terms of the bill would set price supports and make "simultaneous purchase and sale" payments to farmers and "trade incentive" payments to cotton processors, and then the following year come to the Congress with the request to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the losses incurred in such an operation. The Committee on Appropriations would have no control in advance over either the total amount of the payments or over the size of individual payments.

EFFICIENT GROWERS HURT

This bill discriminates against the production of cotton in the more efficient areas of the Nation such as the Mississippi Delta area, west Texas, and the Far West. The hearings on this legislation showed clearly that many farmers in these areas would be willing to accept a lower price for cotton in return for an expanded acreage. The overplant provisions of this legislation would not even begin to come into operation until the national allotment reached 17 million acres.

When we recall that the present allotment is 16.2 million acres and there will be a surplus of nearly 12 million bales on August 1, 1964, it is obvious that it is going to be quite a long time, probably 2 or 3 years, before these growers could even hope for a chance to produce more cotton at lower prices. Western members of this House will, I predict, be very sadly disappointed if they support this bill in the hope of acquiring increased acreage for their cotton farmers.

BAD PRECEDENT

When we look at this bill in the cold light of day, Mr. Chairman, we see it simply as a processor subsidy. How many other farm commodities are there that could not use and will not hesitate to ask for similar treatment?

Some segments of the dairy industry are already seeking to establish a 10-cent processor subsidy on butter. If cotton processors receive these subsidies in cotton, how then will Congress be able to refuse wheat processors who ask for payments in wheat, a commodity even more in surplus than cotton? There will be no end to such demands if this bill is enacted into law.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL EXPANDED

In 1958 a Democratic Congress passed and a Republican President signed the Agricultural Act of 1958. The spirit of that statute was to lower cotton price supports to meet man-made fiber competition, to expand cotton acreage, to maintain farm income, to gradually eliminate the advantages of foreign textile manufacturers, and to lower Government costs and involvement in the cotton industry.

Secretary Freeman has chosen not to follow the spirit of that law, and in exercising his discretionary authority, raised price supports on cotton in 1961 and has held them there since.

In 1958 the textile industry was prominent in its support of the Agricultural Act of 1958. This legislation before us today, however, would undo all that has been done before to realistically meet the problems of the cotton industry.

It would bring the Federal Government even further into the cotton marketing and processing structure. For example, about one-third of the cotton crop will be covered under the "simultaneous purchase and sale" provision dealing with the first 15 bales of production of each farmer. Can you imagine the paperwork on this single provision which would directly involve each and every cotton grower in this Nation? And commonsense dictates that the Government will have to supervise carefully the millions of dollars worth of "trade incentive" payments made to cotton processors, thus bringing the Department of Agriculture still further into the daily commerce of this great industry.

WILL CONSUMERS BENEFIT?

Consumers will not benefit from this bill. I realize that an argument is made that by cutting the cost of cotton to the mills by 8½ cents that taxpayers would save $500 million in cotton products. While this point will be debated at length, I would like to make just two brief observations about such a claim.

First. It is entirely inconsistent with the earlier position of proponents of this bill who have told the House for years that an increase in the support prices will not adversely affect consumers.

Second. If a cut in cotton cost to the mills will now save consumers money, then Secretary Freemans' action 2 years ago in raising the cost of cotton to the mills must have cost consumers millions of dollars.

THE ALTERNATIVE

There is really only one alternative to this bill for Members of the House who seek to realistically meet the serious problems of cotton. That alternative is to enact legislation which would require the Secretary to follow the spirit of the Agricultural Act of 1958.

At the appropriate time in this debate I intend to offer an amendment to this bill which would set lower price supports for cotton starting in 1964 while authorizing an intensive research program designed to cut production costs.

SUMMARY

Yes, the problems facing the cotton industry are serious and something should be done to meet the current intolerable situation. We should not, however, turn to this exceedingly expensive and unwise proposal for a remedy. We should instead make the law that we now have work as it was intended to do when it was enacted 5 years ago.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], who addressed the House a moment ago, seems to be a little disturbed over the welfare and happiness of the glassworkers, but he is little concerned with the welfare of the cotton industry of this Nation.

I want to repeat again, there are about 10 million people in this Nation who are interested in the legislation that is now before us.

He mentioned the fact that the AFL–CIO was opposed to this legislation. I challenge the accuracy of that statement, because I know that the AFL–CIO is in favor of the legislation. I know we have in North Carolina more textile workers than in any other State of the Union. He is also in error in his statement regarding organized labor being in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I have been misquoted, and I want the Reporter to read back what I said with reference to the AFL–CIO.

Mr. COOLEY. If I misquoted the gentleman I will give him an opportunity to correct my statement, and I yield to him now.

Mr. DENT. I said the Farmers' Union is opposed to this legislation. The Farmers' Union.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not know they were an offspring of the AFL–CIO. I am sure the gentleman is in error.

Mr. DENT. It seems from the way we are acting that a lot of Congressmen do not know a lot about a lot of things. I said the textile workers were for the legislation and opposed to my stand, and those in the gallery will substantiate that.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman is speaking to the gallery, that is all right.

Mr. DENT. You are too.

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

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

Mr. JONAS. Just to clear this matter up for the record, I quote the following concluding sentence of a letter I received from Mr. William Pollock, general president of the Textile Workers Union of America, an affiliate of the AFL–CIO, under date of November 11, 1963, as follows:

Because of its importance—

Speaking of the Cooley bill—

not only to textile workers, but to the consumer and the national interest in general, we earnestly urge you to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that is an answer to the situation that the textile union is in.

Since they favor the bill, I hope the House will understand that the bill is important to those who work in the textile mills of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I trust that my position as second man from the bottom on the Committee on Agriculture will be secure after I make this statement today.

I should like to point out that I oppose this legislation. I think it is an inordinately poor bill. I think that many of the things respecting the policy of the bill have not been fully brought to light since we have had a chance to study this bill in the last 5 months since it was reported by our committee.

I should like to point out very briefly the extremism in which the cotton industry is. If you will look at the chart, it starts in 1940 and ends in 1963, with the marking for next year extrapolated. It shows the cash receipts of the cotton farmers for cotton seed and cotton starting down at the $700 million level back in 1940. The green line is the line you are looking at, to the $2.7 billion level at the present time. As you can see, this is the highest earnings they have ever had in their history, save and except for the inordinate marketing conditions during the Korean war.

If you look further at the number of farmers sharing this income, there were 1,600,000 allotments in 1940 and we now have some 700,000 farmers sharing this income at the present time. We have half the number of farmers sharing four or five times the income.

What has happened to the utilization? This is the red line. If you ignore the plateau where the line is, that is the Korean war again, ignoring the inordinate marketing conditions of the two peaks which led to the 1958 act, which corresponds with variations in the market conditions in cotton, you will see that projected for next year we are going to use in the cotton industry 13.8 million bales of cotton. This is a good average. It is more than we used in a lot of years prior to these inordinate conditions we have just passed. I do not think that points out that we have to spend $300 million at the present time to beef up this industry.

We all believe in the Department of Agriculture in their extrapolations as to the health of this industry. If you look at the November issue that the Department of Agriculture put out on the cotton situation, they state here very simply that though our exports this year are 3.5 million bales, if the Cooley bill does not pass and if nothing happens the projections are that we are going to export 5 million bales of cotton next year.

They state that we are using in this market year 8.2 million bales domestically. If nothing happens and we do not pass the Cooley bill we are going to have 8.8 million bales of cotton utilized domestically next year. This does not demonstrate to me that the cotton producers are in extremis. They are in better condition than they have ever been in the history of the industry.

Whom are we trying to help? Our friends in organized labor say we have to keep these jobs and beef up the industry. If you look at the statistics with respect to industrial organizations, the thing we have been fighting not only in the cotton industry but in the petroleum industry and in the food machinery industry is technological unemployment.

This is the monster we are after. There are fewer cotton spindles today because there are bigger spindles working faster with less people on them than we have ever had.

Now what you want to do is to give Burlington Mills $28 million so that they can buy some new spindles and put more guys out of work and confound and compound your problem and this is exactly what you are doing.

As a practical matter this bill should not be on the public calendar today. It ought to be on the private calendar because, really, this is a private bill.

I sent to you a long, complicated chart—I sent that to every Member. I had heard that 35 mills were going to get the bulk of this subsidy after the bill passed out of committee. So then I got the Department of Commerce to give me the 35 leading mills of the country. I asked the Department of Agriculture what was the utilization of those 35 mills. They said they did not have this figure and that you have to get it from the Department of the Census. So we ask the Bureau of the Census to give you the figures. They say, "We cannot give that to you because it is secret information but we can give it to you by fours."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, they say, "We can give it to you by fours—the four greatest producers in the United States and then the next greatest four producers." This puts a burden on any kind of student who is really trying to find out what is going on in this industry. You have to extrapolate and interpolate this industry utilization to get the utilization of the number of bales by the individual 35 large mills.

Now then I find that the largest mill in the country, Burlington Mills, had a net operating income in 1951 of $35 million.

In 1960 they had a net operating income of $105 million.

It went down in 1961 to $90 million—which led to the drive for this legislation.

But then this last year they had a net income of $124,500,000. I checked Standard & Poor's Index for the first three-quarters of this year and I find their net profit this year is going to be the greatest profit in the history of this particular business.

They utilized last year 660,000 bales of cotton.

They are going to receive by this bill in its current form $28 million—which by the way was 80 percent of what Burlington made in 1951.

The next largest firm—Stevens—are going to get $16.2 million.

You might as well name these people right here in this legislation as to exactly what they are going to get.

I think this is the first time in history that we have a situation in an agriculture subsidization bill where we do not let the natural market forces play their hand.

Here $205 million are going to 70 percent of the mills that operate 70 percent of the business throughout the country.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman give us any guarantee that this $28 million which would be authorized for payment to Burlington Mills would be translated into a bigger payroll for the textile workers?

Mr. LEGGETT. That is another thing. When you give $28 million to this one firm, which by the way if you look at the U.S. News & World Report, which I do look at sometimes, you will find that textile industry stocks have gone up 30 percent since the Democratic administration came into office. They are at the top end of the spectrum. They are not at the bottom end of the spectrum. If you want to help this industry, and there are probably some who need some help, it is not at this level as, perhaps, the gentleman from Illinois has inferred. There is a close correlation between the price of raw cotton and the price of gray goods, but there is extremely little correlation in spite of the fact that there are some little tips that correspond to the raw cotton price conditions. There is little correlation between the retail price of cotton and the raw material prices.

No matter how much correlation you have had at the gray cloth line that has nothing to do at all with the utilization. Utilization is established by the consumer demand—that is the ultimate consumer. By this piece of legislation, you are just throwing this money up in the air and if any of it gets down to the consumer level, it may help and it may not.

I think we are making a gross error in passing this kind of bill. I think we are digging the grave not only of the cotton industry and the cotton people, but the grave of practically every farm commodity. This will occur when the American public understands just exactly what we are doing here today and when they understand that this whole issue is because of an increased import of processed cotton cloth of about 200,000 bales. That is what we are talking about. The two-price cotton. In the last 2 years we have had a 200,000-bale increase of processed cotton cloth imports. We have had an $8.8 million domestic utilization. This processed cotton cloth has to come back here from Japan and be reprocessed in our domestic mills to be cut up into material. This is semiprocessed goods that comes back into our country. When that cotton was exported we gave them 8.5 cents a pound and because of

that we have to give everybody in the United States 8.5 cents for the next 3 years for every pound of cotton they process, plus the fact that it will cost us $30 million also to buy their inventory, because we have to make this perfectly equitable. If you want to make it perfectly equitable, what we ought to do is go back 5 years and figure out how much these people lost since the act of 1958 and really make it equitable and give them a subsidization right back to scratch.

I do not think this is a good bill. Rather, it is a poor bill, and it is just unfortunate that we get ourselves into these situations.

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge the fine leadership of the chairman of our Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, HAROLD D. COOLEY. I regret dissenting on a major piece of legislation which contains the hopes of many of our small cotton farmers throughout the Nation.

The test of good farm legislation is simply whether we are buying the best possible net farm income for the most reasonable Federal cost. Unfortunately, as far as I am concerned, I cannot justify the expenditures in cotton for the benefits derived to society and, moreover, I see no real reason other than tradition, which I would like to break with, for giving cotton more favorable consideration than we give to poultry producers and some others.

My figures indicate that in the last 10 years we have expended the following amounts in the cotton program considering Commodity Credit Corporation—CCC—purchases, the raw cotton export subsidy at 8½ cents per pound, the export subsidy on processed manufactured cotton goods, CCC storage and carrying charges, and Public Law 480 sales.

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	CCC loss on cotton sales	Cotton export subsidy	Public Law 480 (food for peace)	Carrying charges on CCC stocks	Total costs
1955	(0.8)		11.2		10.4
1956	66.3		91.9		158.2
1957	420.4	14.2	300.0		734.6
1958	279.5	15.5	194.8		489.8
1959	101.4	22.0	153.9		277.3
1960	212.0	253.1	121.4		586.5
1961	162.6	191.9	223.8		579.3
1962 [1]	137.9	227.0	153.6	26.8	545.3
1963	195.5	165.7	204.0	46.8	612.0

[1] Pre-1962 costs based on losses realized by sales but fail to accrue approximately $50 per bale losses on 3,000,000 bales, including storage, totaling about $150,000,000. Post-1962 figures calculate losses to CCC on acquisition.

GET RID OF TWO-PRICE COTTON?

We are advised now by the cotton producers and the mills that they must now have even more favorable special treatment if the cotton industry is to survive. We are told we must get rid of two-price cotton; that the favorable consideration given to foreign importers is destroying our local markets. The per capita utilization of cotton, it is said, is going down every year.

The facts simply do not bear out the implications from these allegations.

While it is true that per capita use of cotton has gone down from 30.9 to 22.2 pounds per person in the past 12 years, what the cotton proponents do not say is that all fiber use in the United States has declined in the same period from 42.2 to 35.7 pounds per person. Lighter cotton fabrics and lighter synthetics are doing the job.

Also unspecified are the wool and rayon statistics showing reduced utilization of the former, 4.2 to 2.2 pounds per person, and of the latter, 8.9 to 6.1 pounds per person per year.

The allegation that the foreign export preferential treatment is ruining the local cotton market is likewise unfounded. The simple facts are these: The United States produced an average of 14 million bales of cotton per year for 15 years prior to World War II; production went down during the war and has maintained the 14-million-bale yearly average figure since. With modern technology acreages have been steadily reduced to keep this production figure. It should be here noted that when farmer producers deliver the same number of bales on less acres that costs go down and net profits go up. Domestic mill consumption utilized from 6 to 9 million bales per year prior to World War II. Production went up during the war and has maintained a yearly utilization of about 8.5 million bales since that time. An increased population with a constant utilization results in the lower per capita utilization. The Department of Agriculture projects that an 8.2 million 1962–63 utilization will naturally expand to 8.8-million-bale use in 1963–64.

EXPORTS OF RAW COTTON DWINDLING

Exports of raw cotton varied from 6 to 10 million bales before the war, were fractional during the war. Since the war exports varied from 6 million bales in 1960 to 2.8 million bales in 1958 when the 1958 cotton program was enacted, resulting in a utilization of 7.3 million bales in 1959, 6.8 million bales in 1960, 4.9 million bales in 1961, and 3.5 million bales in fiscal 1962–63. Here again the Department of Agriculture in its November bulletin projects a 5-million-bale, natural-export cyclical expansion.

The plain facts are that the United States is a residual world producer and regardless of the export subsidy world markets cannot be maintained if foreign production continues to increase. The foreign cotton is going to be sold first. Free world utilization has risen in the past 10 years, but there has been a greater increase in free world foreign production, particularly in Mexico. The point is that we need to keep the export subsidy to keep our diminishing share of the world market which buys and sells 25 percent below the U.S. market.

EXPORT SUBSIDY—LITTLE EFFECT ON LOCAL MARKETS

Does this export benefit deteriorate the American domestic market? I think not.

Respecting our exports of processed cotton goods, we have a further subsidy that has been costing us about $17 million yearly. Our quantities exported of processed cotton are in fair shape and have remained relatively constant the last 10 years.

In 1930 we exported 375,000 bales.

In 1940 we exported 374,000 bales.

In 1950 we exported 538,000 bales.

In 1961 after we built up the foreign mill capacity by Marshall plan aid, we dropped to 498,000 bales.

In 1962 we exported 459,300 bales—1963 exports are lagging behind 1962 due only to a shipping strike last January 1963.

Conclusion: The foreign processed cotton goods market has not been substantially eroded. As a practical matter we should increase the export subsidy, if anything, if we are to keep our foreign markets. This is indicated by the following article from the United States-Japan Trade Council Bulletin.

U.S. cottongrowers suffered considerably in 1962 from the production cutback in the Japanese cotton textile industry, which is one of the largest in the world and is the largest foreign buyer of American cotton. Between 1961 and 1962, Japanese production of cotton yarn and fabrics fell 12 and 9 percent respectively. Japanese textile mills reduced purchases of raw cotton from abroad and drew heavily from their inventory, which had increased to a high level in 1961 as the result of import liberalization and speculative buying. Japan's total raw cotton imports fell from the record level of 796 million metric tons in 1961 to 602 million metric tons in 1962, a decline of 24 percent.

Because the price of cotton remained relatively high while prices elsewhere throughout the world weakened, the inventory reduction in Japan cost the United States most heavily. U.S. raw cotton exports to Japan dropped from the record 1961 high of 1.7 million running bales to only 846,000 bales in 1962, a 50-percent drop. As a result, the U.S. share in this largest foreign market for cotton slipped from 51 to 32 percent. Mexico, the second largest source of Japan's cotton supply, increased its shipments to 30 percent of the market. Most other source countries of Latin America and the Near East increased their sales to Japan.

U.S. sales to Japan of mohair decreased by 63 percent; while, interestingly, U.S. exports of cotton and woolen apparel and related items nearly doubled and those of manmade fiber products rose from $2.5 to $3 million between 1961 and 1962.

IMPORTS ARE NO PROBLEM

A quota has always limited and allowed only nominal importation of raw foreign cotton. Thus raw cotton imports cannot affect local markets.

Imported processed cotton goods is allegedly the culprit that is destroying the local cotton market. Again the statistics do not substantiate this conclusion.

Imported cotton goods have expanded only at the following rates:

Less than 100,000 bales per year before 1954:	Bales
1954	101,000
1955	181,000
1956	225,000
1957	199,000
1958	233,000
1959	360,000
1960	525,000
1961	393,000
1962	645,500

Conclusion: Our exported cotton processed goods are comparable to our imports of those goods.

Forty percent of current cotton imports are in the form of cotton cloth and assumedly would be processed at domestic mills, thus allowing for an equalization of even this competition.

It seems highly unrealistic to conclude that a 400,000-bale increase since 1957 in cotton processed cloth could destroy or seriously threaten a domestic market of 8,500,000 bales.

The purpose of the domestic subsidy allegedly is to allow domestic mills to meet foreign competition—if we are just to meet competition this should have no effect on demand and thus utilization of cotton.

Since September of 1963 a new bilateral agreement was executed through the Tariff Commission with Japan limiting imports of cotton to substantially the current figure.

Respecting competition of foreign and domestic cottons, the Tariff Commission stated in T.C. 69 as follows:

FINDING OF THE COMMISSION

On the basis of the investigation, including the hearings, the Commission (Commissioners Schreiber and Sutton dissenting) finds that articles or materials wholly or in part of cotton are not being, and are not practically certain to be, imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the programs or operations undertaken by the U.S. Department of Agriculture with respect to cotton or products thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from cotton or products thereof with respect to which such programs or operations are being undertaken. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that a fee equivalent to the per pound subsidy rate on the cotton content of imported articles and materials wholly or in part of cotton or any other restriction on imports for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is not necessary.

The proposed fee is popularly, though inaccurately, referred to as an equalization fee, on the theory that it measures the difference in the cost of raw cotton to domestic mills and to foreign mills that market some of their output in the United States. As shown in the body of the report, there is great variation in the cost of cotton to mills throughout the world. The application of such an equalization fee would therefore not equalize costs of raw cotton to mills in the United States with those in foreign countries.

No evidence was made available to the Commission in the course of its investigation that imports of articles containing cotton were adversely affecting the operation of any specific program of the Department of Agriculture for cotton or cotton products. On the contrary, it was found that the rising level of imports of articles containing cotton contributed to the success of several of those programs, notably, the export-subsidy program for raw cotton and the domestic price-support program. But for the expanding U.S. market for such imports, the tendency would have been for U.S. exports of raw cotton to be smaller or lower priced, or the export-subsidy or price-support programs to be more costly to carry out, or some combination of these.

The view that a restriction of imports of articles containing cotton would bring about an increase in domestic mill consumption of U.S. cotton equal, or nearly equal, to the cotton content of the excluded imports rests, in our opinion, on a mischievous denial of the most commonplace workings of the market.

In referring to the ratio of the cotton content of imported cotton articles to exports of raw cotton, the USDA stated in its brief that "we have simply swapped one bale for another." In each of the calendar years 1959–61, however, the cotton content of U.S. imports amounted to less than 10 percent of U.S. exports of raw cotton. In 1960, the peak year to date for imports of cotton articles and also the year when exports of raw cotton—amounting to 7.5 million running bales were larger than in any preceding year since 1933, the cotton content of imported cotton articles was almost 7 percent of the exports of raw cotton.

Whereas average annual consumption of raw cotton in 1953–61 was 28 percent above that in 1935–39, the corresponding increase for all fibers was 57 percent. Thus, it becomes apparent that cotton has not benefited as greatly as other fibers from the enlarged total market for textiles resulting from the increased population and the expanded incomes since World War II. On a weight basis cotton's share of annual U.S. mill consumption of all fibers declined from 80 percent in the years immediately preceding World War II to 63 percent in 1961. Inasmuch as the yardage of fabrics produced from a pound of manmade fiber is, on the average, about 50 percent greater than the yardage of similar types produced from a pound of cotton, cotton's share of the market for the total output of U.S. textile mills (measured in yards) declined to an even greater extent than that indicated above.

Since 1946 there has been a substantial expansion in the combined annual consumption of the three principal groups of textile fibers—cotton, manmade fibers, and wool. The raw-cotton equivalent of aggregate annual consumption of manmade fibers and wool, added to the annual mill consumption of raw cotton, increased from 12.8 million bales in 1946 to 15.3 million bales in 1960. Thus, while the total market for these fibers has obviously expanded, the relative importance of cotton in that market has declined. The principal explanation for that decline in an expanding market for textile fibers is that manmade fibers have enjoyed a phenomenal increase in usage during the postwar years. In terms of actual weight, consumption of manmade fibers in 1960 was nearly double that in 1946; when expressed in terms of raw-cotton equivalents, the increase was even more spectacular, as indicated by the following tabulation:

	1946	1960
Actual weight (million pounds)	954.3	1,878.1
Raw-cotton equivalent:		
Million pounds	1,295.1	2,824.5
Million bales	2.7	5.9

During the 15-year period 1946–60, the raw-cotton equivalent of aggregate U.S. consumption of manmade fibers was approximately 68 million bales. The sum of the increments of annual consumption of manmade fibers in the period 1947–60 over consumption thereof in 1946 is 27 million bales of raw-cotton equivalent. Part of the increase in consumption of manmade fibers resulted from new or expanded markets for such materials, some of which were not suitable outlets for natural fibers primarily because of their physical characteristics. At least a third of the increase in the consumption of manmade fibers, however, probably represented a direct replacement of cotton. In the manufacture of tire cord alone, where manmade fibers have replaced cotton almost entirely, cottongrowers have lost an outlet for more than 7 million bales during the period since World War II.

In addition to the quantity of cotton displaced by manmade fibers, there has been displacement by other competing materials, such as paper and plastic. Although the aggregate displacement by these materials cannot be exactly determined, the total is known to be very large, as is indicated in the subsequent discussion of industrial uses of cotton.

MARKET SHIFTS FOR COTTON

Reduction in industrial outlets for cotton: The heaviest market losses for cotton since World War II have occurred in industrial uses, owing in large part to competition from manmade fibers, plastics and paper. Immediately before the war, more than a third of the consumption of cotton in the United States was accounted for by industrial end uses. By 1960, less than a fifth of the total went into such uses. The heaviest losses were sustained in the tire cord and bag markets. In 1960 the production of cotton tire cord required only 70,000 bales of cotton. Cotton accounted for only 4 percent of all fibers used in tire cord in that year. Before World War II, the bag market used some 500,000 bales of cotton annually. This market shifted largely to paper and plastic; in recent years it has consumed only about 150,000 bales of cotton annually. The use of cotton also declined in the manufacture of electrical insulation, hoses, laundry and dry-cleaning supplies, and machinery belts.

Increased use of cotton in apparel: Total gains for cotton in the apparel market have exceeded the losses in industrial uses. Since the end of World War II, wearing apparel has accounted for a steadily increasing share of all cotton consumed—rising from 36 percent in 1947 to 53 percent in 1960. In terms of absolute quantities, the increase from 1947 to 1960 in the annual consumption of raw cotton by the apparel manufacturers was 1.7 million bales (63 percent). Not only has there been an increase in the quantity of cotton required for producing wearing apparel, but cotton provided a larger share of all textile fibers consumed in this end use in 1960 than in 1947—cotton's share being 62 percent in 1960, compared with 56 percent in 1947.

WOOL AND OTHER FIBERS HAVE PROBLEMS

Other goods besides cotton have had problems over the past 12 years. The export-import figures on wool and manmade fibers are as follows:

WOOL

[In pounds]

	Exports	Imports
1950	7,535,000	63,804,000
1962	4,543,000	127,458,000
MANMADE FIBERS		
1950	81,385,000	4,348,000
1962	118,954,000	23,491,000

Conclusion: Where in 1950 we had a 239-million-pound balance of trade on the export side, today we have merely a 23-million-pound export balance.

ARE MANMADE FIBERS CAUSING COTTON PROBLEMS?

The alternative ground is given as support for the domestic subsidy that regardless of the foreign competition we

must have the subsidy to meet domestic competition in rayon and manmade fibers.

Since 1950 cotton, wool, rayon, and manmade fibers, domestic mill consumption figures have varied as follows:

	Cotton		Wool		Rayon		Manmade fibers		Total consumption (million pounds)
	Million pounds	Percent	Million pounds	Percent	Million pounds	Percent	Million pounds	Percent	
1950	4,464.0	67.1	691	10.5	1,305	19.8	136	2	6,596
1962	4,278.0	59.8	568	7.9	1,238	17.3	1,074	15	7,159
1963 (estimated)	4.4								

Conclusion: While cotton consumption has gone down slightly, so also has wool and rayon, and next year we will produce the average in cotton.

At least 60 percent of increased consumption of manmade fibers created new markets. The 12-year increase of 563 million pounds is largely as a result of new markets created by manmade fibers, though admittedly some cotton markets have been taken.

SURPLUS PROBLEM

Respecting the surplus of cotton on hand there is no problem. In 1961 we had the smallest CCC stock in 10 years. The current supply is not the largest and can be depleted by pricing cotton supports in line with demand.

COSTS OF PROPOSED COTTON PROGRAM

The proposal is to reduce the support price for production over 15 bales over a series of years and pay a domestic subsidy arbitrarily to local mills to allegedly make them competitive.

Projected annual costs and savings are as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Export subsidy (payments in kind, CCC stocks to exporters)	150.0
Public Law 480 (exports in kind valued at $161 per bale)	180.0
Storage charge (carrying and storage charges on 7,500,000 bales held by CCC)	74.2
Domestic subsidy (payments in kind, cotton valued at $120 a bale allegedly to make 8.5 million bales in domestic cotton competitive with 400,000 bales of processed imported cloth)	292.5
10 percent premium on first 15 bales (payment of full support price of 32.7 cents per pound on 1st 15 bales to all producers)	68.0
Payment on cotton in inventory	30.0
Estimated 1st-year cost	794.7

I have projected on the appended chart which has been mailed to each Member the exact projection of how 34 mills will cut up a $205 million pie in a shotgun effort to beef up this industry.

The largest firm, Burlington Mills, will receive $28 million based on that firm's average cotton consumption over the past few years. This handout is 80 percent of that firm's operating income in 1951. Other absurd results are charted showing a 370 percent increase in one firm's income. This chart was prepared with the assistance of statistics from the Library of Congress, Department of Commerce, Department of Agriculture, Bureau of the Census, and a number of private organizations, including the cotton industry itself.

The Democrats have long stood for priming the pump at the bottom. The theory of the pending bill, I believe, is alien to our philosophy. Should the mill subsidy provision be included in the final version of the bill, I would ask you to consider seriously defeating this legislation.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would merely comment that the Agriculture Committee has worked diligently on the subject legislation, but due to the inexperience of some of us and pressure of representing our constituents on others of us, I do not in good faith believe that we have the best bill for this subject matter.

There is a need to do something for the cotton industry. My calculations based on State university cost reports for each cotton State and census data indicate that comparing cotton in the Carolinas and Georgia as opposed to Arizona and California is like comparing bicycles to Cadillacs. In one area cotton presents a social problem with 150,000 small producers in a single State accounting for the bulk of the production netting each less than $1,000 per year; in the other States due to better growing conditions, larger acreages, irrigation and mechanization, a few thousand producers account for 85 percent of the production and net in excess of $50,000 per year each.

The need to subsidize the former is patent; the actuality of subsidizing the latter is scandalous. Cotton is produced in the Western States every day below 20 cents per pound.

If we are to maintain our worldwide markets to any degree we are going to have to move in a direction which recognizes competitiveness and allows that competitiveness to expand having due regard for the technologically displaced. Herein lies the deadlock of our system respecting the cotton commodity.

In summary it can be concluded as my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, CHARLES WELTNER, showed the other day in his fine exposition that the cotton producer industry was never healthier. The chart attached shows the mills were never in better condition, consumers are not complaining and neither are our international competitors.

We have developed an export subsidy to protect a high support price. A domestic subsidy would appear to confound the matter in that we are seeking to protect us from ourselves.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes just to attempt to answer in 2 minutes the speech you have just heard which is entirely erroneous, because the record will show that the Textile Manufacturers of America came before our committee and stated emphatically that they did not want any part of a subsidy paid to them. The farmers took the same position. So in that situation we authorize in this bill the Secretary of Agriculture to make such payments as may be necessary to eliminate this inequity. That is the record. Yet he comes here with a statement that the mills are going to pick up millions and millions and millions of dollars. That is just not true.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN of California. All the mills are seeking is the right to buy cotton at the same price as their foreign competitors. Is that right?

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what is involved here.

I want to ask a question—Do you know of any industry in America that has borne on its back this unique burden which by law has been forced on the textile industry of this country—$42.50 a bale? Cotton sells in Hong Kong and Pakistan and Portugal, and anywhere else in the world for $42.50 a bale less than our own mills can buy it for. The present Secretary of Commerce said in a speech at Charlotte, N.C., some months ago that it was the silliest thing any government ever did on this earth.

I agree with that statement, and our committee agrees with it, and I hope the Congress will agree with it. How on earth can you go home and say by Federal law you impose this burden on an American industry, which is a unique burden? You talk to me about coal miners and glass workers and other people in depressed areas. There are 10 million people interested in this bill, and yet somebody comes in here crying and bleeding their hearts out about the coal miners and glass workers in an effort to bring about its defeat.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] such time as he may desire.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, it is not right that foreign buyers should be permitted to continue purchasing American cotton on the world market 8½ cents per pound cheaper than American manufacturers can buy the same cotton on the domestic market and then sell the finished products on the American market in competition with the American textile industry. This bill would improve the competitive position of domestic cotton mills against imports and cheap foreign cotton goods. It would make American cotton available to domestic mills at world cotton prices.

In the past 10 years U.S. imports of cotton products have risen from the average cotton equivalent of 68,000 bales in 1952 to 225,000 bales in 1956, to 234,000 bales in 1958, to 526,000 bales in 1960, and approximately 672,000 bales in 1962. This upward trend in the main has occurred since 1956 when the two-price cotton system was created.

Since the advent of two-price cotton in 1956 active cotton spindles have

dropped 9.1 percent. Textile employment has declined 176,000 workers. Mill consumption of cotton has declined and imports of cotton textiles continue an upward surge.

The textile industry is the second largest employer in the United States and has been hard hit by imports from low-wage countries. The American cotton farmer is being hurt by this decline in the textile industry on which he must depend. A bale of cotton has little value until it is processed. The export market is uncertain so the strength of our Nation's cotton production industry must depend on a healthy American textile industry. The two-price cotton system is not only weakening the textile industry but is hurting the American cotton farmer.

I have received numerous letters and telegrams from textile and garment manufacturers in my congressional district pointing out the necessity of early action to eliminate the two-price cotton system. We cannot afford to delay, with textile employment shrinking, and the number of cotton spindles being constantly reduced. Our textile workers deem it most unfair to suffer unemployment and shorter hours while their foreign competitors are supplying so much of the American market.

All who have spoken on this bill have agreed that an inequity exists which should be corrected. There is disagreement as to the best method of correction. Those who have objected so forcefully to the legislation in speeches during the last hour have admitted that a wrong exists which should be corrected, but they have offered no solution to the problem.

I was among those who appeared before the Tariff Commission seeking a solution by an offset import fee but it was denied by a three-to-two decision. Our textile mills do not want a subsidy. They are just requesting the right to purchase American cotton at the same price that their foreign competitors are paying.

The late President Kennedy characterized the two-price cotton system as "a unique burden upon the American textile industry for which a solution must be found in the near future."

Enactment of H.R. 6196 would improve the competitive position of American-produced cotton goods, would reduce Government stocks of cotton, would save cotton goods consumers some $500 million per year and would thus increase cotton consumption.

This bill is important because it deals with the livelihood of millions of American citizens and with the future of our textile plants, their management and employees. It is important because it corrects an inequity that should be corrected. I believe that the equity of this legislation should appeal to every Member of this House.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Is it possible to repeal that unjust law which is now on the statutes and which has caused this problem?

Mr. TAYLOR. It may be possible to repeal it but I am firmly convinced that it will not be repealed. The only opportunity we will have to correct this inequity is to pass this bill during this session of Congress.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. The textile industry has tried to eliminate this inequity. They have spent tens of thousands of dollars presenting their cases to the Tariff Commission. There were two outstanding cases, one under the Eisenhower administration and one under this administration. They went to the Emergency Planning Board and received no relief there. This is the only way they can secure any relief.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in the last analysis, who has control over this matter, the Tariff Commission or the Congress?

Mr. COOLEY. The Tariff Commission under existing law has control over the problems involved. The Tariff Commission exercises that responsibility at the request of the President.

Mr. KYL. Do they not derive their authority from the Congress, from congressional acts?

Mr. COOLEY. Ah, yes; if you want to go back, we could abolish the Tariff Commission or probably put some law on the books. But this is the law that we have decided is best for all concerned; that is, to make our domestic industry competitive with foreign industry and with domestic synthetic textiles.

Mr. KYL. One other related question, if I may. Is it not true that the Secretary of Agriculture today can make the adjustments in subsidies?

Mr. COOLEY. He will under this bill make adjustments as are necessary to eliminate the inequity.

Mr. KYL. The question is, can he do it without this legislation? Does he have this authority today?

Mr. COOLEY. To adjust this?

Mr. KYL. The subsidy level, price supports.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, yes; he can adjust price supports.

Mr. KYL. Without this legislation?

Mr. COOLEY. Price supports have been fixed on cotton at 32.47 cents a pound. That is not competitive with the world market price of cotton which is produced at 24 or 25 cents a pound. It cannot compete with synthetic fibers which sell at a price substantially below that.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GRAY). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety 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. 218]

Adair	Becker	Bromwell
Ashley	Brademas	Celler
Collier	Latta	Passman
Dawson	Long, La.	Powell
Fallon	McLoskey	Rivers, Alaska
Gibbons	Mailliard	Robison
Gill	Matsunaga	Rodino
Griffin	Milliken	Shelley
Hall	Morrison	Sheppard
Hébert	Morton	Shipley
Kelly	Norblad	Trimble
Keogh	O'Brien, Ill.	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having assumed 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 390 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. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to two or three communications which I hold in my hand and which I will insert in the RECORD at the proper time when we return to the House. One is from the United Textile Workers of America, from Cranston, R.I., in favor of this bill. Another is from the Textile Workers Union of America from Lewiston, Maine. It ends up:

> We plead with you to use your great influence to secure the passage of H.R. 6196 known as the one-price cotton bill in order to relieve the insecurity of many thousands of American cotton textile workers.

I have here another communication dated November 11, 1963, a two-page letter, of which I will read only one paragraph at this time. It concludes this way:

> We in the Textile Workers Union of America are most anxious to see the Cooley bill enacted. We regard these payments as essential to remove the competitive disadvantage suffered by the domestic industry. On the basis of past experience with cotton price reductions, it is evident that competition will force the price level for cotton textiles to be lowered. This, in turn, should result in a $500 million savings to consumers and lead to the expanded use of American-made cotton products. In addition, it should not only relieve the threat to existing cotton textile employment, but should create some 35,000 additional jobs for cotton textile workers.

I shall at the proper time insert the full text of these documents in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]:

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I am not unmindful of some of the opposition to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, a large part of the cotton industry and the cotton textile industry in particular finds itself, as has been admitted here over and over again, between two Government programs which are making its situation very bad from the standpoint of foreign competi-

tion. These are, of course, the trade policy of the United States and the cotton price support program. The result of these two programs is that for the average pound of cotton the American miller has to pay roughly 8½ cents more than competing mills overseas. He is thereby placed at a competitive disadvantage not only with respect to the world market but also with respect to the American market.

Most Members have admitted this in their speeches, even those opposing the bill, but many Members have suggested other remedies.

The distinguished gentleman from Iowa with whom I served on the Committee on Agriculture for many, many years, and others, have criticized this bill on other grounds. As a matter of practical legislative fact every Member who has been around here a long time knows that we will either have to take this bill or we shall not get anything. That is the truth of the matter. We are not considering other forms of bills which Members think might be better.

The gentleman from Iowa knows also that some of the amendments which are going to be proposed, or substitutes which might be proposed in lieu of this bill, would be more objectionable to him than is this bill itself. That would certainly be true I say, knowing the gentleman, if a complete Brannan-type bill were substituted for this bill and the farmers were given a direct subsidy. The gentleman knows that this is true.

So, if we start out trying to satisfy one group by amendment there will be nothing more certain than that ultimately we will not do anything, even though the situation cries out for remedy. This is a chance for remedy and I urge the Members of this House not to start voting for amendments, except the amendment of the gentleman from Maine. His amendment is one that has been cleared with the committee. It is a desirable amendment because it attacks directly one of the two Government programs which I mentioned in the beginning as having given rise to this difficulty, namely, the support program.

Now, there has been a lot of talk about the extent of the subsidy. But there is nothing in this bill to show or indicate that any mill will be given $1. All the mill will be given is the right to bid on American-grown cotton at the same or comparable price at which its foreign competitor can bid on that cotton.

Mr. Chairman, that is the essence of this bill.

Now, there has been a lot said about the amount of the so-called subsidy. Well, I think we ought to recall again the practical situation. As of next August 1, the Government carryover will probably reach 12 million bales. We have no possible outlet for that cotton under existing law. It cannot be sold abroad without a subsidy. It cannot all be sold abroad even with a subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, this talk about the cost of this bill, when we consider the payment in kind, is really out of line with the facts. What are we going to do with this cotton? What are we going to do at the end of the next season when the amount of cotton in the warehouses of the Commodity Credit Corporation will probably reach 12 or 13 million bales?

Mr. Chairman, this proposal gives us a way to handle this problem with a minimum of cash outlay. It gives us a chance to do equity to the cotton textile industry of this country. It gives us an opportunity to move in before the cotton farmers of this country, by reason of the laws which we have passed, often with their support, are completely driven out of business, and one of the largest, most important industries in the United States comes to an end.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BELCHER. I think the gentleman probably left the wrong impression here. The cotton mill buys the cotton at the American price which will be as much as 32.47, will it not?

Mr. ALBERT. The cotton mill will not necessarily do that. It could be the handlers. This statement that this subsidy is going to be paid to the mills is simply not correct.

Mr. BELCHER. No; the mill first buys the cotton in the marketplace and then the mill will be given the cotton at this price.

Mr. ALBERT. It may be the mill or it may be somebody else.

Mr. BELCHER. The mill will be given a subsidy in cotton to take up the difference between the cotton price here in the United States and the world price.

Mr. ALBERT. The point which I am trying to make, as I understand it, is that the so-called subsidy can be given to anybody except the producer. If I am wrong about that, the end result is the same in any event.

Mr. BELCHER. If the gentleman will yield further, the end result is the same but, still, this bill will only help the mill. The farmer does not get a dime out of it.

Mr. ALBERT. No. The only thing the farmer gets out of this is the salvation of the cotton farmer. The only thing the miller gets out of this is the right to buy cotton grown on American farms at the same price as someone 10,000 miles away can buy it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure it was not by design that I was put up here to follow my colleagues from Oklahoma. This came about purely by accident. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], said he stood in the House today fighting for a lost cause. I am glad the gentleman has joined me, because, Mr. Chairman, I do not recall ever standing in the well on an agricultural bill that I was not fighting for a lost cause. I am glad to have a colleague on the Democratic side who has also had the experience of fighting for a lost cause.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture of this House apparently can bring more embarrassing bills to the floor of the House than any legislative committee of the House. They never bring a bill here that does not put a whole group of you gentlemen over on that side right square on the spot. You will recall my statement concerning the wheat bill last year. You will recall at that time I told you that there was nobody in America who wanted the wheat bill except the Secretary of Agriculture. You Members were put on the spot to support your administration and vote for the wheat bill. I did not ask anybody to vote according to my viewpoint. I simply would like to have you have the facts. That is all I did in connection with the wheat bill.

I told you at that time the taxpayers did not want the bill, the consumers did not want the bill, and I told you the wheat raisers did not want the bill. I do not think there is any doubt that the taxpayers wanted to pay that subsidy and the consumers of your district were not shouting over the increased cost. The only thing I could have been mistaken about was the fact I was wrong concerning the wheat farmer. When the referendum was put out to the wheat farmer and the Secretary of Agriculture went out to sell the farmer on the idea that this was a good bill, they shouted "No" just like you gentlemen over there shout "No" when we offer an amendment. That was the kind of "no" that was indicated. The wheat farmer did not want it, the consumer did not want it, and the taxpayers did not want it.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot said about correcting an inequity. This inequity was brought on by the Committee on Agriculture. We brought a bill to the floor providing for an export subsidy. We brought a bill to the floor that gave the Secretary of Agriculture the power to set price supports, and while this cotton industry was in serious condition just a few months ago the Secretary increased the export subsidy by 2.4 cents a pound, and this is the same administration that is here today asking you to vote $600 million of your taxpayers' money—for what? To pay for the damage which the last bill we passed caused.

It just occurs to me it is not sensible to create a situation that causes damage, then come back because you loyal Democrats were loyal enough to support your party in creating that damage, and ask you to go back to your taxpayers for $600 million more to pay for the resulting damage.

Why not just stop the cause of the damage? That is a very simple thing to do. We hear that there is no way to get that done. We can reduce price supports and stop this inequity.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Did not former Secretary Benson and former President Eisenhower approve this plan?

Mr. BELCHER. I do not know who recommended it. I may say to the gentleman I did not follow Eisenhower in everything.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not know how the gentleman feels about that.

Mr. BELCHER. The gentleman now addressing the House did not recommend it. That is the only man I can speak for. It was your bill, not my bill. You created the inequity you are asking us to correct.

Mr. COOLEY. Did not Benson recommend it?

Mr. BELCHER. I do not recall that. If Mr. Benson caused this damage there is no reason for us to remove the cause of the damage.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. On the point the gentleman is making as to the level of price support, would the gentleman agree with me that the amendment I propose to offer goes directly to this particular point?

Mr. BELCHER. I would say that the McIntire amendment does attempt to correct some of the inequity, and does to the extent of about $2 or $3 per hundred. It does attempt to correct the inequity brought about. But now this is the situation with which we are confronted.

The Japanese mills are the principal exporters of cotton products into the United States. I have a lot of respect for the Japanese nation. I think they are great allies. I had a lot of respect for the Japanese nation, and all of us did, prior to World War II. We gathered up every pound of scrap iron we could find in this country and sent it to Japan, and Japan shot it back at us.

We are now subsidizing Japan with our cotton. We are sending our cotton over there and subsidizing it at 8.5 cents a pound. Do you know what Japan is doing? It is shooting it right back at us just as they shot the scrap iron back at us in World War II. The only thing is today they do not kill anybody, they merely put American workers out of work.

That can be corrected by the Tariff Commission. That can be corrected by this House of Representatives. But apparently the only remedy we are ever able to offer is to spend more money. This Committee on Agriculture every time it has come to the floor has provided for additional Government expenditures, never to reduce Government expenditures.

We are now asking for $600 million to correct a bill which we passed last year. Next year we are going to be back here and we are going to say the bill we passed last year was bad, it was not good, and now we want to correct the inequity which the last bill created.

I want to say one thing in closing to you very loyal liberals on that side. I admire you. You are liberal. You are generous. Year after year you have voted against the best interests of your constituencies for farm programs and farm expenses. You are good, loyal Democrats, and I admire you for that. But being a loyal Democrat in the wheat bill did not help the Democratic Party. Being a loyal Democrat today is not going to help the Democratic Party. Some day, I do not know when, you are going to get an opponent against you and you will have to explain why you voted $600 million of the taxpayers' money. What for? To correct another bill that you voted for that created the damage of $600 million. Maybe you have a good explanation for that, I do not know, but I believe you are in the same spot I was in for 8 years. The gentleman from North Carolina just pointed out to me something about what Mr. Benson did. Of course, Mr. Benson embarrassed me at times. I was not able to follow Mr. Benson all the time because the people in my district sometimes did not believe in Mr. Benson's program. But I tell you one thing, and I plead guilty, I am sure I am not as loyal a Republican as you are loyal Democrats, because when it came to a proposition of whether I voted for the constituents in my district or Mr. Benson or Mr. Eisenhower, some way or other, I strung along with the people of my district. If you are loyal enough to come down here and vote $600 million out of the pockets of your own taxpayers here, just to be loyal Democrats, I admire you, I respect you for your loyalty, but I do have to admit I am going to doubt your political judgment a little bit. Loyalty is a wonderful thing, but it makes a whole lot of difference what that loyalty is to. Is your loyalty to the administration or to the people that year after year send you down here to represent your constituencies?

If there is a single, solitary Member on the Democratic side or on the Republican side of the aisle who does not have a textile mill in his district who is going to get a part of this subsidy, you are not representing the best interests of your people if you vote for this bill. You are taxing your people to send the money somewhere else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time remaining on this side to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, just yesterday we heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] say that he hoped we could approach this bill from a nonpartisan, unselfish position. Well, now, I can understand why the gentleman can do that very easily. In the first place, he has two-thirds of the Members on his side so that nonpartisanship would be fine. In the second place, his district is going to get one of the biggest subsidies in the United States. Gentlemen, I can readily understand why he can be completely unselfish. I think all the rest of us could be unselfish, but unselfishness alone is not going to pass this bill. If this bill is approached from a nonpartisan angle, as the gentleman from Texas wants, you have not got a chance on earth to pass this bill. If the Democrats are not held in line through partisan loyalty, you have not got a chance. There is not a single Democrat over there whose district does not get part of this subsidy can possibly approach this thing from a nonpartisan angle and vote for it. That is the only excuse you have. Maybe in your district you have the excuse that you are doing what the administration wants you to do, and that is all you need to do when you explain your actions to your constituents. But, ladies and gentlemen, when I go back to my district—and it just so happens that the big majority in my district are Democrats—I just cannot go back to them and say, Well, I followed the Republican administration and whatever they told us to do I did. I have to go back and explain to them why I vote the way I do. I have to be in a position to defend the merits of the legislation that I vote for or vote against. It must be nice to be in a position where all you need to do is to go back to the people and say, I was just doing what my administration asked me to do and I was just doing what the Secretary of Agriculture asked me to do. But that would be no excuse for me. If I followed that policy, gentlemen, I would not be on the floor of this House here today.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am not telling you how to vote on this bill. Vote your own sentiments.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I want to be helpful to all segments of the cotton industry, to the farmer, the textile worker, the textile operator, and last but not least, the consuming public.

The cotton industry is in a plight, not because of any one individual group, but mainly by reason of the encroachment of synthetic fibers. The textile mills have in the main turned to synthetic fibers because of their having to pay a higher price for the cotton consumed by the mills than that paid by foreign competitors. This is known as a two-price system because the foreign mills who use our cotton are subsidized to the extent of approximately 8½ cents a pound or $42.50 a bale. When this cotton is made into a finished product it is exported back to this country and then enters competitive trade with the products made by the domestic mills who have to charge a higher price and are thus penalized to the extent of the amount that the foreign mills are subsidized.

The bill before us with the McIntire amendment seeks to place most of the burden on the farmer. The farmers realize that in order for them to grow and sell cotton that they must of necessity find a cheaper way to produce cotton; however, the McIntire amendment drops the support price too much We should have a one-price system and in order to carry this out some contribution must be made by all segments of the industry and because this amendment does not equitably distribute the burden it should be amended.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, the future economy of our Nation is at stake here today. This cotton bill, which we now consider, has not had the publicity of some of the other legislation before us this session, but it is of the utmost importance to millions of Americans. What we do with this cotton bill today will be reflected in the earnings of textile workers and cotton farmers and, yes, even our Government in the years ahead.

Perhaps all of you here today are not from textile manufacturing areas and are not aware of the size and scope of the American textile industry. Few of us thought of its importance to the Nation this morning when we donned a cotton shirt or cotton socks. The cotton industry is among the largest manufacturing industries in the United States. One of every eight persons employed in manufacturing works in cotton textiles. The more than 2 million workers are employed in more than 8,000 plants of all types scattered through 43 States from Maine to Texas.

This is only part of the picture, however. There are thousands of farmers who grow cotton. There are other thousands who depend for some or all of their income on processing and marketing cotton and furnishing materials and supplies to the raw cotton industry. And, after the weavers, doffers, and dyers have turned the raw product into cloth and that has been turned by cutters and seamers into finished products, it provides jobs of other thousands of salesmen and deliverymen.

The American textile industry provides millions of American famliies with livelihoods. The payroll for workers in the textile manufacturing and apparel industry this year will reach an estimated $3.5 billion. This, in turn, helps to keep the wheels of progress turning in other industries throughout the country. And, governments also are large beneficiaries of the American textile industry. The textile mill products industry annually pays around $320 million in Federal income taxes alone. State and local governments are other beneficiaries.

The textile industry accounts for a significant portion of our national income. In 1958, the manufacturing groups comprising the textile industry accounted for about $9.1 billion of the $104.1 billion of the national income originating in all manufacturing activity in the United States. This was about 8.7 percent of the national income originating in the manufacturing sector of the U.S. economy. In addition, the textile industry is essential to the national security. Of vital importance in peacetime, it has proved indispensable in time of emergency.

So important, so vital to all Americans, and, yet, right now the economic structure of the American cotton industry is in jeopardy. Despite attempts to supply some relief, there is a continuing flood of low-priced textiles coming in from abroad which is displacing the goods produced by our own workers and is demoralizing the domestic markets for our textile industry. The advantage to the foreign mills is that they can buy American produced cotton at 8½ cents a pound cheaper than American mills can buy this same American cotton. This two-price cotton system is killing our textile industry.

Since 1946, imports have increased at an average annual rate of 22 percent. In recent years, cotton textile imports have continued to reach new record highs despite duties on such imports and agreements with governments of other countries to restrict their shipments to the United States. In 1956, some 450 million square yard equivalents were imported into this country. This figure has reached 1 billion square yard equivalents in 1960, and last year, in 1962, some 1.2 billion square yard equivalents were imported. And, the imports are running a little higher thus far this year.

What does this mean for the American textile industry? Of course, it can mean only one thing. Despite the increase in population, less American-produced cotton goods is being used. The population of the United States has jumped from 168 million in 1956 to 187 million in 1962. During this same period, American mills production dropped from just over 10 million linear yards in 1956 to just over 9 million linear yards last year. This has been keenly felt by textile workers. In 1950, there were 1.2 million persons employed in the textile mills products industry. In 1955, this was down to just over 1 million persons, and, in September of this year, the number of persons employed was down to 886,000.

This then is the serious situation which today confronts the cotton textile industry. For Congress to ignore this situation could well mean the eventual ruin of this industry, with all the grievous implications for those who work in and with the industry. What would the United States do if its gigantic textile industry were suddenly more seriously impaired? Where would all the textiles workers go to look for jobs? What could the farmers grow in place of cotton? What would happen to the modern mills, to the business districts and shopping centers that have grown with the industry? In other words, can the United States afford a weak and crippled cotton industry?

Such a situation must not be allowed to come to pass. This deterioration of the American textile industry must be stopped. This is the object of the cotton bill before us today. Perhaps this is not a perfect bill, but it at least eliminates a gross inequity foisted upon one segment of our economy by the Government. The two-price cotton system, so unfair and so unnecessary, would be terminated.

This cotton bill is necessary legislation. Under it the producers will be protected, the cotton textile industry will be given a fair chance to prosper and expand, the livelihoods of millions of persons associated with cotton will be protected, and consumers will be doubly repaid for their tax investment. Seldom has a single piece of legislation benefited so many. I hope it will pass.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN] such time as he may require.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill before the House today, not because I think it is the answer we are seeking to the cotton problem, but because I think it is better than nothing.

This bill might help a little in bringing down the price of cotton textiles to the American consumer. It might make it possible for our cotton textile industry to compete better in the domestic and world markets.

Hopefully, this bill might protect the remaining jobs in the American textile industry for workers who are faced with the threat of losing their jobs because of the unfair competition of foreign mills.

But this bill does not go anywhere near solving the dilemma of the cotton textile industry that has seen American fiber losing out on the world markets and our mills closing down in the face of cheap textile imports.

This bill does not go anywhere near providing a solution to the problem of mounting cotton surpluses piling up in the storage warehouses at the expense of the taxpayers.

There is pending in the other body, Mr. Chairman, a bill that I believe goes much further than this bill toward meeting our cotton problems.

I refer to a bill authored by the junior Senator from Georgia, Mr. TALMADGE, and cosponsored by the senior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY.

The bill to which I refer is designed 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 the consumers, and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, and to encourage the exportation of cotton.

The Talmadge bill, Mr. Speaker, seems to me to be admirably suited to accomplish its avowed purposes, and I think it is far better than the proposal before us today.

The bill before us might do some good, but mainly it would pile another subsidy on top of a subsidy, at greater cost to the taxpayers and would not go to the heart of the problems of cotton.

Mr. Chairman, the Talmadge bill not only would not require an additional subsidy to the mills, as this one does, it would eliminate altogether the necessity for the costly export subsidy which has helped put our mills in such a dilemma.

The Talmadge bill would free the cotton farmer from acreage controls. It would give the small cotton farmer adequate price support to maintain a fair and adequate income. It would permit the large cotton producer to grow as much cotton as he likes and sell it on the world market. It would restore American cotton to a competitive position in the world.

And most importantly, Mr. Chairman, the Talmadge bill would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, handling, and storing cotton.

I say we need the Talmadge bill, Mr. Chairman, and the best way and the quickest way to get it is to pass this bill before us and quickly send it to the Senate so that we can begin promptly to

work out a compromise version of the two proposals. The time to act is now.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, in the State of Oklahoma, 180,000 people live wholly or in very substantial part upon incomes earned directly from cotton. These include 79,000 people living on cotton farms and 66,000 others whose breadwinners are seasonal workers on cotton farms. The remaining 35,000 consist of people whose income earners work in gins or for apparel manufacturers, plus cotton's pro rata share of those living on incomes from farm supply stores, merchandising operations, and so forth.

This by no means tells the whole story because statistics are not available on the many people working in oil mills and cotton warehouses; and there is no way to compute the number of employees concerned with cotton in banks, insurance agencies, department stores, motor freight lines, and many other fields.

The average annual cash receipts from cotton and cottonseed by Oklahoma farmers during calendar years 1960 through 1962 was $58.5 million. About three-quarters of the cotton raised in Oklahoma is in my district. This makes cotton the second most important crop next to wheat. It provides nearly a fourth as much cash income as all other crops combined, and a sixth as much as all meat animals, dairy products, poultry and eggs combined.

The total payroll of all manufacturing establishments in the State of Oklahoma was $470 million in 1961, the latest year reported. In that year, farmers' receipts from cotton and cottonseed alone were $59 million, or one-eighth as much as all wages and salaries of all industrial employees.

Thus the inevitable conclusion: If the cotton economy is crushed, Oklahoma 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. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6196. When the so-called trade bill was before us for consideration I stated that if the great expounded principles of that bill did not work in practice we would be forced to subsidize our industries to compete with world trade in order to offset the lower wage scales of the foreign countries. Today we have reached that point. New York City has long had one of the largest textile industries, but unemployment in this industry has continually increased in a large part due to the lower cost of imported finished cotton products—possibly due to other nations buying cotton at the lower price and their paying lower wages.

I do not believe in subsidizing, but today, because of existing subsidization in the production of cotton and in foreign exports, we must also consider our own home manufacturers. The possible solution and end to this spending will come when subsidization is stopped at the source—that is to stop paying for nonproduction and permit the market to regulate its own production by supply and demand.

This legislation, I believe, will also be an aid to consumers for there can possibly be a reduction in the cost of the finished product, based on the lower cost of the raw material. Though this amount may be very small, the greater benefit will come in increased domestic employment in this industry, thus giving more people buying power which will aid and add to our economy. Thus, what is spent as a subsidy to industry under this legislation will, in a great measure, be returned to the Government in taxes.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have continually worked for, spoken for, and voted for a reduction in Federal Government control and regulation of our free enterprise system. I still believe in the thinking and reasoning of Thomas Jefferson when he said, "That government is best which governs least, providing every American with the opportunity to manage his own affairs."

In order to maintain and preserve a healthy, dynamic agricultural industry in our country today, I believe we must work toward a free-market-controlled economy for our farmers and relieve them from oppressive Federal controls and regulation. Former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson made, and was making, some tremendous strides in this direction during his office tenure.

Basically, the present cotton problem has been created by the failure of Secretary Freeman to carry out the philosophy of the Agricultural Act of 1958. Under this act, cotton prices, through a series of steps, would be adjusted to a realistic and competitive level. Because of this legislation, there was a substantial improvement in the cotton situation during the 1959 and 1960 marketing years. If Secretary Freeman had stayed with this act and the program set forth, he could, and should, have strengthened the competitive position of cotton by reducing the support price in 1961 and 1962. Apparently, it was politically more expedient to raise the support price; and thus came a tremendous increase in surplus cotton in storage, a reduction in the national cotton allotment, a serious reduction in both exports and the domestic consumption of cotton, and an increase in the export subsidy from 6 to 8½ cents per pound.

We need to move toward freeing the agriculture market from these conditions—toward a supply and demand market. Mr. Freeman and his advisers have not indicated a willingness to take the necessary steps to do this; in fact, they have gone the other way. The Congress must take action to get back to the basic philosophy of the 1958 Agricultural Act.

H.R. 6196, the Cooley bill, does not provide the best solution that will answer the problems, but it does, in my opinion, take some desirable steps by reducing the price support by the McIntire amendment from 32.47 cents per pound to 30 cents the first year, 29.50 cents the second year, and 29 cents the third year; and this is mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture who has demonstrated that he does not intend to lower support unless he is forced to do so by the Congress.

A particularly objectionable provision of this bill is the 10 percent additional premium support, with a maximum of 32.47 cents per pound for the first 15 bales produced—thus, in some instances, a sustaining subsidy for inefficient operations. However, it has been pointed out, most of the smaller farms, 30 acres or less, have been declining in number very rapidly even under the 32.47-cent support.

There are many acceptable and objectionable features to this bill. After careful study of this problem and weighing all the facts, in my considered judgment, the good slightly outweighs the bad in H.R. 6196, and I am therefore inclined to support its passage. It does not present an ideal solution of this problem, but it will probably be the only possible step we might have the opportunity to take to help cushion or stem the rapidly deteriorating condition of our very vitally important cotton industry.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, while I am not in favor of some of the subsidization measures provided by this bill, I feel very strongly that it is the only present prospect and opportunity for saving the cotton textile industry in the Nation.

It should not require much argument to demonstrate the plight of this once great industry. Attacked on all sides by unsound and unwise economic policies of this Government, victimized by the incredible two-price cotton system, the one-way-street trade programs flooding the market with cheap goods, cutthroat, unfair competition from foreign nations and all points of the compass, harried by production differentials pricing its products out of many major markets, the cotton textile industry is on the financial and economic ropes. The cotton industry itself is under an unprecedented threat.

Unless prompt relief and encouragement is forthcoming in this bill, the future of the cotton textile business, North, South, East, and West, wherever it exists in this country, not to speak of the great cotton-producing industry, will be in greatest jeopardy.

For these reasons, and because I believe that the interests of our consumers, our American economy, the cotton textile and related industries and the very many workers employed in these industries whose livelihood for themselves and their families is definitely at stake, I believe the Congress should pass this bill in the national interest.

I will support the amendments designed to improve the bill and will vote for its passage. And I earnestly hope it will help to relieve the very distressing conditions existing in the cotton textile and related industries.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, in further amplification of my remarks this date I include at this point in the RECORD a statistical analysis of the exact effect of the pending legislation on the 34 leading mills of the United States.

Plain facts on cotton mill subsidy

[Dollars in millions]

	1951 sales	1960 sales	1961 sales	1962 sales	1962 sales		1962 net income		1963 sales		1963 net income		Operating income				Cotton consumption (estimated bales)	Share in $292,000,000 subsidy [1]	Comparison increase in 1951 or 1960 operating income by subsidy (percent)
					6 mos.	9 mos.	6 mos.	9 mos.	6 mos.	9 mos.	6 mos.	9 mos.	1951	1960	1961	1962			
Burlington Mills	$310	$913	$866	$1,010		$754		$28		$814		$31	$35	$105	$90	$124½	660,000	$28.0	80
J. P. Stevens	349½	513	495½	585	[2] $143		[2] $4		[2] $145		[2] $3		49½	49½	40½	56	384,000	16.2	33
United Merchants & Manufacturers	215	468	471	502½	(3)			[4] 10		(3)		6	31½	36	29	39½	330,000	14.0	45
M. Lowenstein & Sons	144½	253	261½	270	74		1		71		1		13½	18	12½	14½	178,000	7.6	57
Cannon Mills	199	203	218	231	(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)		[5] 20½	26	28	31	274,000	11.6	57
Cone Mills Corp	154	188	214	220	122		3		115		2		26	13	13	14	268,000	11.3	[6] 44
Spring Cotton Mills	(3)	187	188	197.6	(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)	(3)	(3)	14.4	234,000	9.9	(7)
Dan River Mills	112	163	157	173½	91				85		3		[8] 15	[8] 20	[8] 18	[8] 19½	197,177	8.4	56
West Point Manufacturing Co	137	157	145	173		131		5		131		5	20	20	15	17½	209,000	8.7	[6] 43
Kendall Corp	97	112	124	134	[9] 62		[10] 2		[9] 63		2		12	13	13	14	159,000	6.8	56
Beaunit Mills	96	124	109	121	[11] 31		[11] 2		[11] 33		[11] 1		24	20	13	17	143,000	6.2	[6] 26
Indian Head Mills (1952)	13	82	102	152	74		2		73		1		(3)	36	6½	10	176,881	7.5	270
Erwin Mills, Inc. (1952)	61	64	68		(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	115,000	4.9	
Pepperell Manufacturing Co	88	100	91	102	(12)		(12)		(12)		(12)		(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	154,091	6.2	
Riegel Bros	58	91	86	87		[13] 63		[13] 2		[13] 61		[13] 2	(3)	8	6	8	133,000	5.7	72
Graniteville Co	57	62	68	74	38		1		41		1		6	8	7	8	111,000	4.7	78
Bibb Manufacturing Co	(3)	80	74	85	(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)	8	7	7	131,000	5.5	68
Reeves Manufacturing Co	67	72	66	77		55		1		59		1	8	7	3	6	114,000	4.8	[6] 60
Collins Aikman	58	65	65	90	[14] 26		[14] 1		[14] 27		[14] 1		4	4	4	8	133,000	5.8	115
Avondale Mills	[15] 48	61	56	66	(3)		(3)		(3)		[16] 1		(3)	6	7	7	98,149	4.2	70
Fulton Industries	(3)	52	52	49	24		.93		24		[17] .66		(3)	(3)	2	2	87,000	3.7	185
Berkshire Hathaway	61	63	48	53		41		[16] 2		38		[17] .712	(3)	(3)	2	[17] .114	94,000	4.0	200
Belding-Heminway	20	40	44	49	25		.575		25		.465		1	2	3	3	87,000	3.7	370
Thomaton Mills, Inc	42	41	38	42	(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)		7	6	7	7	75,106	3.2	46
Duplan Corp	31	31	37	43		34		1		35		.784	3	2	3	4	72,000	3.1	110
Mount Vernon Mills, Inc	63	37	37	43	21				22				11	3	2	3	72,000	3.1	[6] 28
Bates Manufacturing Co	60	36	36	38	(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)	(3)	2	2	72,000	3.1	155
Fabrex Corp.[2]	(3)	39	36	(3)			(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	72,000	3.1	
United Elastic Corp	26	30	32	35	18		1		19		1		6	6	7	6	64,500	2.8	47
Textiles, Inc	30	29	28	32	[18] 16		[18] .705		[18] 16		[18] .568		(3)	4	3	4	64,500	2.8	70
Monarch Mills	(3)	(3)	[19] 21	(3)	(3)		[20] .63		(3)		[20] .42					[21]	64,500	2.8	
Standard Coosa-Thatcher	26	26	23	27	(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	64,500	2.8	
Wyandotte Worsted	31	24	22		10		.85		9		[17] .48		2	2	2	2	64,500	2.8	140
Stonecutter Mills	(3)	(3)	[19] 13	(3)	(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)		(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	64,500	2.8	
Total																		[22] 205.0	

[1] $42.50 per bale.
[2] 13 weeks; month ending in May of each year.
[3] Not available.
[4] Includes $588,000, or 10 cents a share net capital gains.
[5] 1952.
[6] Companies experienced reduced income, 1951–63.
[7] 1962, 395,000 bales, 16.8 percent increase.
[8] Includes gross income from commission selling operations; 1961, $2,017,523; 1962, $2,164,712.
[9] 24 weeks ending June 15, 1962, and June 16, 1962.
[10] After $229,000 (11 cents a share) charge due to devaluation of Canadian dollar.
[11] Quarter ended June 30.
[12] Year ending June 30.
[13] 40 weeks ended July 7, 1962, and July 6, 1963.
[14] Quarter ended June 2, 1962, and June 1, 1963.
[15] 8 months.
[16] 28 weeks ended Mar. 10, 1963.
[17] Deficit.
[18] 6 months ended March.
[19] Total assets; sales not available.
[20] Canadian dollars.
[21] Merged Dec. 31, 1962, with other companies, including Pacelot Manufacturing Co.
[22] 70 percent of parity.

Sources: Standard & Poor's Corp. records; Moody's Industrials; Daily News Record, Jan. 25, 1962, p. 22, Daily News Record, May 14, 1962.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to state my strong support for the McIntire amendment to H.R. 6196. The amendment will force a gradual reduction in cotton price supports from the present 32.47 cents per pound to 29 cents over the life of the bill. The amendment compels these reductions; the Secretary of Agriculture has no choice in the matter.

With the McIntire amendment the bill, it seems to me, is worthy of support. It is fair and reasonable. I do not see how one can justify two-price cotton and low tariff rates at the same time without making some adjustments. I strongly supported the Trade Expansion Act. I believe in reciprocally low tariffs. I also believe in Americans selling cotton abroad in international markets. This means that we must sell overseas at the world market price. The world market price is 8½ cents per pound below the U.S. domestic price. The United States must sell abroad at this price in order to compete. This same cotton then comes back into the United States in manufactured goods form. What is the answer? Do we end international selling of raw cotton? Of course not. The Government already owns over 8.2 million bales of cotton. This is almost six times the amount owned in 1961. By 1964 it may increase to 10 million bales. The Government investment in this cotton will be $1.6 billion and the storage costs will approximate $83 million annually. We must sell as much as we can and we must stay in world competition. The choice then is to lower the price support for cotton, which this bill does by the McIntire amendment, and to make surplus cotton available to manufacturers at a price which will enable them to stay within the range of competition of foreign manufacturers. Foreign buyers of American cotton still will manufacture more cheaply than we can, but at least American manufacturers will not be prejudiced before they begin. The American consumer will be able to buy domestic cotton-made goods at cheaper prices. It is estimated that 35,000 jobs can be saved. In the past 5 years 45 cotton mills have been liquidated, wiping out approximately 20,000 jobs. How long can this continue? Most assuredly it will continue indefinitely unless some adjustment is made.

I would like to see larger cuts in the cotton price support than that provided by the McIntire amendment, but my distinguished friend from Maine, who is committed to the gradual elimination of the whole price support system, went as far as the practicalities indicated he could go in his amendment. On balance, then, I will support this bill.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the minority members of the Agriculture Committee and to join with them in opposition to this bill.

I would like to make it clear that I share the concern for the serious problems facing the cotton industry. Cotton plays a most important part in the economy of Dallas, the district I have the honor to represent. I agree that a vigorous and prosperous cotton industry is vital. This bill does not assure such a result, rather, in my opinion, it merely postpones the day when the cotton industry is liquidated unless we take proper measures to create a climate in which it may be restored to health.

The weakness of this bill is that it does not move cotton closer to a free market and less Government controls, but actually imposes a triple subsidy program for cotton, as pointed out in the minority report. This bill proposes, in addition to the subsidies for producers and exporters, a third subsidy for the mills. This is wrong and can result only in higher prices to consumers while providing no solution to the problem the cotton industry faces.

The way out of the dilemma faced by cotton is clearly outlined in the minority report on page 40 which is summed up as follows:

It is therefore our general recommendation that the Secretary of Agriculture be required by law to follow the mandate and the authority which he has failed to use under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the Agricultural Act of 1949, both of which were amended by the Agricultural Act of 1958. We propose that these acts be amended to effect an orderly transition over a period of years toward lower price supports for cotton which would allow increased markets and the development and reestablishment of a one-price cotton system while lowering Government costs, maintaining farm income, and recapturing cotton's historic preeminence as the king of textiles.

This is the goal of all of us truly interested in maintaining the cotton industry and this bill makes the attainment of such a goal almost impossible. Finally, there is only one proper solution to the problems of cotton and all of agriculture, ultimately we must get the Government out of the farm business.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, there seems to still be some lingering misunderstanding among some of the Members of the House as to how the Department of Agriculture would administer the provisions relating to changes in the support price of cotton as changes in the costs and efficiency of cotton production develop.

Section 3 of the bill requires that the Department make a determination as to how much change there is in the cost of growing cotton. It has been argued that it is not possible to measure accurately the cost of growing cotton. Let me emphasize that this bill requires only that the change in the cost of growing cotton be measured. There is no question but that it would be extremely difficult to get general agreement on the exact number of cents per pound it costs to produce cotton. But there is general agreement that the change in the cost from year to year can be measured with a very high degree of accuracy. The Department of Agriculture has done considerable work on this subject. In November 1962, a report on this work was published. It is entitled, "Changes in Costs and Efficiency of Cotton Production." Two charts from this report are contained on page 287 of the hearings. This is the method we would expect the Department of Agriculture to use to measure the changes in costs.

I have also heard it said there is some doubt about how the Department would apply this cost reduction provision to the price support level. This also has been worked out by the Department. An index of the average cost of growing cotton would be determined for a period of about 3 years ending in the latest year for which data is available. Three years is suggested in order to eliminate as much as possible the effects of weather. Another such average, ending 1 year earlier, would then be determined. The comparison of these two averages will reflect the change in the cost of growing cotton.

Under leave to extend, I will include in my remarks at this point a description of just how this calculation would be made This is what the Department says it will do should H.R. 6196 be enacted:

PROPOSED METHOD OF ADMINISTERING SECTION 3 OF H.R. 6196, AS APPROVED

The Department's publication, "Changes in Costs and Efficiency of Cotton Production," dated November 1962, contains the basic procedure and some of the data which would be used in administering section 3 of the bill. However, some additional data would need to be obtained in order to analyze and make available estimates of sufficient accuracy for this purpose.

In establishing a statistical series for measuring changes in the cost of producing cotton, it is intended that it will reflect not only those costs arising directly from the production of cotton such as labor, machinery, materials, ginning, and other contract services, but also a reasonable allowance for general farm overhead costs including a return to land. In the matter of establishing a return to land, however, it is expected that to the extent feasible account will be taken of, and appropriate adjustments made for, the many factors that have contributed to an artificial inflation in prices of farmland so that the return to land reflects only its value for agricultural uses.

It should also be pointed out that the Committee intends that changes in production costs from any cause be recognized in administering this section. It is not intended that reductions in price support be predicated only on reductions in production costs realized through the special cotton research program provided in section 3 of the bill.

The Department's publication measures the changes in costs of production for each year. In order to minimize the effects of weather on the cost in any particular year, an average of a few years should be used. The average should be kept as short as possible in order to bring changes in costs to bear on the price support within a reasonable time. But there must be sufficient lag to permit the data to be collected and the cost change determination made.

It is suggested, therefore, that for 1965, the average cost index during the 3 years ending in 1963 be divided by the average index during the 3 years ending in 1962. The result (but not more than 1.00) would be multiplied by the 1964 price support level to determine the level for 1965.

Each year thereafter, the 3-year averages would be advanced by 1 year.

An exception to the above would be made in the event costs go up, and then start down again. No reduction in the price support would be made as costs are coming back down until the previous lowest level is reached. From that point on the price support would again begin to be lowered as costs go down in the manner described above.

This provision is fair to the farmers in that it assures them that their price support will not be reduced unless the cost of growing cotton is reduced. With the kind of a research program contemplated by the bill, production costs can be reduced substantially. As the lower costs of production are reflected in lower price support, the overall expenditures for the cotton program will be reduced.

I think there is a good chance that by 1966, we can expect expenditures to be even less than they are under the present program. Over a period of say 8 to 10 years, it is highly possible, even probable, that costs can be reduced to the point where virtually all of the Government expenditures will be eliminated. To me this is one of the most important features of the bill. It removes from the political arena the establishment of the level of price support for cotton and puts it on a basis which is sound—both to the Government and to the farmer.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time remaining on this side.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, as we come to the end of this long debate, I want to impress upon the House just a few facts and figures. My dear friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], made a speech that was something of a tirade. He seems to think this House is not aware of certain things that have happened.

The fact is that for 20 long years under Democratic administrations, and I know that my colleague is very, very partisan, we operated a cotton program so successfully and so well that when we turned it over to the Eisenhower administration in 1953 we did not show a loss of a single dime nor of a single dollar but had a net profit of $268 million in the cotton program over a 20-year period.

When it got into the hands of unfriendly administrators, within a few short months that profit had been lost. Now we have lost up to date through the Commodity Credit Corporation on cotton $1,858 million—almost $2 billion. Yet the gentleman from Oklahoma comes here to oppose us when we are trying to do something about the losses and to minimize the costs and gives you a figure which is misleading. He says that this program costs $600 million. That is the total cost. He does not point out what the cost will be if you do not pass this bill. The additional cost for the first year is only $118 million. The second year it goes down to $87 million, and the third year $44 million, but during those 3 years it is estimated by experts that we will save the consumers of America $500 million and save the jobs of textile workers.

Let me go now to wheat. Our colleague had a lot to say about wheat, and

that is the principal crop in his district. Do you know what their losses have amounted to on wheat to date? Under the 20 years that we ran the program for wheat we lost only $76 million.

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

Mr. COOLEY. No. I am sorry. I cannot. But I will give you some information I do not think you know. Losses on wheat in the 20 years prior to 1953 were $76 million, which amounts to nothing compared to the subsequent losses we have incurred to date on wheat, his principal commodity, which amount to $10,931 million. And I challenge you to deny the accuracy of those figures. It is all right to lose on wheat, but you cannot lose on cotton. I have voted for wheat legislation, and you griped and growled about the last program we gave you. You went out to the country and told everybody to vote down this program. You said, "We will get you another." You have not gotten another wheat program. The wheat farmers rejected it. And I am willing to abide by their decision. Whenever the cotton farmers and the rice farmers and the peanut farmers and the tobacco farmers reject our programs I have no complaint to make. But I do have a complaint to make when fallacious statements and erroneous statements are made here in the last minutes of this debate in an effort to lead the Members to vote against this bill.

I can tell you this is the last clear chance to save the cotton industry of this country. This is the vote that you will cast. That is how important it is. I am pleading not only for the cotton farmers. We have about 230,000 textile workers in my State—more textile workers than any State in the Nation—more textile spindles than any State in the Nation.

This is a bill that will bring relief to everybody in the textile industry from Boston to Houston or Boston to Austin or whatever you want to say—from Ocracoke in North Carolina to the Golden Gate of California.

So I think this bill should be enacted and you should not be frightened or intimidated by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] because he does not want to vote it out. He has a perfect right to believe so.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. BELCHER. If you did not yield to me, you need not ever ask me to yield on the floor, whether I was for your case or not, because I have never, since I have been a Member of this Congress, refused to yield to you. When you give me some information I do not know, that will be a novel experience. But I will say to the gentleman I admit those wheat losses. Every single one of those bills was passed by your committee and it was your support that cost that money.

Mr. COOLEY. And signed by your President and recommended by your Secretary of Agriculture and voted for by you.

Mr. BELCHER. I voted against the bill that you passed that cost $8 billion. Your committee brought these bills up and not I.

Mr. COOLEY. No. It was your administration that weakened the program so much and accumulated these losses which are now constituting a great and intolerable burden on the taxpayers of this Nation.

I ask you to give careful consideration to the implications involved in this legislation. I have resolutions and letters here that will go into the RECORD from Rhode Island and up in Maine and all over this country where the people are begging for this legislation. Yet we see it wrapped up here in partisan politics.

I am inserting certain letters and resolutions at this point in the RECORD:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., July 30, 1963.

Hon. HAROLD COOLEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: I have read with a good deal of interest an article in the Daily News Record of July 24 which indirectly quotes you as saying that the Textile Workers Union of America can be of help in rallying support for one-price cotton legislation.

Specifically, the article says: "Mr. COOLEY is known to believe that the Textile Workers Union may be able to muster help from other segments of organized labor to work for the bill on behalf of textile mill workers."

My purpose in writing is to assure you that, as in the past, we will do all we possibly can to promote the passage of legislation which eliminates the inequities of the present two-price cotton system. We shall, of course, use all of our influence and persuasive powers to convince "big city" Congressmen of the pressing need for such legislation.

As for any attempt to enlist the rest of organized labor behind this legislation, I feel I must warn you and all other interested parties that this is no small or routine task.

It is very difficult, indeed, to arouse any sympathy on the part of other segments of labor, and the public in general, for a low-wage, nonunion industry, such as textiles, which fanatically resists the efforts of its workers to organize and improve their working and living standards.

It is hard to sell the proposition that an industry which will not even sit down with the representatives of its workers to discuss joint efforts to promote beneficial legislation deserves any consideration of this sort.

However, because textile workers have a stake in eliminating the inequities of the two-price cotton system, we shall make a vigorous attempt to mobilize support. But these are the facts of life we have to face, and they do not make this task an easy one.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM POLLOCK,
General President.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., November 11, 1963.

Hon. HAROLD COOLEY,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: Over the years, the Textile Workers Union of America has devoted a good deal of its energy to enlisting the aid of the Government in developing remedies to help restore the economic health of the textile industry. We have pursued this course not only in the interests of nearly 1 million American workers who depend upon it for their livelihood, but also because this industry is essential to the Nation's welfare.

Textile imports have always been a threat to our industry because the emerging, underdeveloped, low-wage nations always turn to this commodity in their efforts to industrialize quickly and to secure dollar-exchange for international trade.

To compound the difficulties which stem from this practice, our own Government makes it possible for foreign manufacturers to purchase raw cotton from the United States at 8½ cents a pounds (or 25 percent) less than domestic manufacturers are compelled to pay for the same cotton.

In turn, these foreign manufacturers, who already enjoy the advantage of low wages, convert the raw cotton into consumer goods and ship them into the same markets upon which our own industry depends. The result has been a drastic shrinkage in the jobs of American textile workers and a continuing threat of further shrinkage.

As a result of this unfair competition, imports of cotton products have skyrocketed. In 1962, they were equivalent to 645,000 bales of raw cotton. This amount is 64 percent greater than in 1961 and four times as great as the annual average of the last decade. Moreover, they continue to increase.

This vast influx of imports has seriously aggravated the unemployment problems of cotton textile workers. Employment in broadwoven fabric mills declined from 246,800 production workers in 1958 to 216,700 in August of 1963. In this 5-year process, 45 cotton mills have been liquidated and approximately 20,000 jobs have been wiped out.

What prompts this letter is the fact that, at long last, a remedy for this situation is about to be considered by the House of Representatives. The Cooley one-price cotton bill (H.R. 6196) will shortly be before you. This legislation would eliminate the two-price cotton system which has been depressing the domestic textile industry. It would enable domestic manufacturers to purchase raw cotton at the same price that foreign buyers pay.

This would be accomplished by gradually reducing the support price from 32½ to 29 cents a pound and, by making payments to the mills (in the form of cotton from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation) to make up the difference between the support price and the 24-cent world price of cotton.

We in the Textile Workers Union of America are most anxious to see the Cooley bill enacted. We regard these payments as essential to remove the competitive disadvantage suffered by the domestic industry. On the basis of past experience with cotton price reductions, it is evident that competition will force the price level for cotton textiles to be lowered. This, in turn, should result in a $500 million savings to consumers and lead to the expanded use of American-made cotton products. In addition, it should not only relieve the threat to existing cotton textile employment, but should create some 35,000 additional jobs for cotton textile workers.

The Kennedy administration is supporting the Cooley bill and the Speaker of the House has agreed to bring it to the floor shortly after November 11, 1963. Because of its importance not only to textile workers, but to consumer and national interests in general, we earnestly urge you to vote in favor of this legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM POLLOCK,
General President.

LEWISTON JOINT BOARD, TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
Lewiston, Maine, October 28, 1963.

The Honorable HAROLD COOLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: I am enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by the

delegates to the Lewiston joint board of the Textile Workers Union of America at a meeting held on Sunday, October 27, 1963.

The joint board represents approximately 4,000 textile workers in Maine at the present time.

Only a few years ago, we represented over 8,000 workers. The decrease has been due principally to competition caused by increased imports of cotton products.

We plead with you to use your great influence to secure the passage of H.R. 6196 known as the one-price cotton bill in order to relieve the insecurity of many thousands of American cotton textile workers.

Very truly yours,

DENIS A. BLAIS,
Manager.

Whereas the cotton textile workers and manufacturers in this country have been burdened for many years with unfair competition from foreign made products; and

Whereas the action of our own Government in permitting foreign manufacturers to purchase American-grown raw cotton at prices substantially lower than those prevailing for American mills; and

Whereas the combination of low foreign wages and lower priced cotton has resulted in greatly increased imports of cotton-made products with a corresponding decrease in employment in the American cotton textile industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lewiston joint board of the Textile Workers Union of America, representing workers in the areas of Lewiston-Auburn, Augusta, Waterville-Winslow and Old Town, in the State of Maine, urgently request the Congress of the United States to pass H.R. 6196, known as the one-price cotton bill now pending in the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee and members of the Maine congressional delegation.

Unanimously adopted October 27, 1963.

UNITED TEXTILE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
CRANSTON, R.I., *September 8,1963.*

RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO ECONOMIC HARDSHIP OF THE AMERICAN TEXTILE WORKER

Whereas it is a matter of record that the economic plight of the American textile worker has become so acute, each week thousands are forced on relief rolls because their employers are compelled to shut down their plants, or are forced out of business due to unfair foreign competition; and

Whereas it is also a matter of record that the price differential of 8½ cents per pound of cotton allowed foreign competitors is economically unsound, and eventually will cause more textile mills to close their doors, thereby making a graveyard of an industry which was once the backbone of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Local 2459, United Textile Workers of America, Cranston, R.I., respectfully memorializes Congress to pass remedial legislation to end price differential discrimination against the American textile industry, and give to the American textile worker the inalienable right to work at his chosen trade; be it further

Resolved, That our international president, George Baldanzi, be consulted on the propriety of a peaceful march to Washington, D.C., by members of our international union, for the purpose of presenting our petition to the Members of Congress, and to provide documentary proof that legislative inactivity is causing irreparable harm to thousands of textile workers in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, and supporting data, be forwarded to our delegates to Congress from Rhode Island, to John H. Chafee, Governor of Rhode Island, and to President John F. Kennedy.

This resolution was passed at a regular meeting, Sunday, September 8, 1963.

JAMES LENEHAN,
President.

EXCERPTS, PROVIDENCE SUNDAY JOURNAL BUSINESS WEEKLY, AUGUST 25, 1963

The two-price system centers around an export subsidy program established in 1956.

Foreign competitors buy American grown cotton 8.5 cents cheaper, or the equivalent of $42.50 for each 500-pound bale.

American Textile Manufacturers Institute report on imports of cotton products including grey goods and yarn.

	Square yards
1955	363,487,000
1962	1,165,878,000

At the moment, there are three bills in Congress. Two are in the Senate, Cooley bill in the House. Apparently, the Cooley bill has the best chance of passage.

Berkshire Hathaway operated four textile plants, and a finishing plant in 1961. Now only one plant remains.

Cotton inventories are exceedingly low, business is being done on a hand to mouth basis, because Congress is not saying whether it will grant relief or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 348. 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, 1967, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than producers 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 on the date of enactment of this section available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of this section: *Provided,* That beginning August 1, 1964, payments shall be made to persons other than producers in an amount as will make upland cotton produced in the United States available for domestic use at a price which is not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 13, insert the word "such".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: 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. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I hope it will not be necessary to take even 5 minutes to explain this amendment. All it does is to insure that we will not go further than making a payment which will eliminate the inequity. That is supposed to be the purpose of this bill. The first part of this section takes care of that by giving the benefits to the mills of any inequities that exist because of the export payment. The proviso beginning on line 12, however, says:

That beginning August 1, 1964—

The Secretary can go further than remove the inequities and make the payment exactly what the foreign payment is. It is not necessary in the opinion of many of us and in the opinion of the Department to do this. The Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Murphy, who appeared for the Department of Agriculture before our committee said that it might take 5 cents, it might take 6 cents, it might be as low as 4 cents, to remove that inequity. The difference is because of the transportation cost, handling, and insurance and other relevant items like that. So by adopting this amendment you would be merely providing what the proponents of this bill say that they want. You would be prohibiting the possibility of a windfall to anyone.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, of course, would ruin the pending bill. It would take the heart out of the bill. I think the author of the amendment is well aware of the fact that no provision in this bill requires the Secretary of Agriculture to make an 8½-cent-a-pound payment to anybody. The payment to be made is the same that is necessary to eliminate the inequity, whatever it happens to amount to. If under the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE], the price of cotton comes down to 29 cents a pound over a 3-year period, naturally the payment would come down.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a brief question?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Can the gentleman tell me why they would put a proviso in here to the effect that beginning August 1 there would be different rules followed than would be followed upon enactment of the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows exactly why.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No, I do not.

Mr. COOLEY. I will tell the gentleman if the gentleman will just listen.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I will listen.

Mr. COOLEY. We promised to eliminate this inequity. At that time when the promise was made the inequity was 8½ cents per pound. Everyone in the industry came before our committee and supported my original bill. My original bill contemplated the elimination of the inequity in toto. Then, when the administration people came before our committee they told you and told me that because of the budgetary situation they could not go the full 8½ cents per pound in 1963, but would try to reach it in 1964. I think the Under Secretary said under the budget they might be able to go as much as 5 cents a pound.

When that word came out all of the people in the industry just left Washington and went home. I think they were heartbroken and upset.

Then we finally got them together again in Washington and the officials convinced the industry that they could take less than full and complete elimination of the inequity in the first year under this legislation.

So, that is the reason we put this date in the bill.

In August of 1964 we are proposing to go all the way to eliminate this injustice.

If there is an injustice and if there is an inequity, it should be eliminated in toto and not partially. That is the reason it is in there and I thought, certainly, that the gentleman from Missouri knew that.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does not the first part of the section there say that in order to make such payments as will eliminate the inequities—it does not place any restriction upon it, does it?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right exactly.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Why have they not suggested that instead of coming down here and saying it has to be the exact amount, when the Under Secretary in all of his testimony did not say this. The only people who said it took a full 8½-cent reduction were the mill people. I do not blame them for saying it.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But, I think they got a little greedy.

Mr. COOLEY. The Department officials admitted it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No, the Department officials never did admit that. The gentleman cannot show me a place in the hearings where they admitted it.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there anything in here that calls for 8½ cents? If there is, show it to me. It is not in here.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If it were not in that proviso, you would not object to taking it out.

Mr. COOLEY. It is not in there. The language says whatever it takes to eliminate the inequity. That is what we want to do and that is all we want to do.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture a question, in order to clarify the amendment that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] has offered here.

As I understand it, with the striking of this language, beginning on line 12, the Secretary could decide to pay only—and let us say—a 2-cent subsidy to the mill if he wanted to, rather than be required to bring the price to the mill down to the world market price; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. If he wanted to break faith with the intent and purpose of the law, of course, he could do that. But I have no reason to believe that the Secretary of Agriculture would issue any such order.

Mr. QUIE. When the Secretary of Agriculture, or someone who represented him, appeared before our committee, he indicated that the disparity or the difference between these prices was not 8½ cents, because there is some transportation cost involved.

Mr. COOLEY. Why there was some talk about transportation costs. If the Secretary finds a disparity of 8½ cents, there is nothing to require him to pay 8½ cents. If he is right, it might be something substantially less than 8½ cents.

The point is the inequity. I do not believe in trying to partially eliminate inequity. I think we should go all the way and be fair to this industry which is so vital to the welfare of the people of our country.

Mr. QUIE. In other words, even with the language in the proviso which the Jones amendment would strike, the Department of Agriculture could consider transportation. Say transportation was 1 cent, then he could make the payment 7.5 cents instead of 8.5 cents?

Mr. COOLEY. He has all the flexibility in the world, it seems to me. He must look to the intent and purpose of the law, and that is to eliminate inequities, and I think the gentleman will recall that because of the budget situation they could not go all the way.

Mr. QUIE. In other words, if we agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, there is a likelihood in 1964 the Department would not go all the way either?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the gentleman's amendment seems to me to be a rather important point. Although I am not sure I understand what the bill's objective is, in one place it says the objective is to eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users. I am not sure what that means, but I suppose it means to equalize the cost of cotton at the mills, both foreign and domestic. The bill says "eliminate inequities." It does not say that the Department would be authorized to make a lesser payment immediately upon the enactment of this act simply because of a limited budget. It says the Secretary is required to eliminate the inequity.

Mr. COOLEY. Here is the difference between us. The gentleman from Missouri I think understands that to eliminate inequity we must have this subsidy.

Mr. HARDY. Let us get away from the 8.5 cents, or any specific amount. Let us talk about what an inequity is. I do not know whether it is 8.5 cents or what it is you have been talking about.

Mr. COOLEY. Eight and one-half cents is not mentioned in the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You are misquoting me. I did not say it required 8.5 cents to remove the inequity.

Mr. HARDY. I did not mean to promote an argument between my two friends. This thing has me a little bit confused, too, because there is nothing in the bill about "cents." It says "to eliminate inequities." I do not understand how under the language of the bill the Secretary could make a payment of less than the amount required to eliminate the inequity as of the effective date of the bill.

Frankly, I think I have to agree with the gentleman from Missouri. As I read the language in the proviso, its meaning differs substantially from the earlier language in the section. In one case it says "difference in the cost of cotton between foreign and domestic users." Under the proviso it says "the price at which such cotton is made available for export." So in the proviso the Department would be required to take into consideration the cost of transportation and any other incidental expenses. Frankly, I think the proviso ought to be stricken if you are going to promote equity.

Mr. COOLEY. In the proviso the language is "at a price that is not in excess of the price at which cotton is made available for export."

Mr. HARDY. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the whole thing does make sense. That is, if there is an inequity it should be eliminated. We do not tie the Secretary's hands.

Mr. HARDY. That is not what you are saying in this language, as I read it. You are saying in this language that the American competitor is going to have an advantage because he is going to get his cotton at the mill cheaper than the foreign importer can because the foreign importer has to pay handling and storage and transportation costs. In the proviso you relate it to price for export.

Mr. COOLEY. That is not related to price. It is related to an inequity in price.

Mr. HARDY. I cannot read inequity in the last part of the proviso to save my life. The proviso relates to price and it proposes to equalize the price of cotton to mills in the United States with the export price of cotton to which still must be added transportation and other costs before it reaches foreign mills.

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

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. It seems to me clear that the proviso puts the domestic mill in a very much better position than his foreign competitor.

Mr. HARDY. That is it exactly.

Mr. MEADER. This adds transportation costs, insurance, and all the other costs.

Mr. HARDY. That is my point. The amendment of the gentleman from Missouri ought to be adopted.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, during the discussion in committee, if I recall properly and I am sure I do, the purpose of this language was the Department testimony that it could not make an 8.5-cent payment to remove the so-called price inequity between the export cotton and the domestically consumed cotton. It testified the inequity was somewhat less. You could determine it was 5, 5.5, or 4.5 cents. But the proviso that this would strike would insure that if the McIntire amendment is adopted and the price support of cotton is reduced you would carry the gage relating what the transportation cost is, you would not continue the payment, if it were 5 cents of 15 cents after August 1, 1964, regardless of what the inequity was. So it does bring about a higher payment after August 1, 1964 than it does before, in relationship to the 1963 crop.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising is to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri what his definition would be in relation to equity under the amendment which he proposed. I think for the legislative record it would be very helpful if the gentleman would say what he thinks of in terms of equity that would be attempted under the legislation if his amendment were adopted.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the wording in the bill, the part that I do not strike, gives an adequate definition. It says here very plainly:

> 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, 1967, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than producers—

Of course, the mills may not get it.

> 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.

In the hearings, when Under Secretary Murphy was before our committee he was raked over the coals quite a bit. We were trying to pin him down to a point. He indicated that the payment might be different in different areas due to the difference in the cost of transportation, due to the cost of handling, insurance, and all the other factors that go into it. We discussed that in the committee and we finally wrote the language and said we were going to leave it up to the Secretary of Agriculture to decide what the equity was. That is what he still does and would still do if my amendment is adopted. Unless my amendment is adopted, we get into paying the exact figure. The reason I say the exact figure is that the differential between the domestic mills and the foreign mills should not be the same, because the difference in transportation costs and other relevant factors would be ignored.

According to the American Cotton Association, it cost 35 cents to get cotton from Memphis to Bremen by the Gulf ports as against 35.12 to get it from Memphis to a Carolina mill. It depends on where the cotton is going as to the amount of subsidy that mill should collect at that time.

That is what the Secretary would do. That is what he would be permitted to do under this bill, if my amendment is adopted. But if my amendment is not adopted, then we are going to say that this payment to the domestic mill has to be the same as the payment to the foreign mill. I say that would provide a windfall.

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

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Missouri said that during the hearings there was a discussion of such an amendment in the committee. The gentleman never offered such an amendment in the committee. Now he comes here and offers this amendment and confuses the issue. You know the clear purpose and intent of this bill is to eliminate the inequities. Here we are making legislative history and if the amendment before us is adopted all we will be saying is that the purpose of it is not to give our domestic mill any advantage. You know that as well as I do.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the chairman will admit that we had considerable discussion. There were amendments offered in committee at the time this was under discussion.

Mr. COOLEY. But it was not your amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It was not my amendment, no. But I have supported a lot of amendments on the floor that I did not offer. As a matter of fact, I offer very few amendments.

Mr. COOLEY. But no amendment with the same purport and intent as your amendment was offered in committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. There were amendments with the same purport offered—yes, I beg to differ with the chairman. I am not trying to confuse the issue. I am trying to bring the issue out and make it clear.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I think the point has been thoroughly discussed. I think the objective we have in mind is that there shall be equity, and I feel that the language that is in the bill makes this intention very clearly.

I want to say I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

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

Mr. McINTIRE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. If the purpose is equity based upon the cost to both the domestic and foreign consumer, then I can vote for the bill because the rule of thumb on exports into the United States as contained in the hearings and the information that we got in hearings that I held for 2 years at the instance of the House of Representatives is that approximately 25 percent of the American purchase price is added.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am serious about this. I would be happy to vote for this bill, if the purpose is to really create equity between the American purchase price of cotton and the foreign purchase price. Because if they purchase at $139.50 the rule of thumb is that 25 percent of the American purchase price is added for insurance and transportation. That will mean that the added price to the $139.50 would be $35 making it $164.50, which is the cost of a bale of cotton, let us say, to the Japanese. That is if they charge the rates of transportation provided under the international rate board schedules. But since the Japanese own and control their own transportation, I can guarantee you that they will increase the price of their transportation so that it will equalize the cost at the figure of $172. As this now stands, if we accept the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri, the total available amount that can be retained or claimed by American industry and American textile mills will be $7.50 a bale instead of $42.50 a bale.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORHEAD. As I understand it, the gentleman is saying that with the proviso eliminated, the bill would provide for equity whereas with the proviso included in the bill, it would go further than that and might involve a windfall.

Mr. DENT. Yes, and it would go further. I say that the gentleman is right in that assumption.

Furthermore, you must remember that the entire cotton content imported into the United States is less than 8 percent of the American consumption of cotton content products or textiles. Therefore, if it is only 8 percent of the total U.S. consumption, how can you justify giving a so-called equity of $42.50 on 8 million bales to American textile maker? The impact upon his production and sales in American is 8 percent of his total sales.

Now, I am not one who believes in imports. If I thought this bill would close the door to imports, I would be the first to vote for it, and every person here knows that. But it will not, because the cotton content of a shirt is less than 4 ounces of cotton. So the cotton content makes no difference when you are paying $2.15 an hour average wage in South Carolina and are paying 15 cents as an average wage in Hong Kong and Japan. The question of equity here has to be based on four factors. I would vote for a bill that would undertake setting up a factor of wages, a factor of raw material, a factor of taxes, and a factor of services where the costs are mandated by law. If you do that, you put your industry in competition not only here but all over

the world. Until you do that, do not do it this way, piecemeal, because the cotton States will suffer the most. Those of us who are your friends are telling you frankly this is unsound. It will hurt you when you have to come back to the House within a year or so.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. We are told—whether accurately or not I do not know—that if this inequity is eliminated and our mills are authorized and able to purchase cotton at the same price as foreign mills purchase cotton then we will substantially increase the use of cotton here at home. That will benefit the cotton farmer and it will benefit the cotton textile man and it will benefit everybody including the consumer. All of this will bring down the price to the consumer to the extent of about $500 million a year. That is what the record shows.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I respect you and respect what you are trying to do, but let me tell you something. While all other commodities in the United States increased in volume from 1947 to 1962 by 50 percent in production and use, the textiles in the United States diminished by 2 percent. The textile industry is the victim of its own advancement as well as the advancement of manmade fibers. When they started to product shrinkproof materials and started to Sanforize cotton and make cotton so that it lasted longer and a housewife could buy a cotton dress for a dollar and throw it into a washing machine instead of having five dresses that she had to scrub and scrub away on and scrub them into the sewers, that is what caused the decline in textiles. This is a national decline. There is an increase in the foreign countries because they do not have washing machines and they do not have detergents and other washing materials and do not have our processes for making cotton so durable.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment would have the effect of tightening up on the possible abuse of the direct payments to mills under the provisions of this bill. The latest quotation I have seen on the price of Middling inch upland U.S. cotton at London, for example, was somewhere around 27 cents a pound and not the 24 cents a pound price at which I presume the differential payment or trade incentive payment could be computed under the definition which appears in lines 12 to 17, page 2, of this bill.

I just discussed the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], who spoke a few minutes earlier. I believe I speak for him in stating that he is definitely in support of the Jones amendment, and I join him in urging my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have the high privilege of being a member of the Committee on Agriculture, but I have followed this problem very closely for a great many years. There is not a bale of cotton produced in my district, and there is not a textile mill located in any of the areas that I represent, but I have worked for many years on our trade agreements program and I have been one who has recognized this inequity which exists as a result of the laws enacted by the Congress. As a matter of fact, I headed a subcommittee which went to Japan about 4 or 5 years ago. We met with the Japanese textile industry for about a week. We discussed these problems in the friendliest fashion possible. A year or so ago when we considered the passage of the new Trade Agreements Act, the cotton textile people came before us and pointed out what was obviously an inequity. They then went to the Tariff Commission and filed a complaint there, and the Tariff Commission said that there was an inequity but that it was created by law and could not be solved by a tariff.

Obviously there is an inequity. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] had to say. The textile industry is a great variety of industries. It is not limited to cotton. The synthetic fiber industry is fast moving into the textile industry. The synthetic trade is moving ahead of the normal cotton fiber phase of the industry, which is falling behind, as everybody knows.

Mr. Chairman, I am the last person on earth to say that this is a perfect bill. I know that all of the bills that come before this body lack perfection, as everybody else knows. But I do know that a sincere effort has been made to perfect a bill. I do know that this bill has one primary objective and only one primary objective and that is to correct the inequity, namely: the price differential that an American mill has to pay as compared to someone operating a mill in England or in Tokyo or in Hong Kong.

Mr. Chairman, I am a great admirer of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I listened to his remarks here earlier today with great interest. He and I usually have been on different sides of the export-import trade question. The only exception I would take to what he had to say was in connection with support for this bill. I know that the labor people in the textile industry are supporting the bill because they are fast losing their jobs.

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

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

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana. I think this amendment should be defeated. This bill was carefully considered by the committee. It represents a majority viewpoint of the members of the committee who carefully considered it over many days and many weeks. I think it would be a mistake to start amending it now in this fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. DENT. I notice it has been bandied around here that I, for some reason or other, intimated that there has not been a loss of jobs and that unions are not for this legislation. Certainly they are for it. They were for the trade bill. But that does not mean that I have to follow exactly everything that any union labor leader wants or what every farmer wants, or anybody else wants. I do want to say that in the publication of October 26, 1961, from the press of Indianhead Mills, Inc., Mr. James E. Robison—a person whom I do not know—takes exception to the gentleman's remarks when the gentleman suggested that the textile industry has been increasing. From 1947 to 1961 industrial production in the United States increased 50 percent while textile production declined by 2 percent. Employment was 1,325,000 in the textile industry in 1947 and employment now is 940,000.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed?

Mr. DENT. Yes, you may.

Mr. BOGGS. The facts are that the textile industry employs a great many people in New England, and in the southeastern part of the United States. There is not a single person in my congressional district who is employed in the textile industry.

What this bill is designed to do, if it has any merit at all, is to correct the differential that exists. One does not have to be an economist to understand this problem. An American mill goes out to buy a bale of cotton and that American mill has got to pay x number of cents for that bale of cotton more than does the Japanese mill.

The gentleman made some point a moment ago in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] that we should not take into account shipping costs and all the other things that go into the movement of cotton. But, if we did not look at this thing on an overall basis, then we would have to go into the whole competitive situation between the American cotton industry and, let us say, the Hong Kong cotton industry. As all of us know, the wage differential, the fringe benefits and all of the rest of these items are quite different in Hong Kong as compared to the situation in Massachusetts, North Carolina, or Georgia, or some other place in the United States.

As I understand the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], what he seeks to do is to strike out the language on page 2, beginning at line 12 which, in effect, says in modifying the definition of "inequity," that it should not be in excess of the price at which

such cotton is made available for export.

If we strike that out, what it really means is that there will be no requirement to equalize this inequity.

I say, Mr. Chairman, if there be an inequity—and there is one—and if we are going to legislate in the field, let us face up to it realistically and recognize the inequity and try to do something about it.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, one other point: This cotton is paid in kind, cotton in storage costing the taxpayers money to store it.

The idea that these payments are made out of the Treasury of the United States is just not so.

I say, in conclusion, that this is a long way from a perfect bill. But it is a step in the right direction. By the time this bill has been passed by the other body and has been perfected in conference between the two bodies, I think we will have taken a step in preserving the great American textile industry, and I think we should do it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish that some of those who go over to Japan to frequently would talk to the Japanese about some of the facts of life in this country. They should be told that we cannot forever absorb their imports at the cost of jobs for American workers and damage to our industries.

Mr. Chairman, I recall, after World War II, how this country moved into Japan. We gave the Japanese modern equipment. We sent technicians to teach them how to use this modern knitting and textile equipment. We loaned them some $1.8 billion. About a year and a half ago that loan was settled and we got back somewhere around $470 million in full payment for a billion-800-and-some-odd-million-dollar handout.

There is only one way that we are ever going to cure situations of this kind, not only for the cotton people but for the raw materials producers and processors of this country, and that is to somehow or other get out of the Committee on Ways and Means, of which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] who has just addressed you is a member, a tariff that represents the differential in the costs of production as between foreign producers and American producers.

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in a chicken war with the European Common Market. It has not yet been settled, and we are on the way to taking another shellacking from the Common Market nations.

A blue ribbon U.S. Commission was established and it reported there was $46 million worth of damage to American producers by virtue of the loss of the poultry market because the Common Market virtually tripled its tariff on our frozen poultry.

Incidentally, Arkansas, the home State of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, is one of the largest poultry producing States in the United States. Then U.S. and foreign negotiators got busy and the other day we were told the $46 million damage has been reduced to $26 million. Somehow or other, overnight, the damage to American producers shrunk to $26 million.

This is but one example, Mr. Chairman, of how we are getting whipped all over the world. In South America they expropriate our property, the American-owned telephone company in Brazil, for instance. Sure, the Brazilian Government is going to pay for it, and pay more than the telephone company was worth. But how are they going to pay for it? With the dollars we dump in through various forms of foreign aid. They expropriate American investments, then we give them a soft loan that will never be paid, or we give them foreign aid in outright dollar grants. In other words, they use our tax dollars to pay for their larceny.

How long are we going to continue with this fleecing of American taxpayers for such purposes?

This bill is but another device for victimizing the American people for the benefit of a few. American textile manufacturers, according to the sponsors of this bill, are being damaged by foreign textile imports. So the answer is easy, as this bill provides—simply raid the U.S. Treasury and compensate the textile corporations for the damage they allegedly sustain.

Well, what do you propose to do for all others—farmers, processors, manufacturers, and labor—who are also hurt by the importation of low-cost foreign products? How many billions will it take to compensate all those who are being damaged on the same basis?

In the debate yesterday, it was stated that President Johnson supports this legislation. He is also being touted in the newspapers these days as being an advocate of frugality and economy. If it is frugality and economy to advocate spending an additional $600 million on the cotton program, with a substantial part of this money going as a windfall to the textile corporations, then I do not know the meaning of the words frugality and economy.

We are witnessing an attempt to put the raw materials producers on a world price level. The only sane answer is to get back immediately to tariffs—tariff schedules that represent the differential in the costs of production of foreign and domestic products.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me to stand in the well today, coming as I do from New England, and speak against this bill. However, I feel I have no alternative. As a Member of the House for some 5 years, and having taken the well of the House on many, many occasions against subsidies and the principle of subsidies, I cannot see how I can, in good conscience, vote for a triple subsidy in this bill. We must vote with our conscience, whether it affects our own backyard or not. We must rise above politics.

In questioning the tone and intent of this bill, Mr. Chairman, I am questioning mainly the serious and continuing problems of subsidies which go against the grain of the American democratic system.

And yet many of my colleagues, who are concerned with the increased spending on countless issues, are saying that this is not a subsidy program, and that it is a sensible solution to a serious problem.

We cannot fool anyone in this country, Mr. Chairman, with this program, a so-called panacea to abolish two-price cotton which will increase the agriculture expenditures in this one commodity from the $500 million level to the $775 million, at a subsidy cost of $283 million a year.

It is quite possible, as the gentlemen from California [Mr. LEGGETT], who serves on the Committee on Agriculture said in a letter to his colleagues, to "oppose this measure not because I am not interested in a healthy cotton industry, but because I wish to see this industry expand and prosper in a healthy way."

First, Mr. Chairman, how ridiculous can this problem of subsidies become? Here we see the evolution of a three-barreled subsidy to, first, the farmer, second, the importer and, third, the manufacturer.

Instead of pouring money into a situation that will not improve at the termination of this act, this Congress has had the time and the talent to look into the serious problem and arrive at a better solution than this.

Instead, by injecting a philosophy of supply management, so odious to the American farmer, the Congress would, by the passage of this bill, continue to damage the laws of supply and demand and by doing so, damage agriculture more than the natural and terrifying forces of nature ever could.

We are, in effect, admitting that the subsidy program has been a failure and we are attempting to correct that failure by still another error in judgment.

This reminds me of the old golf pro in Massachusetts who guaranteed that he could cure anyone's slice, which he did. Everyone began to hook.

And like the damaging hook, Mr. Chairman, this bill is out of bounds.

One of the strangest features, it seems to me, is the kind of handout it provides to an area of our country that has been responsible for pilfering many of our textile industries in New England.

All of these things considered, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that Congress will pride itself on the passage of this legislation at a time when we should be considering issues of a national and world importance.

At a time when we should be national, we are being sectional. At a time when we should be united, we are splitting ourselves apart on a piece of legislation that, upon deep reflection, rips through our free competitive system. It should not be supported by anyone who has any

concern for the tightening of our fiscal system at a time when spending is getting out of hand.

Mr. Chairman, a colleague from New England said yesterday he could not understand for the life of him why anyone from New England could not vote for this bill. I bleed for the textile industry; however, it was not two-price cotton that came in and stole the textile industry from New England. It was the South. It was the cheap labor in the South, the sweatshop conditions, the tax inducements, and the lack of fringe benefits. These were the causes that took our textile industries from New England to "greener pastures" in the South. Now you want us to bail out the South so that they can finish the job and take what remaining industries we now have—but not with my vote.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri), there were—ayes 102, noes 90.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chairman appointed Mr. JONES of Missouri and Mr. ABERNETHY as tellers.

The committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 125, noes 122.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOEVEN

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is in the nature of a substitute to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute to H.R. 6196 offered by Mr. HOEVEN: Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' at the beginning of the first paragraph and adding the following:

"'(b) 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 annually 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.

"'(c) In establishing the level of price support to cooperators for each crop of upland cotton beginning with the 1965 crop of such cotton, the Secretary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 103(a), shall make such reductions in the price support level as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton. The level of price support for the 1964 crop of upland cotton shall be the national average support price which reflects 30 cents per pound for Middling inch. For 1965 and subsequent years, the level of price support shall be the level in effect for the preceding crop adjusted as provided in this section to reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton; *Provided*, That the maximum level of price support shall be the national average support price which reflects for Middling inch 29½ cents per pound for the 1965 crop and 29 cents per pound for the 1966 crop'."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask whether or not the document just read is offered as a substitute for the first section or as a substitute for the whole bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROONEY of New York). It is offered as a substitute for the entire bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. COOLEY. That the bill has not been read and a substitute is not in order to the bill until it has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is attempting to offer it at this time for the reason that if the first section is stricken he may take subsequent action.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is offering it at this time and if the first section is stricken he may subsequently move to strike out the remaining sections as they are read.

The gentleman from Iowa may move to strike out section 1 at this point and insert new language. If that motion is adopted he then may move as the remaining sections are read to strike them from the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit, while I do not disagree with the statement of the Chairman, I am looking at the situation as it is. Previously I requested unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point, but objection was made to that request. Then we adopted the Jones amendment on page 2, line 12. The rest of the bill has not been read and I say the gentleman is out of order in offering a substitute until we finish reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Technically the gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Iowa may offer an amendment at this time to strike out section 1.

Mr. COOLEY. But he has not offered an amendment to that effect. I am not talking about what he may do hereafter, but up to this time he has made no such offer, and therefore my point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair at this time is indicating what the gentleman from Iowa should do.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. He has indicated that three times, but he has not done it yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] will be required to change the language presently offered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Do I understand that it is not in order to offer a substitute to the bill as such until the entire bill has been read?

The CHAIRMAN. No; that is not so. The gentleman must first move to strike out section 1 of the bill and insert the language he has offered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will it also be necessary to move to strike all of the succeeding sections?

The CHAIRMAN. It will, if the amendment is adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot hear what is going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is responding to a parliamentary inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. COOLEY. May we ask what the parliamentary inquiry is?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is inquiring as to how he should proceed.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Chair that the gentleman is proceeding according to information which he had received.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the gentleman from Iowa could offer his amendment at the conclusion of the reading of the entire bill as a substitute for the bill.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will the gentleman be recognized for that purpose at the proper time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Then I shall defer action until that time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I now renew my request that the remainder of the bill be considered as having been read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill follows:

SEC. 2. Section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This section also shall be applicable to payments provided for under section 348 of this title."

SEC. 3. Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) 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. In carrying out this special research program, the Secretary is authorized to utilize not to exceed $10,000,000 annually of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Secretary shall report annually 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.

"(b) In establishing the level of price support to cooperators for each crop of upland cotton beginning with the 1965 crop of such cotton, the Secretary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 103, shall make such reductions in the price support level as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton."

SEC. 4. 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: "*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 loan rate for such cotton under section 103(a) plus reasonable carrying charges:"

SEC. 5. Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsections:

"(b) For the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops of cotton, the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may provide to cooperators price support on not to exceed fifteen bales (standard five hundred pounds gross weight) of the production from their allotments at a level up to 10 per centum in excess of the basic level of price support established under subsection (a) hereof but not in excess of the level of price support for the 1963 crop.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to keep cotton to the maximum extent practicable in the normal channels of trade, if the level of price support to cooperators for the 1964, 1965, or 1966 crop is increased under subsection (b), price support for cotton at the level established under subsection (b) shall be carried out through the simultaneous purchase of cotton at the support price therefor under subsection (b) and sale of such cotton at the support price therefor under subsection (a) or similar operations, including loans under which the cotton would be redeemable by payment of the amount for which the cotton would be redeemable if the loan thereon had been made at the support price for such cotton under subsection (a)."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]. Does the gentleman offer an amendment?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOEVEN

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HOEVEN: Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' at the beginning of the first paragraph and adding the following:

"'(b) 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 $10,000,000 annually, as may be necessary for the Secretary to carry out this special research program. The Secretary shall report annually 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.

"'(c) In establishing the level of price support to cooperators for each crop of upland cotton beginning with the 1965 crop of such cotton, the Secretary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 103(a), shall make such reductions in the price support level as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton. The level of price support for the 1964 crop of upland cotton shall be the national average support price which reflects 30 cents per pound for Middling inch. For 1965 and subsequent years, the level of price support shall be the level in effect for the preceding crop adjusted as provided in this section to reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton: *Provided*, That the maximum level of price support shall be the national average support price which reflects for Middling inch 29½ cents per pound for the 1965 crop and 29 cents per pound for the 1966 crop.'"

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

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

Mr. COOLEY. The reading of the amendment was not very clear. But permit me to ask a question: Is it the purpose of the gentleman's amendment or substitute to eliminate the whole bill, except the research provisions, and then to insert the McIntire amendment?

Mr. HOEVEN. Exactly. This incorporates the McIntire amendment and the research section of the bill before us and eliminates everything else.

Mr. COOLEY. Everything else. All right.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, it was said on this floor a while ago that this was the last chance to enact cotton legislation. I do not think there is ever a last chance. My substitute gives you a chance to do something about it. Several people from the Cotton Belt have confided in me, that the answer to their problem is the reduction of price supports for cotton. I wish they would practice what they preach by supporting my substitute.

My substitute would amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to change the operation of the cotton price support law.

It is identical to the price support language of the bill with the amendment which may be offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] if my substitute fails. It is also identical to the language on research contained in the committee amendment to the bill.

The effect of the substitute would be to delete from the bill all provisions dealing with payments, including both trade incentive payments to cotton processors and simultaneous purchase and sale payments on the first 15 bales. It would also delete from the bill provisions dealing with CCC release prices and overplanting of allotments at the world price.

The purpose of my substitute is to require the Secretary to make adjustments in cotton price supports starting in 1964. It would set a maximum support price of 30 cents a pound in 1964, 29½ cents a pound in 1965, and 29 cents a pound in 1966. Thereafter supports would be related to production cost research.

It would achieve these results:

First. It would cut the cost of the present cotton program substantially. Since the current support price is 32½ cents, it would save taxpayers 2½ cents a pound in the first year, 3 cents a pound in the second year, and 3½ cents a pound in the third year on every pound of cotton acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program.

According to the Department of Agriculture, CCC took title to 4,744,000 bales of the 1962 cotton crop on August 1, 1963. On August 1, 1962, CCC took title to 3,246,000 bales from the 1961 crop. For the last 2 years, therefore, CCC has taken title to an average of about 4 million bales.

Assuming a drop of 2½ cents a pound or $12.50 per bale next year under my substitute along with a drop of 3 cents a pound or $15 a bale the following year and a drop of 3½ cents a pound or $17.50 a bale in the third year, we can forecast substantial savings to taxpayers.

Based on a 4 million bale takeover by CCC, taxpayers would save $50 million the first year, $60 million the second year, and $70 million the third year below the cost of the present program under my substitute.

It would also cut the present cost of the export subsidy. At a 5 million bale export level, this alone would amount to a $62.5 million savings next year, $75 million the following year, and $87.5 million during the third year.

Second. It would eliminate the proposed "trade incentive" payments which the Department of Agriculture assigns a gross cost of $283.5 million next year, $259.9 million the second year, and $236.2 million the third year under H.R. 6196 as reported to the House.

Third. It would eliminate the "simultaneous purchase and sale" provisions of the bill which the Department of Agriculture estimates would be $61.7 million the first year, $73.7 million the second year, and $72.5 million the third year.

Fourth. It would make cotton available to mills at 2½ cents a pound cheaper next year than at present, 3 cents a pound cheaper the following year, and 3½ cents a pound cheaper the third year. While it would not eliminate completely the present two-price structure for cotton, it would make a long step toward that goal.

Fifth. It would relate future cuts in cotton price supports to the results of an intensified research effort. My substitute authorizes the annual expenditure of $10 million per year for this purpose.

Sixth. It does not change the Secretary's authority under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to increase cotton acreage as expansion in the use of cotton occurs.

Seventh. It protects the income of cotton farmers by gradually lowering price supports rather than by dropping them abruptly. Even though the support price would be lower, the individual farmer would be growing more cotton in the future, thus maintaining his income.

Eighth. It also would be in the interest of consumers of cotton who would be able to purchase cotton goods made from raw cotton costing the textile mills from 2½ to 3½ cents a pound less.

Ninth. It would begin to close the competitive gap between cotton and manmade fibers. This gap must ultimately be closed or at least substantially narrowed someday if cotton is ever going to be economically justified as a source for fabrics.

My substitute, Mr. Chairman, is, of course, not the total answer to every segment of the cotton industry. But, I submit, neither is H.R. 6196 as reported to the House. My substitute, however, represents a balancing of the equities between the public treasury, the income of cotton farmers, the welfare of the textile industry, the competitive realities of manmade fibers and the interest of consumers.

It is in accord with the spirit of the Agricultural Act of 1958 which passed

this House with bipartisan support and I sincerely urge its adoption today as a realistic alternative to either doing nothing or adopting the committee bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we set aside this day of debate for the purpose of considering methods of equalizing the inequity which has so long existed between the American mills and the foreign mills.

I am delighted that the ranking minority member of our committee is pleased with my handiwork, because his research section is a word-for-word copy of the section I offered and put into the bill in committee. I am delighted he approves of it. Still, I regret that he should have overlooked entirely or he has deliberately abandoned every effort to bring about an equalization on behalf of the American mills.

Of course you have had no opportunity to read his so-called substitute amendment, but he simply strikes out a large part of the bill and keeps the research section that I have put in the bill, and adds the McIntire amendment which the committee has agreed to accept and that is all there is in it. The research section I think is good, and I am committed to the support of the McIntire amendment, as are a great many Members of the House. But we did not come here to pass a research bill, much as we need research. We have not worked a year and more simply to bring to you an amendment to lower the support price on cotton. I want every one of you from the South to understand that this substitute would lower the support price on cotton, lower it by some 3.5 cents without any compensating increase in your market.

I think that if we can increase our markets, if we can expand the uses of cotton, it is perfectly logical to say that we may be able to take a somewhat less price for it, because if you are able to sell 100 bales of cotton instead of 50 you can afford to sell it at something less. But the Hoeven substitute does not offer you one single new outlet for cotton, not one bale increase in the consumption of cotton, but it does lower the price your farmers would get—not 2 or 3 percent but close to 15 percent.

I ask my friends from industry how many of you could stand a cut in wages of 15 percent? That is what the Hoeven amendment does to the cotton farmer.

What does it do to the cotton worker in the mills? It takes his job away from him because it does not make cotton available at a price which will enable American cotton to compete with either foreign textiles or domestic synthetics. Every cent we lower the price to the mills must, under this Hoeven substitute, come out of the farmer. Every penny by which this substitute would reduce costs to the mills must come out of the farmer's hide.

What does it do for the consumer? The committee has brought you a bill which the Secretary of Commerce has said will effect a saving to the consumer of at least $2 for every $1 we spend. But this substitute offers you no such opportunity. It offers nothing to the farmer but still lower prices. It offers nothing to the mills but what it takes out of the hide of the farmer. It offers nothing to the consumer except the infinitesimal drop which might come out of the farmers' already inadequate income.

Should we consider here at this late hour something that was not suggested in the committee, something that has not been considered by industry, producers, or consumers, something on which hearings have not been held, or should we consider the legislation which the committee has worked on for a full year?

There have been few pieces of legislation which have come before this House which have had more full consideration than this has. I urge the Members of the House, regardless of your interest, whether it be that of the farmer, the mill man, mill worker, or the consumer, to defeat this substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], a member of the committee.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, in a moment a chart will be brought into the Chamber which will set forth the value of payments to mills that are authorized in the bill now before us.

There has been some discussion today as to whether this really is a mill subsidy bill.

The question is—Who would get the payments?

Here are some typical answers and I invite your attention to this chart.

Burlington Mills, for example, would be authorized to receive payments worth up to $16,500,000 a year.

Stevens Mills would be authorized to receive payments worth up to $13,500,000 a year.

Springs Mills would be authorized to receive payments worth up to $11,250,000 a year.

Dan River Mills would be authorized to receive $9 million a year.

West Point Mills would be authorized to receive payments worth up to $7 million a year.

And, of course, other mills would be represented by the same typical figures, based on their use of cotton—the mills that would get the payments. You can say that they do not get a subsidy, but they certainly get these multimillion-dollar payments.

The Hoeven substitute would get rid of this nonsense. It would take it completely out of the bill. It would also eliminate this nonsense of simultaneous purchase and resale of cotton, a premium to the farmer himself. That too does not belong in this legislation.

The Hoeven substitute would get the cotton program back on the right track—the same track built by the Agricultural Act of 1958. An act which intended a gradual reduction of price supports, accompanied by an increase in acreage limits as demand for the lower priced cotton rose.

The act of 1958 reached a final vote in the other body on July 25, 1958. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date the name of U.S. Senator Johnson of Texas—now the President of the United States—is listed as voting "yea."

At that time he was majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

The then Senator Johnson helped to steer this legislation to final passage.

The Agricultural Act of 1958, containing the cotton program, was cited by the Senator from Texas as one of the "most important achievements" of the 85th Congress.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 15, page 19453, the then Senator from Texas was quoted as saying:

> I believe this Congress rose to great heights.

I am placing in the RECORD some of of our most important achievements. On page 19493 of the same date, the gentleman enumerated these achievements, including a detailed review of the Agricultural Act of 1958.

The President of the United States is thus on record in behalf of the approach to the farm problem set forth in the Hoeven substitute. In his message to a joint session of the Congress just last week, the President urged "thrift and frugality."

The Hoeven substitute is an example of thrift and frugality, and no doubt that is one of the reasons for President Johnson's support of the Agricultural Act of 1958 when he was in the other body. The bill before us is not an example of "thrift and frugality." It is an example of waste and lavish spending.

We can all give President Johnson a resounding vote of confidence by supporting the Hoeven substitute, because we thus endorse and reestablish the same approach to the cotton problem President Johnson then advocated as a U.S. Senator and majority leader of the Senate.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Using these charts and interpreting the charts, does it not actually mean that these domestic mills have been paying that many more million dollars than the foreign mills have been paying for the same kind of cotton?

Mr. FINDLEY. No, not at all, due to shipping. In fact, the latest quotation, as I have mentioned earlier today, on the Middling inch upland U.S. cotton in the London market, the same basic item we are talking about today—the latest quotation I have seen—is over 27 cents a pound. The bill before us now would authorize up to 8.5 cents, which is partly taken care of by the simultaneous purchase and resale gimmick and partly by the trade incentive gimmick.

Mr. COOLEY. You are not using 27 cents but are only using about 24 cents.

Mr. FINDLEY. If you will repeat your question, I will come back to it.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not that chart indicate clearly the burden being borne by the domestic industry and the number of millions of dollars listed on that chart.

Mr. FINDLEY. It does not accurately set forth the burden.

Mr. COOLEY. What does that chart mean, then, if it does not show that?

Mr. FINDLEY. It represents the big payments, the subsidies, the multimillion-dollar payments that textile mills will get under this bill.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I thought the figures on this chart reflect the true situation, I would not support this bill myself. I think the chart is misleading and that the so-called subsidies to domestic mills will not occur. My colleague from North Carolina pointed out the actual situation when he said these so-called subsidies more accurately reflect the degree of discrimination against domestic mills since the two-price system began.

What the chart fails to show is that we are currently subsidizing foreign cotton mills to the extent of from $150 to $200 million a year. Instead of subsidizing domestic mills, this bill simply makes it possible for our own mills to receive the same kind of treatment we give their competition abroad.

May I bring this debate back to proper perspective. The substitute offered by my friend from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], does not even touch the serious problem involved here. It would not take one bale of cotton out of storage. It only applies to future crops.

My friends, you must remember that this Government owns today, stored in warehouses around the country, nearly 10 million bales of cotton, for which the American taxpayers paid $1.5 billion. Now what are you going to do with that cotton if this bill does not pass and if you do not make it possible for the American mills to begin using some of it at the world price ? You cannot eat it.

It is one agricultural commodity that is not edible. That $1.5 billion worth of cotton is not worth 5 cents unless some cotton mill spins it into cloth or yarn. The only customers for this cotton are the cotton mills at home and abroad. In the sale of this cotton, are you going to continue to discriminate against the domestic American mills upon whose successful operation 10 million American citizens depend for a livelihood? Are you going to continue to subsidize foreign competitors for our mills? If you do that with 10 million bales, do you know what the subsidy will be? Nearly a half of a billion dollars in export subsidy, which will further put out of balance the competitive situation between our mills and foreign mills.

There are only three alternatives. There are only three ways in which we can get rid of this 10 million bales of cotton. We can continue to export it with the current subsidy of $42.50 a bale and thereby perpetuate the discrimination which now exists and which this bill would undertake to try to correct. I call your attention to the fact that we are in a declining trend with regard to exports, anyway, even with the heavy 8.5-cent subsidy. Last May the Department of Agriculture testified before the committee that up to that time in this marketing year only 3,059,333 bales had been registered for export as against more than 4,350,000 during the preceding year. So our cotton exports declined more than a million bales in just 1 year—even with the heavy subsidy. Even if we can push our annual exports up to 5 million bales again, we will be paying out $212 million a year for the sole benefit of foreign competitors of our cotton mills who furnish employment to our own citizens. This is an actual subsidy to foreigners but the opponents of this bill never refer to that.

Second, we can give some of it away under the aid program, or sell it abroad under Public Law 480 for unredeemable currencies. Or we can make some of it available to our own mills at the price we sell it abroad, and I do not call that a subsidy but simple justice to a domestic industry and to millions of American citizens who make their living from it.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in opposition to this substitute amendment, and I wish to address myself to my Democratic colleagues. I think if this amendment carries we might well predict that we can write off the South as a voting area for any Democratic presidential candidate we might have, because this amendment knocks the price support for cotton down to 29 cents without any compensating feature.

The bill that we have written recognized the realities of cotton production in the South. They have some inefficient producers. They have some very small producers. Although our bill basically provides for a reduction of price supports it eases the blow with respect to those who produce 15 bales or less and has certain political values, believe me, to the Democratic Party. We in California could well accept the Hoeven amendment. In fact, a great majority of my farmers would be perfectly willing to abolish all price supports. I want to say that it ill behooves anyone to get up here who supports high price supports on rice, high price supports on wheat, on corn, on dairy products and complain about the price support levels on cotton and the equalization payment feature of this bill, because, believe me, it is not the most expensive farm program that we have. But it is an extremely valuable farm program. Cotton annually earns about $750 million in foreign exchange to help in the balance-of-payments problem. It supports a vast manufacturing industry which relates directly to such cities as New York, Boston, Los Angeles, and other areas all over the United States. It supports machinery, fertilizer, and many other industries all over the United States. It is not just the welfare of the cotton growers that is involved here or the welfare of a few spinning mills in the South. It is the welfare of a much broader industry which is represented in almost all of the areas of the country and specifically in the New England States and in the garment centers around the country.

This is a very delicate mechanism that the committee has put together. It recognizes some of the political realities in the cotton situation as well as the economic realities.

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

Mr. HAGEN of California. Certainly.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the Hoeven amendment would really cut the heart out of this bill, so far as the inequity which the present law has created is concerned. But the bill as we now have it before us will do everything the Hoeven amendment seeks to do and also cure the inequity.

Mr. HAGEN of California. The distinguished gentleman is correct. In other words, what the Hoeven amendment would do is reduce the price support to the farmer without any of the other necessary provisions of the Cooley bill. The mills would receive some advantage, but not enough advantage to eliminate or to substantially diminish the inequity which they suffer now in competition with foreign mills. So this is a rather perfect device that we have put together here.

We in California would like to see some special proviso in there to correct inequities which we feel exist in the cotton law. But we realize the political reality of the situation and we cannot get them except for the rather limited overplant privilege contained in it.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge all of the Members to vote against this substitute amendment and not upset this delicate compromise which is contained in this bill and which has been arrived at after a year of deliberation.

I want to say that as far as the timing of this legislation is concerned I am not an illiberal Democrat. This bill was read for floor action and it was scheduled for such action before our late great President died, President Kennedy. It has been kicking around the House of Representatives since July.

Mr. Chairman, its immediate passage is a matter of urgency because the mills do not know what the price of cotton is going to be and there has been a lot of uncertainty in the cotton trade because of the failure to act on this legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have very much cotton acreage in my State. So my interest in this bill is a little bit remote, perhaps, but it is very deep because I happen to represent one of the most agricultural States in the Nation. I am also a member of the Committee on Agriculture and I would like to be a part of enacting some farm legislation that will finally, at long last, make sense and get to the root of the real farm problem.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the gentleman from Iowa has offered would make a reasonably good bill out of a bill that, in my opinion, is nothing more or less than bad legislation. I say that the bill before us is bad legislation because it provides for an expensive means of continuing a program of cotton price supports which has been responsible for getting the cotton industry into the trouble about which we have heard so much these last 2 days.

Mr. Chairman, little has been said during the debate so far to identify the fact that the reason for the trouble is that the Secretary of Agriculture has insisted upon maintaining a price-support level that is a few cents per pound

above the cost of synthetics and above the world price of cotton.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to adjust this inequity. I have not heard anyone deny that on this floor during this debate.

Now, I am a farmer. I have a sympathy for farmers. But I have little faith in the ability of Congress to improve the economic lot of farmers. We have been trying for some 30 years and yet we find today that agriculture, partially at least, according to the statistics, is a depressed portion of our economy. The important part of this picture of adversity for agriculture is that it is the small farmer who is still experiencing adversity.

It is too often overlooked that the benefits for our farm program accrue to the larger farmers rather than the small. A price support that is a limited benefit to a little farmer is a windfall to the bigger one. We should keep this in mind: that 39 percent of the farmers of America produce 89 percent of the total agricultural production of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, we have got to start recognizing some distinction in size of farm operations if we are ever going to really get to the root of the farm problem, and I would be the last to deny that there was not one.

The Cooley bill makes a gesture at recognizing the small farmer. The fact that this bill provides special attention for the first 15 bales has not been identified here, but it is the first 15 bales of the cotton of every farmer, big or small, that they produce. If we want to get to the root of this problem of the small farmer, then apply this special consideration to the first 15 bales of the farmer who does not produce more than 15 bales of cotton.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may not be popular with farmers. I suppose the words I am saying now are not going to be popular in my district, either, because they are going to be interpreted that I am in favor of lower price supports. I think the time has come when we have to recognize the simple fact that we have to have our agricultural commodities move at prices that would permit them to move, in world trade, and in our domestic trade.

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

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

Mr. HOEVEN. I am sure the gentleman will recall that when I addressed the committee awhile ago, I read parts of a letter from the Farmers' Union stating that they were opposed to this bill. The Farmers' Union has always been in favor of high price supports and apparently they now realize that high supports did not solve the cotton problem. Of course, they also have other valid objections to this bad bill.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman for reminding me of that fact. I reiterate here that the two largest farm organizations in America are opposed to this bill. The Farm Bureau has opposed the bill and the Farmers' Union has written to all Members of Congress on yesterday stating they are opposed to the passage of this bill. I do not know how you can make it any clearer that the farmers are not in favor of this legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the debate on the bill that is before us, I was tempted many times to take the floor today and point out some other factors that I did not think were being stressed fully. I have not yet done so, however, I hope to do so now. At this time I point out a number of reasons why I think the Congress should turn down the present substitute bill which would reduce income to the cotton farmer about $15 to $20 per bale. I asked for the additional time so that I might review with you some of the background in connection with the necessity for agricultural programs and some of the reasons for some of the things which have been discussed, all of which lead to the need for us to do something in connection with cotton and cotton production. As much as many would like to do so, we know if we are to continue to produce cotton, we must see it is used.

At the outset, the original farm legislation provided supports so as to maintain the purchasing power of those engaged in agriculture, recognizing that was the greatest market that the industry of America had. We had then and now have minimum wage laws; we have the bargaining power of labor unions, the right of industry to mark up. In the great depression the drop in purchasing power of American agriculture, in my opinion, was the beginning of the depression in that they did not have the purchasing power to buy what industry produced. We know what this country went through at that time. Every State and nearly every person was "broke." Then it was that the Congress provided price supports for various and sundry farm commodities, all to provide a fair purchasing power. There was a difference in the law in the case of perishable commodities, since an oversupply of perishable commodities would decay or rot and not be in the way of next year's crop; and storable commodities, such as a bale of cotton, which will keep for 50 years and be in its original condition.

I would like for some of my friends who have spoken here today to realize that they too have price supports. Those in the beef cattle business say they get no subsidy, that they do not have any price support. May I say, you certainly do. You have the best kind, because yours is in the form of price supports on grains and feed.

The next best price system I am aware of is that for perishable commodities, where more than 50 percent of the 30 percent of import duties, the so-called section 32 funds, are set aside to buy up the surplus in order to balance supply and demand; then the producer gets his price at the marketplace. All these programs are based on the necessity of maintaining a proper balance between agriculture, industry and labor, by maintaining the greatest customer of industry, which is agriculture.

The original cotton law provided for a processing tax which was levied on users of synthetics as well as cotton, with the proceeds then used to maintain farm purchasing power and income. However, the Supreme Court held that law unconstitutional on the ground you could not levy a tax for a special group.

If that law had been reenacted so as to provide that such tax be paid into the Treasury and used as a justification for appropriation, as in our sugar program, I believe it would have been held constitutional.

However, when the law failed, and when the new laws were written, the synthetics manufacturers were left out from under the provisions of the law. Then cotton had price supports but there were no price supports on synthetics; synthetics manufacturers have been able to undercut cotton prices, and cotton's share of the domestic textile market has constantly gone down. Many cotton producers believe the Cooley bill will help to regain a greater percentage of the domestic market.

As to this, time will tell. Certainly we need to follow the course of this measure to be sure it does what its title says—I quote: "A bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton to maintain income of cotton producers, and so forth." We hope research will do the job, though I know it is slow.

May I point out again that always our Government surpluses could be sold in the world market for whatever price it would bring. For many years our Government held U.S. cotton off world markets while building up foreign production. None of that is required by law. The payment of a subsidy is not required. The law authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell anything in the world it has for anything in the world it will bring. What we have is losses, but mechanically we have at times used the subsidy approach.

Many of my colleagues from the sugar-producing area think they have no interest in price supports. May I say you do, for you have a processing tax that is levied and you divide it among the sugar producers. The wool producers think they have no interest in this matter. To you I say you have a real Brannan plan; but may I say, you are dependent upon the support of Congress to keep the program. Another major reason we are in this predicament is that under section 22 of the basic law, the Agricultural Act, it was provided that the Government could prohibit the import of any foreign commodities, or finished goods, or tax them if such imports jeopardized our domestic farm program. Under the policy followed by our Government for the last few years, under both parties, the right of keeping these goods out has not been fully exercised; and imports of cotton goods have greatly increased. Whatever the reasons, section 22 has not been fully used

and all these goods are coming back into this country.

To tell you another thing which has not been stressed here, I want you to know that Congress has been more fair than might appear. Congress, through the Department of Agriculture, has paid the domestic mills money to the point where that part of the cotton the domestic mills exported in world trade has been bought at the world price. Do not tell me it has not. It has and is.

These are some of the reasons the Cooley bill is before you. The cotton people, as a group, have come up with the idea that sooner or later they have to be competitive with synthetic fibers, or they cannot maintain the use of American cotton—which is essential if we are to produce cotton. Also, they know they have to live in an economy where we have high costs. The Cooley bill hopes to give help until such time as research can lower the cost of production, cotton can attain a competitive position with the synthetic fiber, and save the Government lots of money.

The Hoeven substitute, which I oppose, would simply reduce the farmer's price—right now $15 or $20 a bale, leave the farmer with all of his costs, reduce his income, and give no help while efforts are made to reduce costs.

The Hoeven bill would wreck the economy of the Cotton Belt and seriously hurt the national economy.

So I say again, the American producer is trying to cooperate, trying through research to get where he can produce cotton cheaper, trying by research to get his cost of production down to where he can compete with synthetics pricewise. He says he will go along with the proposed Cooley bill, if you will go along with the provisions to help out with this adjustment during the period when he tries, through research, to reduce costs. I hope they are right, though again, I know research results are slow to come.

I do recognize that we are up against the Hoeven amendment of cutting prices to farmers $15 to $20 per bale if we don't do something. So far as the Cooley bill is concerned, I have a number of reservations, as I know the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] does. However, when the producers take this upon themselves it is time this Congress helped them and not come in here as the gentleman from Iowa would do, and whack $20 a bale out of farm income in a period when it is as hard as can be just to meet the cost of production.

Again I say, there are no "holier than thou's" in the field of agriculture. There are price supports in every direction you can imagine. There are price supports on perishables. There are price supports on beef. And there are price supports on all the rest of these commodities, all made necessary by other laws.

But here, for once, you have a group that recognizes its problems and says, If you help us over a period of 4 or 5 years, we will try to work our problems out so we can compete and keep cotton from going into the hands of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN], a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, when we were holding these hearings on January 30, 1963, I suggested to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], that we should include pertinent information in the record. The discussion yesterday and today has proven that this information should have been included in the record and not try to sweep it under the rug.

My questions were: What will the 10 largest producers receive under this program?

What will the 10 largest handlers receive under this program?

What will the 10 largest mills receive under this program?

The chairman asked me to defer, and through the kindness of the chairmen, the subcommittee chairman and the committee chairman, all through the hearings in permitting my many questions of the witnesses, I deferred. I am from Nebraska, ladies and gentlemen, and I knew little about cotton as of December 13, 1962, I knew little about cotton legislation except that I wore and what I might purchase—at that time I suggested to the gentlemen on the committee, I would be glad to help in the cotton problem if you will bear with me, I needed to know many things.

The gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman GATHINGS, very kindly gave me this freedom and I asked the questions. And I appreciate the kindness of the committee chairmen; every question I asked was answered but this one.

The question was, What will these people receive if this type of bill is passed?

Further than that, the discussion between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], vice chairman of the committee, and Mr. Murphy, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, was on the points discussed here today. What is the rate inequity? How are you going to satisfy the inequity? We spent the whole morning on that one subject. How are you going to handle this inequity?

We never decided it in the committee. It was taken out of the bill because we could not decide it in the committee.

I withdrew my questions on these subjects but they have come back to haunt you today.

I withdrew my questions at the request of the subcommittee chairman after I said, "Agriculture has a public relations problem to consider. I just do not want to see it injured."

My point was, if that information on amounts had been in the RECORD, you would not have had the problem you have had in the last 2 days.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] said:

> I think you are doing more to injure the program in the questions you have asked there than anything conceivable.

In deference to my chairman, I said:

> I withdraw my question.

I say it was a mistake not to include it in the hearings. You would not have had all this fight today. Everyone who came before the committee said: "We do not want this subsidy."

The producers did not want it. The handlers did not want it. The mills did not want it.

Then just who wants it?

The National Cotton Advisory Committee was far from unanimous in their recommendation of this legislation. So, if the producers do not want it and the handlers do not want it and the mills do not want it, what are we fighting about? Right now we are fighting to force the poor Secretary of Agriculture to make a determination that the committee would not decide.

I would like to show you a little newspaper. This is the China Mail, established 1845. This is the late final edition of Thursday, November 15, 1962. This is in the record of the hearings on page 60. Now, this is in the record, too. The gentleman from South Carolina came before our committee, and I asked him if he agreed with the gentleman from North Carolina, where the front page headline says, "Now that the textile dispute has been settled you can look forward to a great expansion of exports to the United States."

This was Secretary Hodges' message of hope for Hong Kong.

> Hong Kong can look forward to a great expansion of her exports to the United States now that the textile dispute has been settled, Mr. Luther M. Hodges, the American Secretary of Commerce, said before his departure today.
>
> He said that the United States is an extremely favorable market for the Colony and there is no ill feeling against "made in Hong Kong" products.
>
> His advice for Hong Kong manufacturers was to devote more effort and money to research.
>
> He said industries here should not limit themselves to any particular products or market.
>
> He described the bustle and activity he saw in Hong Kong as "fantastic."
>
> The mental attitude of the people in Hong Kong is excellent, he said. He believed that people in Hong Kong generally wanted free trade.
>
> He said the textile dispute between Hong Kong and the United States created some misunderstanding in both countries.
>
> But this, he said, had been cleared up and future trading patterns would follow orderly arrangements under the long-term Geneva agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEERMANN. Now look at your hole card. Those of you who voted for the Trade Expansion Act. I know this bill is fulfilling a promise to help you out, but you are getting doublecrossed by your own Secretary of Commerce.

On page 103 of the hearings a gentleman testified before the committee and he said, "cotton is being punished for a crime it did not commit. The crime is simply being overpriced."

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you the Hoeven substitute gets about as close to the bill that the Committee on Agriculture was close to agreement on before the Secretary of Agriculture announced the support price for this year. When he announced that support price it threw cotton legislation into a cocked hat in the Committee on Agriculture.

I ask you to support the Hoeven substitute and let us get on with the business of helping the people in cotton out of their dilemma.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we agree on a limitation of time. This thing could go on way into the night unless we do. We will be about an hour or two speaking on this amendment at the rate at which they are now rising. I ask unanimous consent that we agree to close debate on this amendment at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] moves that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I understood the gentleman to propose that all debate on this amendment close at 4 o'clock, and I understood the Chair to say "this amendment and all amendments thereto."

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SNYDER. Which is it?

The CHAIRMAN. "And all amendments thereto" is the way the Chair put it: "This amendment and all amendments thereto" is the way the Chair put the question.

Mr. SNYDER. Then, a further parliamentary inquiry. In the event this amendment would pass, would this preclude any further amendments to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I understood the Chairman to say that if the substitute were adopted there could be still further amendments. I am inquiring whether or not under the rules of the House if the substitute were adopted the Committee would not immediately rise.

The CHAIRMAN. There could be further amendments only in the event the substitute were voted down.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to transfer my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, no one would deny that, as the result of Federal programs, an inequity is borne by the textile mills of the United States. The Hoeven substitute would ease this inequity to the tune of 3½ cents a pound on cotton which would bring things far better into line than they are today, and get us on the right track.

Concerning my source of information for my mill subsidy chart, I have in my hand letters from each of the mills involved stating how much is used by each. The figures on the chart are computed on the basis of payments authorized as a result of the McIntire amendment, which would vary between 5 and 6 cents a pound over a 3-year period. The figures are computed carefully and they are accurate. They have been on the public record for over a month without any challenge. They authorize multimillion-dollar payments to textile mills.

Can anyone give me a guarantee that even one dime of these multimillion-dollar payments will be translated into the form of lower prices for the consumer? He cannot give such a guarantee. Can anyone give me a guarantee that even one dime of these multimillion-dollar payments will be translated into the form of bigger payrolls and higher payrolls and higher wages for the employees of the textile mills? Of course not.

Are you prepared to make the same sort of multimillion-dollar payments to the manmade fiber industry? After all, the pepole who make dacron, nylon, rayon, are American citizens, too. If you vote for this bill you are voting to require those American citizens as taxpayers to help finance their own competition. Is this your idea of justice? I do not see how anyone in good conscience could vote for a bill which would retain the multimillion-dollar subsidies or payments that are set forth accurately on this chart.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, before we agree to support this bill or oppose the Hoeven amendment, I think the Members of the House ought to consider what would happen if every other commodity that was in the same plight as cotton received the same kind of treatment as proposed in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is pretty well agreed that this will mean something like $600 million over a 3-year period additional cost to the taxpayers if this cotton bill goes through. Let us just consider two other commodities that are in the same plight, wheat and butter. If wheat received the same kind of treatment, at least another $300 million a year would have to be added to the taxpayers' expense, or $900 million in a period of 3 years.

If butter received the same kind of treatment, with a 15-cent-a-pound reduction in price, this will mean $360 million a year, or $1,080 million in the 3-year period, making a grand total for just three commodities, then, rather than just cotton, of $2.6 billion at the end of 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to bring equity to American agriculture, and equity is what we are talking about, look at what it is going to cost us. Think of this before you support this kind of a program, because we set precedents here. If we give it to cotton, think what it will mean to the dairy farmer, because the dairy interests are represented all over the country rather than just a small part of the country as is the case with cotton.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, the shaky structure of cotton subsidies should be razed rather than reconstructed as attempted by the kind of illogical and inadequate patchwork bill we have before us at this time.

This bill is not going to be of any help with respect to imports, because the cost of cotton is such a small fraction of the reimported textiles' cost in relation to the cheap labor overseas, that nothing is going to be changed pricewise of sufficient significance to have any effect upon the export-import problem.

But let us assume for a moment that the contrary would be true. Even under that assumption the bill is going to be of no help to reduce the cotton stockpile because exports will be reduced in direct proportion to increases in domestic consumption. Moreover, it is going to be of no help to the general economy because whatever increased use of cotton, if any, is going to come out of the chemical fiber producers of America and hurt that sector of the American economy in direct proportion to any help it gives the natural fiber sector.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, with reference to these mills which are listed over here on the chart, over which there have been considerable tears shed for their financial prospects, I just took a look at the Wall Street Journal file maintained outside the Chamber in the Speaker's lobby, and the first on the list is Burlington Industries. Its stock during this year has risen from 25⅞ on the New York Stock Exchange to 42, a rise of 62 percent.

Stevens stock has experienced a 23-percent rise in price on the stock exchange. Dan River Mills has had a 27-percent jump. I could not find the other two mills listed.

Mr. Chairman, the brutal truth is that we have too much cotton in this country because too many people are growing too much of it.

They are growing too much because the domestic price levels are artificially high, which incidentally keeps U.S. cotton blocked from natural access to world markets.

The further brutal truth is that these artificial price levels are maintained because legislation passed by this Congress makes it possible and because the Secretary of Agriculture lacks the political courage to reduce support levels, which he has the power to do.

The cotton mess will plague us, drain the Federal Treasury and pile up the national debt until this Congress has the courage and wisdom to drop this artificial, illogical, and fallacious business of crop props.

As a starter I urge passage of the Hoeven amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be yielded to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, all I want to do is to sum up the situation. From the standpoint of economy in Government this bill will cost $635 million more than the present cotton program over the period of 3 years.

Those who are talking about economy in Government should take heed. This bill also provides for back-door spending to which a lot of us have been opposed.

This bill would embrace the so-called Brannan plan of production payments. This would establish a dangerous precedent which is going to haunt you when other segments of agriculture demand similar relief. You will likely be confronted by similar requests from the dairy industry, from the cattle feeders of this country, and from other segments in our agricultural economy. Once we have opened the door, we are going to have to afford similar relief to everyone of our agricultural industries that gets into trouble.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the Committee will review the objections as I see them, and that you will then vote for my substitute. It simply eliminates all of the controversial sections of the bill; lowers the price support over a 3-year period to 30 cents the first year, 29½ cents the second year and 29 cents the third year and provides for a comprehensive research for cotton. If you really want to do something for the cotton industry you will vote for my substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

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

The was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment would have a very disadvantageous effect on a very important segment of American industry, an industry that everyone knows is entitled to equity and justice, and as everyone knows is placed in a very disadvantageous position by reason of the international situation where people abroad can buy cotton at 8.5 cents less than it is sold to American industry. If ever there was a cause for justice, it is this bill. The pending amendment would cut its heart out so far as justice is concerned, and I hope the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be defeated.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished Speaker for his remarks. He most accurately stated the situation and it is along the same line that I intended to address my remarks. Our distinguished Speaker has stated the situation so much better than I could and I trust the Members will heed his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would not be here if it were not for the inequities, the existence of which no one has challenged. This bill has not been brought to the floor because of the research provision which it contains. This is merely an incidental amendment added to the bill. That is one section of Mr. HOEVEN's substitute. Neither was this measure brought here because of the McIntire amendment, the substance of which is the second provision in the Hoeven substitute. This is another incidental item. Neither of these incidental items deal with the problem which brought the bill out of committee and to this body.

The bill is here because of certain inequities, the existence of which no one has challenged. The Hoeven amendment just puts us up to the issue a bit sooner and, to my judgment, a bit too early. If you want to vote down the bill without even hearing any more of its merits, if you feel you have had enough, and the time has come to vote the bill down, then the thing for you to do is to vote for the Hoeven substitute because it completely eliminates the provision of the bill which inspired the hearings and brought this issue to the floor of the House. The situation is just that simple.

I hope this Committee and all Members present who are interested in having the issues fully debated will afford the members of our committee that opportunity. As of the moment that is all we ask. Then if you feel the bill has merit you can vote it up. If you do not feel it has merit, you can vote it down. I hope you will vote down the Hoeven amendment because to vote it up means the end of the bill and the perpetuation of the inequity which the bill is designed to correct.

I respectfully ask you to vote down the Hoeven amendment and accord us the privilege of discussing the issues and the merits in an orderly fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I represent 450,000 cotton users and consumers. They are entitled to have their views heard. The implication of the arguments against the Hoeven substitute is that the only way to correct the existing inequity is to establish a third subsidy in the field of cotton.

There is another way to correct this inequity. That is to lower cotton price supports until they are no higher than the world price and the cost of transportation to the mills overseas who are buying our cotton. If we lower price supports to where they are equivalent to the world price plus the freight rate overseas, then we would eliminate the inequity that now exists. If we take this course to eliminate the inequity we are not putting a new inequity on the U.S. taxpayers. For this reason the Hoeven substitute has merit, and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

(By unanimous consent Mr. McINTIRE yielded his time to Mr. BROCK.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I do not think any of us on this side, at least, would object to the principle sought in the Hoeven amendment. I think what we now must do, though, is to look at the real impact of this amendment if adopted by this House. I do not see how we can adopt it for one simple reason.

You talk about a basic problem. The basic problem is the price support which forces a false price on American cotton and requires the American manufacturer to pay 8.5 cents a pound more than any other manufacturer. It is not only 8.5 cents a pound more than the Japanese manufacturer but 8.5 cents a pound more than the manufacturer of a competing fabric, of synthetics such as rayon and nylon. This is the problem. The problem is not with imports but with synthetics, which have tripled the impact of cotton imports.

The effect of this amendment would be simply to say we are going to reduce the support price, but what happens while that reduction is going on? You eliminate your cotton market by changing your machines over to synthetics. When you get through with reducing the support prices you have solved your problem, yes, but how? By eliminating the market for cotton. That is the end result of the Hoeven amendment. This is the problem we face if we adopt this

substitute proposal. I do not think it is proper or workable. I think it is going to result in the elimination of thousands of jobs in American industry. I do not think we can afford that.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that there is bipartisian recognition of the seriousness of the problem confronting the cotton economy and that both sides of the aisle see the need for legislation. I deeply regret, however, that there is disagreement over the extent of the action the situation demands. While the substitute being offered here would deal with part of the problem, it is inadequate. Certainly, I oppose this substitute and I urge that the integrity of the original proposal with the amendment to lower price supports progressively be adopted.

Too much time has gone by already. If this substitute is accepted, it will be an admission that there is still more time available to deal adequately with the problem. In my opinion, this is not the case. I only wish it were.

The equalization features are the very heart of this bill, and they represent the only sound hope of putting American cotton back on its feet.

As I have said before, markets, and only markets, are the key to this whole question. It will not do any good to reduce price supports over the long term, or reduce growing costs by the research program, if the markets for cotton textiles have been wiped out in the meantime. What good will it do to initiate a program for lowering raw cotton prices over a 3-year period unless we insure that there will be cotton textile markets left for farmers to sell to? We have got to provide a way now for cotton prices to be competitive.

The equalization features of this bill are the answer. If we continue to force American mills to pay more for cotton than their foreign competitors, American cotton products will continue to be priced out of the American market.

Gradually lowering price supports over 3 years, and gradually lowering production costs with a research program, while a step in right direction, simply will not give the help needed. We have got to get back these markets for cotton textiles. And we have got to get them back now. Three years more of the present situation, and the American cotton industry will just be something for historians to use as an illustration of the Federal Government's power to destroy.

Over the past 2 years, cotton has suffered a direct competitive loss to other fibers in the amount of 20 percent. Also over the past 2 years, imports of cotton in the form of textiles have increased 56 percent. Over the past 5 years, thousands of textile jobs have been wiped out. This ought to be warning enough to all that the approach taken in this substitute is not enough.

Now, some might say that this is too bad, but that it really is not the Federal Government's job to help cotton out of its problem. Well, gentlemen, I say that it is the Federal Government's job to help cotton out, because it was the Federal Government that got cotton into this mess in the first place.

Statistics indicate a fantastic loss in markets over just the past 2 years. So far this year, indications are that market losses are going to be even greater during 1963. If we wait more years, as this substitute suggests, it is simply going to be too late.

In this debate, much has been said about the inroads of synthetic fibers. Today the price squeeze the cotton textile industry suffers has caused it to turn to synthetics on a massive scale. This is a fact of business life. The synthetics are cheaper. However, they are not available. Production capacity cannot fill the orders for synthetics. Certainly, the synthetic fiber industry is watching closely what we do today. If we do not act to assure a market for cotton in our domestic mills now, the course synthetics manufacturers will take is obvious. Plant expansion can be expected immediately to fill the orders which capacity operations now cannot fill.

There is no mystery about this. There has been too much talk here about "windfalls" to the cotton mills. The plain fact is that price competition is going to prevail. If cotton mills are denied cotton at competitive prices now, those strong, wealthy enough to survive, will look to synthetics. Others will seek out foreign supplies of yarns. Can there be any doubt that the declining market for cotton will be aggravated? Is there any doubt what economic damage will result in a vast section of this country? Is there any doubt that emergency relief measures costing far more than the additional cost of this bill may have to be considered here?

It is obvious that the cotton surpluses we are piling up now cannot be sold without expanded markets. If we could dispose of them, the opposition to using these surpluses to expand those markets might be valid. But the facts are otherwise.

Cotton surpluses have increased over the past 2 years from 1.5 to 8.2 million bales and exports have dropped from 6.6 to 3.4 million bales. We obviously cannot sell surplus cotton on the world market as fast as the CCC is acquiring it, and we are losing our market at home because of the support price. Well, how are we ever going to get rid of this cotton? The answer is—to create markets for it. How do we create markets for it? By making it competitive. And how do we make it competitive? By making it available to our mills at a competitive price. And how do we make it available to our domestic mills at a competitive price? Only by rejecting this substitute.

I do not want to see "too little and too late" carved as the epitaph on the tombstone of the cotton economy. I urge that this substitute be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POAGE yielded his time to Mr. COOLEY.)

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, there has been some question about the standing of the AFL–CIO on this legislation. Here is a telegram I have received from William Pollock, general president, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO:

> Have just been informed that there is some doubt that the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, favors H.R. 6196, the Cooley cotton bill. This is to inform you that as general president of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, we are 100 percent for this bill with the McIntire amendment.

In concluding the debate on this amendment, I want to give the House some figures. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] sounded off here in very eloquent fashion about this bill. He hopes that we will lose sight of the fact that his commodities, wheat, and dairy products, have resulted in losses as follows: On wheat the taxpayers of America have lost $10,931 million. Last year out of every dollar received by the wheat-growers the taxpayers paid 75 cents. Dairy products cost $3,351 million. For the two of them, you and your producers have cost the taxpayers $14,282 million. I want to repeat that when the cotton program was taken over by the Eisenhower administration we had a profit of $268 million. Now we have substantial losses. We lost substantially last year.

We are told this bill is going to cost $600 million. That is not true. The cotton program is going to cost a substantial amount of money whether we pass this bill or not. But in 1964 it will only cost $118 million more. Furthermore, we are told it will save for consumers $500 million a year.

The next year it will only cost $87.9 million.

The next year it will only cost $44.3 million.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the pending amendment.

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

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

The question was taken and the Chairman announced the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, on this vote I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chairman appointed Mr. HOEVEN and Mr. ABERNETHY as tellers.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 122, noes 184.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 3, line 3, after the period, strike out the sentence down to and including line 6 and insert: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $10,000,000 annually, as may be necessary for the Secretary to carry out this special research program."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, after line 3 insert:

"SEC. 6. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

"'(1) The following new sections are added to the Act:

"'SEC. 349. If the national acreage allotment established under section 344(a) for the years 1964, 1965, or 1966 exceeds 17 million acres (exclusive of the national acreage reserve established under section 344(b)), the amount of such acreage allotment in excess of 17 million acres shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this part, be allotted as follows: One-half of such excess shall be allotted pursuant to the provisions of section 344. The remaining half of such excess shall, subject to the provisions of this section and section 350, be allotted by the Secretary as export market acreage directly to farms eligible to receive allotments under the provisions of section 350 to the extent that he determines that such allotments will not increase the carryover of cotton at the beginning of the marketing year for the next succeeding crop above the carryover on the same date one year earlier, except that no farm may receive an allotment of export market acreage in excess of 20 per centum of the acreage allotment for the farm established under the provisions of section 344. Any acreage available for allotment as export market acreage which the Secretary determines will not be used shall be allotted pursuant to the provisions of section 344. Any acreage allotted to a farm as export market acreage and planted to cotton shall be in addition to the county or 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 a farm shall be included in the notices of farm acreage allotments and marketing quotas. The provisions of this section shall not apply to extra long staple cotton.

"'SEC. 350. The producers on any farm on which there is export market acreage or the purchasers of cotton produced thereon shall, under regulations issued by the Secretary, furnish a bond or other undertaking prescribed by the Secretary providing for the exportation, without benefit of any Government cotton export subsidy and within such period of time as the Secretary may specify, of a quantity of cotton equal to the actual production of the export market acreage as determined pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary. The bond or other undertaking given pursuant to this section shall provide that, upon failure to comply with the terms and conditions thereof, the person furnishing such bond or other undertaking shall be liable for liquidated damages in an amount which the Secretary determines and specifies in such undertaking will approximate the export subsidy on such quantity of cotton. The Secretary may, in lieu of the furnishing of a bond or other undertaking, provide for the payment of an amount equal to that which would be payable as liquidated damages under such bond or other undertaking. If such bond or other undertaking is not furnished, or if payment in lieu thereof is not made as provided herein, at such time and in the manner required by regulations of the Secretary, or if the acreage planted to cotton on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment established under the provisions of section 344 by more than the maximum export market acreage, the farm acreage allotment shall be the acreage so established under section 344. Amounts collected by the Secretary under this section shall be remitted to the Commodity Credit Corporation and used by the Corporation to defray costs of encouraging export sales of cotton under section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended.

"'(2) Section 376 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This section also shall be applicable to liquidated damages provided for pursuant to section 350 of this title."'"

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 5, lines 7 to 25, and page 6, lines 1 to 10:

"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."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In reality is not the gentleman's language offered as a substitute for the committee amendment?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It is offered as a substitute for a part of the committee amendment and therefore it had to be offered as an amendment to the entire committee amendment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If the gentleman will yield further, what part of the committee amendment does the gentleman leave in?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We are leaving in section 350. I cannot yield any further. I have to have time in which to explain my amendment, and I can explain it to the members of the Committee very briefly.

The committee in its consideration of this bill recognized that there were many cotton producers throughout the United States in many States who wanted to produce additional acres badly enough that they were willing to produce it without any subsidy. In other words, the export acres which are provided for in the amendment—the committee amendment—in section 349, the export acres mean that the farmer who grows those export acres would pay the Government 8½ cents a pound, or the total amount of any export subsidy for the privilege of growing cotton.

However, under this bill—this committee amendment—the export acres could not go into effect until the national cotton allotment reached 17 million acres.

Under the present law there is a limitation that the national allotment cannot go below 16 million acres.

Last year every cotton producer in America was supposed to receive an 11-percent reduction in acres. With the 11-percent reduction in acres, we are producing this year one-half million bales more of cotton than we produced last year.

Under the provisions of the present law we will produce on 16 million acres of national allotment next year.

Now, the effect of this amendment that I have offered is merely this, and the members of the Committee can understand it this way: Under my amendment we will not produce on the 1 million acres of cotton between the 16 million acres national allotment and a 17-million-acre national allotment, cotton that would be subsidized.

Under the committee amendment there would be a million acres of cotton which would be produced before the free or export acres could go into effect. That would cost the Government over $50 million in paying the subsidy on the cotton that would be produced on the million acres, between the minimum of 16 now and the 17 provided in this bill.

The only thing that this amendment of mine does is to permit the export acres to be grown without any cost to the Government. It does not add to the national allotment. It will not be used in figuring the future State, county or farm acreage allotment. It will only go to those people who say, "We can produce cotton at the world price, we are anxious to do it, and we are willing to pay 8.5 cents a pound to do it."

I would have preferred that it had gone in before this, but in compliance with the present law, the 16-million-acre minimum would be maintained, and the export acres would go into effect only when it was decided by the Secretary that 16 million acres could not produce the cotton needed.

There are many States that would take advantage of these export acres. Under the committee amendment during the 3 years that this bill will be in effect the committee amendment would be of no effect whatsoever because there is no one and I defy anyone on this floor to say there is any possibility at any time during the next 3 years we will have a national allotment of 17 million acres.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I merely wish to state that I offered this amendment in committee and it lost by a very close vote. I am heartily in favor of the gentleman's amendment, and hope it will be adopted.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman does agree it would save the Government at least $50 million?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I certainly do.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I may say that I considered offering a lot of other amendments, but I am giving you an opportunity here to vote to save at least $50 million. I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment. At least there will be some saving of money, as the gentleman from Missouri indicated, $50 million. That will be helpful.

The chairman of the Agriculture Committee indicated that the dairy program and the wheat program cost money during the last few years. During this administration the cotton program cost money. The cotton program cost $545 million in 1961, $612 million in 1962, and for this year, 1963, according to the estimate of the Department of Agriculture, $550 million.

What should we do? Cut back the cost of the program? That might be a good idea. There is nothing in this bill that suggests it, and with the McIntire amendment the cost of this bill will increase the cost of the cotton program next year to $779.4 million. That is an increased cost—contrary to any sound program or unsound program offered in this Congress.

Will the chairman of the committee want to add to the cost of the dairy program for these last few years, and the wheat program for the last 3 years, to give them an identical program with the one proposed here for cotton, and paying a direct payment to the processor to bring their raw material price down to the world market price? You will find a fantastic increase in the cost to the taxpayers if you bring this equity into every commodity. So we come to this amendment which will surely save some money and permit the part of the country where they can produce cotton at the world price to do so.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I think the House ought to have all the facts about this amendment, particularly the background and the consideration which it had in committee. I do not mean my colleague from Missouri has concealed anything; probably he did not have time to cover the situation entirely. The situation needs some review and I shall give it to you.

The only reason this bill is before the House of Representatives is because of the inequity which we have heard repeated over and over today and yesterday. But for no other reason is this bill before us. The distribution of acreage and the subject of price support has nothing, absolutely nothing, to do with the immediate problem.

As my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] indicated earlier today, we frequently have a very difficult time getting together in the Committee on Agriculture. The people down in my State where I represent a lot of the little 10-, 15-, and 20-acre cotton farmers, most of whom are poor people, had a special amendment, too. Like the pending amendment, it did not have a thing in the world to do with this inequity nor did it contribute anything to its solution. The people in Missouri had amendments to help their particular situation, some of which our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] has presented today, the pending amendment being one of them. But none of these amendments contribute to a solution of the overall problem. Our friends in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, in fact all sections of the Cotton Belt had amendments they wanted to tack on. And mind you none of them had a thing to do with the problem of the inequity.

Everybody wanted something special, and they wanted to tack them on as riders to a bill that was designed to help everybody from one coast to the other, the mills, the trade, and the farmers of the Carolinas, Missouri, Louisiana, Arizona, and California, each and every other State in the Cotton Belt. It had become evident that because of these special and sectional amendments we would never get a bill. We were stalled on dead center.

On our side of the aisle all of us finally agreed to stand aside on our special gadgets and to waive amendments, that is, all except my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], who has offered the pending amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I did not agree to waive amendments.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I said the gentleman did not. He was the only one who did not.

Somebody asked yesterday, Why has this bill been so long getting here? This is one of the reasons. It was snagged in the committee for months and months all because so many members wanted to use it to get a little something special. Numerous members wanted a special coach on a train that was being run to help everyone. This brought about an impasse. So the bill remained locked in committee. Finally, as I say, everyone agreed to give up on special amendments, except our colleague from Missouri, with the hope that we could get the bill out, pass it and bring needed benefits to every segment of the cotton industry as well as the consumers.

And by the way, if these people who are so anxious to save money—I do not believe the amendment will save $50 million or 50 cents. It will not save anything. It will just bring about the production of some cotton that will replace other cotton, with the latter being forced into Government stocks. And incidentally, if my colleague's Missouri farmers wish to produce some cotton under a waiver of price supports there is nothing to prevent them from doing so now. They do not have to take supports.

In any event, we finally all agreed on a compromise on the provision wanted by the gentleman from Missouri and other members, that is, all agreed but the gentleman from Missouri. We drafted the compromise amendment and put it in the bill. The compromise was made known to the gentleman from Missouri. As I say, we put it in the bill and we have heard no more about this issue since until today. Everything has been quiet since the bill was reported out months ago. We had hoped and thought differences had been compromised enough to get this sorely needed legislation out, on the floor and passed.

Until about 2 years ago cotton farmers were allotted better than 18 million acres of cotton. The acreage was divided on a historical basis among all the States between the Carolinas and California, all in accordance with a fair formula written into the law. The yields were so high that acreage had to be cut. So the national allotment was dropped to 16 million acres, the statutory minimum. Every State allotment was proportionately reduced.

Operating for 2 years at a bare minimum, and suffering from the cuts in acreage, we were all looking forward to the day, and still look forward to same, when we would return to the 18-million-acre national allotment. We are looking forward to the time when our farmers, large and small, particularly the small ones, could plant their normal cotton acreages.

All of us have made our contributions to reducing the surplus by reducing our acreage. When and if the surplus is reduced then all of us should, in my judgment, share in the fruits thereof, that is, larger acreages for each farm, with every farm being treated alike in the increased allotments.

If we do get back to the normal plantings under an 18-million-acre allotment, then I think every farmer should share in it, share and share alike. That is not what the amendment of my friends is designed to do. Nobody will challenge that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will challenge it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Just a minute. I did not yield. So as matters rocked on we finally worked out a compromise in committee on the Jones amendment. We agreed that acreage up to 17 million would be allotted in the normal way, and the next million above that if the national allotment went that high would be divided 50–50 between those who wanted to produce cotton under the price support program and those who wanted to produce under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

If you are unable to follow this explanation, then to put it simply, we all agreed to meet the sponsor of the pending amendment halfway. Rather than stymie the bill, hold it in committee and do serious injury to the entire cotton industry, we agreed to this compromise.

We had been standing firm that this rather unusual proposal would not become operative until we returned to the old national allotment from which we had been cut. Our friend from Missouri was insisting that we begin with the first increased acre above the present 16-million-acre minimum. Our compromise met him halfway. How much fairer can one be?

Take a look at page 5. There you will find where we inserted the 17 million acres as the beginning point for the idea proposed by our colleague from Missouri. Instead of demanding that we wait until we reached the point of a return to the old national allotment of 18 million acres, which prevailed for so long, we said we will start at 17 million acres, we will go halfway with you.

That is all we ask you to do in urging you to vote down the Jones amendment. Let us compromise our differences, let each side go halfway. That is what the bill provides. What could be more fair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the author of this amendment, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES]. My recollection is that a few years back we had a provision in the cotton legislation for an A and B program. This has some similarity in that it would provide for additional expansion of acreage, with the so-called export acreage and an equalization payment for the privilege of that export acreage?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It would be similar to it except it goes much further because this way they are paying 8½ cents a pound for growing it and there is only a differential, I think, of some less than 4 cents a pound in the A and B program.

Mr. McINTIRE. Could the gentleman give us for the record some figures as to what the participation was in the A and B program?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do you mean nationally?

Mr. McINTIRE. In your particular area. Was it quite substantial?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In some States it was. In our State I think something like 40 percent participated and took advantage of growing cotton at a cheaper price—yes.

Mr. McINTIRE. And the figures which you use as to the possible saving of $50 million was calculated on full participation?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No, the calculation was made because any production on a million acres of cotton at the present yield will produce cotton where the subsidy would amount to $50 million. That would be saved under this amendment.

Mr. McINTIRE. In the use of the term "export acreage" from a practical standpoint, this cotton would not necessarily be set aside physically for export; would it?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It would not be set aside physically for export, but the payment would be made. It would be set aside as far as the processor is concerned and he would be paid 8½ cents a pound for it—yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri and I live right close together. Some of my constituents live in Arkansas and work land in Missouri, and some of his folks live in Missouri and work land in Arkansas. These are the very people who want an increased acreage. I would like an increased acreage for my people. It does not make any difference, as a matter of fact, how the vote goes on this Jones amendment because of the fact the Secretary of Agriculture is not going to go above 16,310,000 acres in the national acreage allotment until such time as this cotton moves into various channels, domestic and export, in much larger quantities than it has been moving.

But, in any event, just as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] stated, it was a compromise because the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from California wanted to start at 16 million acres and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] wanted to make the figure 18 million acres. Seventeen million acres was written into the bill as a starting point. When the national allotment exceeded that number of acres then the export acreage provision would go into effect.

But I want to say this to you. We grew 15,300,000 bales of cotton in the current year, as has been estimated. The estimated disappearance is 13.8.

We have grown 1.5 million more bales of cotton in the current year than we can dispose of. This is no time now to talk about an increased cotton acreage allotment for anyone.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You are not trying to say we are going to get any increase until we meet the disappearance? I feel myself we will not get it unless we have the disappearance.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right. And whether your amendment is agreed to or not it makes very little difference, because until we move more cotton into the channels of trade the gentleman's amendment would not operate. I hope that the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and stand on what I said before.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few brief observations in the limited time I have at my disposal. First I want to agree with what has been said to the effect that this amendment was worked out in the committee with one compromise after the other being made. We composed our differences and agreed on this provision. The Gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] had his day in court, so to speak, in the committee. He was heard at great length, and the committee rejected his proposal.

To sum up I want to say the minimum of 16 million acres is now in the law. On that allotted number of acres we added this year to our surplus amount of cotton somewhere between 1.5 and 2 million bales. Now, every bale of cotton produced under the Jones theory and his program, even though they pay 8.5 cents or whatever it is as a penalty or premium to grow it—every bale of it will displace another bale of American cotton in foreign markets of the world. There is no way to get around it. How inconsistent can we be? Here we have a program on the one hand controlling production, at great cost, and then we come along on the other hand and permit his constituents to grow cotton and put it into Liverpool and all other ports of the world and take the place of some other bale of cotton grown here under the program of controls.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You are not telling this House here that this amendment of mine would add 1 bale?

Mr. COOLEY. Of course it would.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It would not add an acre to it.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the purpose for proposing it, then? You want to grow it for world markets. You say you can go ahead and grow it at world prices and sell it in the world markets and make a profit, but this is an inconsistent proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 53, noes 112.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'INTIRE

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McINTIRE: On page 3, line 19, strike out the quotation mark and insert the following: "The level of price support for the 1964 crop of upland cotton shall be the national average support price

which reflects 30 cents per pound for Middling inch. For 1965 and subsequent years, the level of price support shall be the level in effect for the preceding crop adjusted as provided in this section to reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton: *Provided*, That the maximum level of price support shall be the national average support price which reflects for Middling inch 29½ cents per pound for the 1965 crop and 29 cents per pound for the 1966 crop."

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, the basic purpose of the amendment is to move in the direction of lower price supports for upland cotton.

The amendment in its present form would make three important changes in the upland cotton price support law:

AMENDMENT IN NEXT CONGRESS

First. It would permanently repeal the Secretary's present discretionary authority to set upland cotton price supports from 65 to 90 percent of parity.

Second. It would establish a statutory ceiling on the level of price supports for the production in excess of 15 bales on upland cotton for the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops. For the 1967 and subsequent crops during which trade incentive payments and the 15-bale provisions would not apply, a statutory ceiling would continue in effect unless changed by subsequent legislative action.

Third. Beginning with the 1965 crop, price supports could be lowered below the statutory ceilings under a cost of production formula reflecting the research efforts of the Department of Agriculture.

1. REPEAL OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY

First it would permanently repeal the Secretary's discretionary authority to set price supports at a level from 65 to 90 percent of parity. Although other provisions of H.R. 6196 would be temporary in nature—such as the "trade incentive payments" and the "simultaneous purchase and sale provision"—and would be authorized only through the 1966 crop, the price support provisions of the bill as amended by my amendment would be permanent law.

Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is the present statutory authority for cotton price supports. It provides as follows:

PRICE SUPPORT FOR 1961 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS (COTTON)

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, price support to cooperators for each crop of upland cotton, beginning with the 1961 crop, for which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas shall be at such level not more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor nor less than the minimum level prescribed below as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act. For the 1961 crop the minimum level shall be 70 per centum of the parity price therefor, and for each subsequent crop the minimum level shall be 65 per centum of the parity price therefor. Price support in the case of noncooperators and in case marketing quotas are disapproved shall be as provided in section 101(d) (3) and (5). (7 U.S.C. 1444.)

Accordingly the Secretary has set the 1963 level of price support for the key grade Middling 1-inch cotton at 32.47 cents or 79 percent of parity.

Section 3 of H.R. 6196 states that the Secretary "notwithstanding the provisions of section 103, shall make reductions in price support levels as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton."

The amendment goes on to state that for 1965 and subsequent years, the level of price support shall be "the level in effect for the preceding crop adjusted as provided in this section to reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton."

2. STATUTORY CEILING

Under the amendment the statutory ceiling for the "balance of the crop"—that is, the cotton produced in excess of 15 bales—would be as follows:

[Middling 1-inch, cents per pound]

1964	30
1965	29½
1966	29

For the 1967 and subsequent crops the statutory ceiling would be the lower of 29 cents or the level in effect for the 1966 crop.

The level of support is, of course, the key to both the cost of the program and the income of producers.

By lowering the level of support to 30 cents in 1964, the cost of acquiring surplus cotton and the export subsidy are both reduced by 2.47 cents. This saving would be offset by the cost of the trade incentive payments and the "bonus" payment made to 15-bale producers through the "simultaneous purchase and sale" device.

The Secretary could, under the bill, make these small grower payments at a level up to 10 percent above the support on the balance of the crop. In 1964 this could not exceed 2.47 cents—10 percent of 30 cents but not in excess of 1963 level of support; in 1965, 2.95 cents—10 percent of 29.5 cents; and in 1966, 2.9 cents—10 percent of 29 cents.

Under the bill the trade incentive payments would be equal to the export subsidy. Since the market structure is assumed to be 30 cents the export subsidy and the trade-incentive payment would be 6 cents—30 cents minus the assumed "world price" of 24 cents. In 1965 it would be 5½ cents—29½ cents minus 24 cents—and in 1966 it would be 5 cents—29 cents minus 24 cents.

For each 1-cent-per-pound reduction in level of price support cost of support will be reduced $45 million per year.

3. PRODUCTION COST RESEARCH

A separate provision of the bill, as well as the general authority of the Department, authorizes the establishment of a cotton research effort aimed at reducing production costs. Through extensive research by the Department, it is hoped that cotton production costs can be reduced, particularly in the area of insect damage—that is, the cotton boll weevil.

Under data now compiled by the Department it is hoped that if and when these research efforts begin to be effective the Secretary will accordingly reduce the level of support below the statutory ceilings.

WHAT THE AMENDMENT DOES NOT DO

The amendment materially modifies the Secretary's discretion in setting upland price supports, trade incentive payments, small farm "simultaneous purchase and sale" payments, and export subsidies. It does not, however, delete any of these provisions from the bill.

The amendment would reduce the cost of the bill as reported by the committee if the Secretary were to exercise his discretion to set the levels of support at the maximum range. It is generally conceded, however, that the new program would be more expensive than the program in effect for the 1963 crop, although the amount is subject to argument.

The amendment deals only with price supports. It therefore makes no changes in the acreage allotment and marketing quota provisions incorporated in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

In summary, this amendment would materially change the operation of the upland cotton price support law by replacing the present discretionary authority of the Secretary to set price supports under the parity formula with a new method under which statutory ceilings which would be lower than the present level of support could be further reduced in the event of future effective production cost research.

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

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the membership of the House that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] proposed this amendment in committee. It was thoroughly considered and discussed.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Maine was adopted by the committee, and I, chairman of the committee, was directed by the committee to accept the McIntire amendment when it was offered by the gentleman from Maine, the author of the amendment.

I here and now announce to the membership of the House that pursuant to the direction of the House Committee on Agriculture I accept the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

I believe in high price supports, and high prices for agricultural commodities. In the past, when producers of such commodities have been willing to make necessary adjustments in production to bring production in line with reasonable consumer demands adjustment programs have been successful and have been accepted by producers, and I do not favor, and never have favored, high price supports with unlimited production of any agricultural commodity. I repeat that I am in favor of high price supports, I am in favor of adjustment programs, and I believe that producers should be willing to reduce production in an effort to bring supply in line with demand. I know that the McIntire amendment provides for a gradual reduction in price supports. Regardless of my own views, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, by direction of my committee, I must accept the gentleman's amendment.

After all, we must be realistic. We must realize that the cotton industry of America is in great and grave danger.

We must realize that American-grown cotton is competing with foreign-grown cotton.

American-grown cotton is competing with manmade fibers. And above all, we must understand that unless American cotton is made competitive with foreign-grown cotton and with manmade fibers, the cotton industry of America will suffer.

No industry in America has been burdened with such a burden as has been borne by the cotton industry of America.

This inequity between our domestic mills and foreign mills is unwarranted and intolerable.

All the evidence before our committee indicates that if American cotton is made more competitive with foreign-grown cotton and with manmade fibers our markets for cotton at home and abroad will be expanded and the cotton farmers of our country and every segment of the cotton industry will be benefited.

There are two magic words in all the languages of this earth—food, and raiment. In America we have an abundance of both food and fiber. Our warehouses are bulging. The cost of storage is great and unbearable: The pending bill provides for a payment "in kind" rather than in cash.

I know that the gentleman from Maine is a very sincere man. I know that he understands the problems involved in the proposals now under consideration.

So, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, I accept the McIntire amendment.

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

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

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, there has been much said pro and con on the merits of this legislation. The fact is that the cotton manufacturer is paying a substantial part of this price for Federal policies—both domestic and foreign—for which he has no responsibility.

The editorial from the December 1 edition of the New Bedford Standard-Times which I will now read sheds light on several factors which have been misunderstood and I commend it to the attention of the House. I particularly commend that portion of the editorial dealing with the so-called McIntire amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this editorial is entitled "Fair Play for Cotton"—it could perhaps be referred to as fair play for the cotton manufacturer, the worker in the textile industry, and the allied industries using the goods they jointly produce. It will benefit, too, the consumers who will buy the finished products from American looms and the American garment industry.

FAIRPLAY FOR COTTON

The U.S. House of Representatives is scheduled to act Tuesday on the so-called cotton subsidy bill. In so doing, it has an opportunity to correct a discriminatory situation that now penalizes American management and labor.

The price of cotton since the 1930's has been Government-supported at artificially high levels. Since 1939, domestic mills have been unable to import foreign cotton in excess of 30,000 bales annually. This is less than 1 day's supply.

Thus, U.S. mills cannot buy in the world market, but must purchase American cotton.

Since 1956, however, U.S. cotton has been exported under a subsidy equal to the difference between our high Government-supported domestic price and the world price.

Foreign mills, therefore, can purchase U.S. cotton at the world price, which is below the support price established by the Government for U.S. mills.

At present, the difference between the world price and the Government support prices is 8½ cents a pound. This means foreign mills can buy U.S. cotton 8½ cents a pound cheaper than U.S. mills can purchase it.

What effect does this have?

In 1955, the year before the export subsidy was enacted, the United States imported 300 million square yards of cotton goods. The figure now is 1,200 million square yards, and increases progressively each year.

This is not entirely due to the lower price at which foreign mills may purchase their raw material, yet 8½ cents a pound—a 25-percent differential—is a substantial advantage. Without even figuring cheaper labor costs, it means that foreign mills can produce cotton goods competing with those of the United States at from 2 to 5 cents a yard cheaper.

The pending bill would remove this inequity imposed by Government policies, by making cotton available to U.S. mills at the same price at which foreign producers can buy it.

How would this be done?

By utilizing the huge stockpile of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, through payment in kind, rather than payment in cash. U.S. mills would pay to cotton distributors the world price; that is, the American support price less 8½ cents a pound. The distributor would get the difference between the support price and the world price in free cotton shipped to him by the CCC.

Thus, this is not a subsidy to mills, but to the cotton market, just as is done with wheat and other items. The cotton distributor already receives this subsidy when he sells abroad; the pending bill simply expands an existing subsidy provision to include domestic, as well as foreign buyers.

This legislation would do no more than give U.S. mills the same break as foreign mills. It would allow us to be competitive at least to the extent of raw material which, frankly, in terms of realistic economics, we should get cheaper than our foreign competition, because we grow it here.

Representative McINTIRE, Republican, of Maine, has an amendment to this bill which ought to be passed, too. It provides for gradual reduction of the cotton support price. This is constructive; instead of continuing to pay an unrealistically high subsidy, the Government should gradually reduce the support price to the world price level. A provision in the bill for $10 million, to aid research aimed at growing cotton cheaper, might help in this direction.

It is encouraging to learn that President Johnson looks with favor on this legislation, and the House ought to pass it, in the name of fairness to American business and American jobs.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I congratulate the gentleman on his usual scholarly approach. But I want to ask this question with respect to his amendment. These cost figures with reference to this bill that have been propagated in the sum of $661 million are inaccurate; is that not correct?

Mr. McINTIRE. I would agree with that. These figures which have been tossed around bear examination, because as far as cash outlay is concerned, this bill with the amendment that I am proposing in the first year would cost $118 million, the second year it would cost about $88 million, and the third year it would cost about $44 million. So, for the 3 years, if you put these figures together, would cost a total of those amounts.

But let me be fair and say that in making those statements I am not including the value or the cost of cotton which is to be used in payment in kind.

Mr. HAGEN of California. If the gentleman will yield further, also, is there not a possibility that once you get the price support down to the 29-cent figure, it would never go any higher in succeeding years? Perhaps that is a requirement of your amendment?

Mr. McINTIRE. It is a requirement of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Did not the evidence before our committee clearly indicate, if this amendment is adopted and this bill is enacted, that the result will be a saving to the consumers of America of approximately one-half billion dollars?

Mr. McINTIRE. This figure was used in the committee, and I have no basis for denying its accuracy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota would yield for a unanimous-consent request?

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would this preclude a further amendment to the bill, debate on a further amendment to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. No; this only applies to the pending amendment and all amendments to the pending amendment.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, many of the Members of the House have been

opposed to the bill, as reported by the committee, but with the McIntire amendment they favor the bill.

I just want to point out to the Members of the House what the McIntire amendment does in relation to what the bill provided when it came out of the committee.

As the bill came out of the committee, the Secretary can set the price support at 29½ cents a pound for cotton and pay the subsidy on the first 15 bales. Seventy percent of the farmers that produce cotton in this country produce 15 bales of cotton or less. I understand that 94 percent of the farmers in North Carolina produce 15 bales or less.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture can set the price support at one-half cent below the McIntire amendment for next year and still do the same thing as the bill provides, keep the 32½ cents for the first 15 bales that are produced and then bring the price support down for the rest of the production to 29½ cents.

The McIntire amendment sets it at a half cent higher the first year than the bill already provides that the Secretary can do. It is also the same price that the Secretary can set it at in the second year, and in the third year he is required to set it at 29 cents with the McIntire amendment, half a cent less than the bill provided. So, that is it. You are paying one-half cent less the third year. I do not think that this saves much money at all.

I have no doubt but what the Secretary of Agriculture would set the price support at a low level as long as the little farmer could receive the 32½ cents on his first 15 bales, because of the philosophy which he has espoused for a long time. This is taken for granted that he would set support at the levels I have indicated.

So, I would expect that would happen. So this is really no savings, except one-half cent the third year.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Might it not be said, however, that this amendment which I propose does take the authority for setting the price support level out of the hands of the Secretary and vest it in the Congress in this legislation?

Mr. QUIE. That is right, the Congress under your amendment requires the Secretary to do by law what the bill previously gave him authority to do.

Mr. McINTIRE. Does it not meet the problem which the cotton industry has been confronted with? That is, it has been the decision of the Secretary to put price support levels up to 32.7. This does, in fact, set the direction of price supports more in a lowering scale. I think the gentleman will agree that is very constructive as far as the total problem is concerned.

Mr. QUIE. As with any commodity, if you give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to make direct payments on any commodity to the farmers, he is going to set the loan level as low as he can and use the payments to the farmers to keep the supports at same rate. This has not solved anything.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Did the gentleman support the Hoeven substitute?

Mr. QUIE. The Hoeven substitute did not have the payment to the producer of the first 15 bales.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I understand that, but a part of the main thrust was to compel the Secretary to lower price supports, and that is what the McIntire amendment does.

Mr. QUIE. We have a little different situation. The Hoeven substitute compels them to comply with what 1958 intended to be the case. Under the bill now before us the Secretary would do the same thing that the McIntire amendment proposes. He would set it at a half cent lower the first year and half a cent higher the third year.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am intrigued by the statement that the consumers would gain $500 million. We would be spending $250 million on the program, and the consumer would get $750 million back. Following that theory, if we provided enough money by the taxpayers the mills would get the cotton free and the consumers would gain a billion dollars. Why do we not go all the way and give them the cotton?

Mr. QUIE. Perhaps we could pay them to take the cotton and save the consumers $2 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to raise a question about the McIntire amendment, although the remarks of the preceding speaker may answer the question. My question is, and it is directed to the gentleman from Maine, does not section 5(b) remain in the bill H.R. 6196, regardless of your amendment?

Mr. McINTIRE. It does, indeed.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Does not that section provide that the Secretary of Agriculture himself may set price supports at a level 10 percent above the price supports in your amendment on 15-bale acreage?

Mr. McINTIRE. It does. My amendment does affect the price level on the 15-bale provision in the second and third year of the bill.

Mr. RYAN of New York. As I have calculated the effect of the McIntire amendment on the 15-bale producer, in 1964 there would be no change in the present price support level.

Mr. McINTIRE. That is correct.

Mr. RYAN of New York. In 1965 there would be a reduction in the present price support level of two-tenths of 1 cent, and in 1966 there would be a reduction of one-half cent. And the present price support for 1963 is 32.47.

Mr. McINTIRE. That is approximately correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: Page 2, line 5, strike out "persons other than".

Page 2, line 9, strike out "including" and insert "and shall also make to handlers and users".

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment I offered in the agriculture committee. At one time this amendment carried by a vote of 19 to 16 in the committee. Then the next time it came up for reconsideration, it was rejected on a vote of 19 to 15.

What this amendment provides is that the direct payment shall go to the producers. We have heard talk for these 2 days as to who gets the direct payment. I think it ought to go to the producer, so it will be simple and clear as to who is receiving it. Right now there is really a triple subsidy. The farmer gets a price support up to 32.5 cents, the exporter gets 8.5 cents, and now you propose another subsidy for the textile mills.

If we would let the loan level be at the world market price, then let the Secretary of Agriculture give a payment to the farmer in addition to that to bring the price up to the support level, at the McIntire amendment's level of 30 cents, 29.5 cents, and 29 cents, then we would see what kind of agricultural program we have before us. It would be the least expensive way of operating the program and would be of benefit to the people who are supposed to be helped by an agricultural program, the farmers. The marketplace would be able to compete competatively. The mills would have assurance then. We would be able to solve something then. This would solve something, because the mills would have assurance that the loan level, the approximate price they have to pay, would be at the world market level, and we could adjust in the years to come the amount of payment we thought the farmer ought to have. So I think this will make the bill a much more workable program than it is at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I inquired of the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, if he could clarify what language was stricken from existing law by section 3, lines 22 and 23 on page 2 of the bill. The question was not clearly answered. As I understand the effect of the Ramseyer rule, as it applies to pages 24 and 25 of the committee report, the bracketed language strikes out the basic legislation on which the current feed grains program is based and would also reinstate the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to impose acreage controls in the feed grains area. This is of great concern to anyone who has feed grains in his district. We are entitled to know exactly what the legislative effect of this section is, and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina or to anyone who can clarify this question. I am referring to section 105, which appears at the bottom of page 25 of the committee report, and which was subsequently amended four times.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN], a member of the committee.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] so that this item can be cleared up.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the language stricken out was section 104, an obsolete or dead law so to speak which was not needed. The referendum referred to was held in 1958.

Mr. FINDLEY. The language includes section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 which is part of section 104, as printed on the bottom of page 25. That is my point. Is section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 stricken from the law? If so, then feed grains are in a terrible predicament. We should know what the situation is.

Mr. COOLEY. That is not the purpose of it at all.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is that the effect of it whether it is the purpose of it or not?

Mr. COOLEY. No, that is not the effect of it; but if you feel that it is, we can make a clarifying amendment at the appropriate time.

Mr. FINDLEY. Does the gentleman state that section 105 is not actually stricken from the law by this Ramseyer rule on this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. No; it was not stricken.

Mr. FINDLEY. If it is not stricken from the statutes, then the Ramseyer rule clearly shows it in brackets as being stricken and thus the Members are misinformed.

Mr. COOLEY. The Ramseyer might be incorrect as far as that provision is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this for one moment with the chairman of the full committee in order to bring it quickly to a resolution.

Mr. Chairman, may we have the assurance of the gentleman from North Carolina that if this legislation does violence to the feed grain provisions, this matter would be taken care of in the conference, if the bill is passed?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, sir; I assure the gentleman that will be done.

Mr. KYL. There certainly is no intention either overt or otherwise to do any violence to the feed grain provisions?

Mr. COOLEY. None whatever.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. That creates more uncertainty. If this language does not belong in here under the Ramseyer rule then I wonder if there are many more bones there in the barnyard. Maybe we ought to delay further consideration of this bill. This is legislation of vital importance. It involves the entire feed grain price support program.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. What you say as to the language in the report under the Ramseyer rule has no effect on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is apparently admitting now what he would not admit yesterday, that this bill does strike the acreage allotment and feed grain provisions from the law. He says at the appropriate time he will correct this. There is no more appropriate time than right now to rectify the mistake that has been made in this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is certainly too good a parliamentarian to make that sort of assertion on the floor of the House. The Ramseyer rule is not the law.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say that it was.

Mr. COOLEY. We cannot put something in a report under the Ramseyer rule that would strike out what is in the law.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. Turn to the bill, section 3, where it says:

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

Then follows an amendment which repeals the law. If that is not true, why did you put in brackets in the report on pages 25 and 26, showing repeal of the acreage allotment and feed grain provisions?

Mr. COOLEY. If there is any doubt about it, I will draft an amendment to clear it up. If there is any doubt about it, I will make an effort to clear it up before it comes back to the House.

Mr. GROSS. This is the time to do it and not in conference.

Mr. COOLEY. Will you prepare the amendment?

Mr. GROSS. No, I will not prepare it.

Mr. COOLEY. You do not want to prepare anything.

Mr. GROSS. You repealed this law, not I.

Mr. COOLEY. Who did?

Mr. GROSS. You did. You prepared the bill, and you are in charge of it here on the House floor.

Mr. COOLEY. If you want to present an amendment, all right. If you do not, all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, in the debate yesterday I am sure that all of us who were not on the committee were completely confused, and obviously today in the debate it would appear members of the committee do not fully understand what is in the bill. But after the debate of yesterday, Mr. COOLEY's answer to Mr. GROSS' question relative to the possibility that sections of the feed grain bill was repealed was this. I am quoting Mr. COOLEY. "All right. If we have done that, it certainly can be corrected when we start to read the bill."

Now, I am confused, Mr. COOLEY, and I do believe that we should have a satisfactory answer.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. To clear it up I will offer an amendment at the proper time and see if we can clear it up.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6196 provides that payments to eliminate the inequities of the so-called two-price system shall be made to persons other than producers. It is now proposed that these payments be made to producers.

The question of how these payments will be made in order to effectuate the purposes of the bill has been the subject of intensive study and discussion by many groups during the past 12 months. I favor the language of the bill which vests in the Secretary of Agriculture authority to determine the terms, conditions, and procedures for issuing the certificates. It is likely that the payment rate for the period beginning with enactment of the bill and ending July 31, 1964, would be different from the rate in effect beginning August 1, 1964. Also, it is uncertain which would be the most practical means of making payments on inventories of raw cotton on hand at the time the bill is enacted. The Department of Agriculture has had many years of experience in administering a wide variety of programs involving payments. Under some of these programs the payment has necessarily been made direct to the farmer. But in others, where the payment is related to movement of the commodity through normal trade channels to the ultimate consumer, the procedures have designated a particular seg-

ment of the trade as the control point for the preparation of records, furnishing of reports, and issuance of payments.

As a general proposition I believe it is more economical and efficient for the Department to carry out a program by dealing directly with several hundred—or even several thousand—persons and firms in the channels of trade than to be required by law to issue payments to producers. In the case of cotton we have over 700,000 farms with allotments, and even if the producers on these farms were to receive PIK certificates covering payments it would undoubtedly be necessary for certain substantiating reports to be obtained from the trade.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE) there were—ayes 57, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLE: Page 3, line 19, insert the following:

"TITLE I—PRICE SUPPORT

"(c) Effective with the 1964 crops, section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 105. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1964 crops, price support shall be made available to producers for each crop of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, and rye 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 wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, and rye marketed during any of such years: *Provided*, That in the event that a special agricultural conservation program is in effect for such designated grains as provided in subtitle D of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the Secretary shall establish the level of support for such grains at not less than 65 per centum nor more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor.

"'(b) In the event that the special agricultural conservation program for the designated grains is in effect, the Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support on wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, and rye that the producers of such crops participate in and comply with such special agricultural conservation program as provided in subtitle D of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

"'(c) If the producers on the farm elect to participate in the special agricultural conservation program, price support shall be made available only if such producers divert from the production of the designated grains in accordance with the provisions of such program an acreage on the farm equal to the number of acres which such operator agrees to divert, and the agreement shall so provide. In the event that the special agricultural conservation program is not in effect, the Secretary shall make price support available to producers of the designated grains as provided in subsection (a) of this section.

"'(d) Beginning with the 1964 and subsequent crops of wheat, any wheat stored in order to postpone or avoid payment of a wheat marketing quota penalty under sections (3) and (6) of the Act of May 26, 1941 (Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended), prior to its repeal by the Feed Grain and Wheat Act of 1963 shall not be eligible for price support.'

"(d) Section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"(e) Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended—

"(1) by striking the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That effective with the beginning of any marketing year for which a special agricultural conservation program is not in effect for wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, and rye (as provided by subtitle D of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended), the Corporation shall not sell any such designated grains for unrestricted use at less than 115 per centum above the current support price for such designated grains plus reasonable carrying charges.'; and

"(2) by striking the semicolon after the words 'deterioration and spoilage' in clause (D) and inserting the following: 'except if the supply of any designated grain (as defined in section 301(a)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) is not in excess of a normal supply (as defined in section 301(b)(10)(A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) the Corporation shall forthwith replenish its stocks by the purchase of a quantity of the commodity equal to the amount of such commodity so sold;'.

"(f) Subtitle D of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SUBTITLE D—SPECIAL AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

"'SEC. 379. (a) If the Secretary finds that during any year the total supply of designated grains will, in the absence of a special agricultural conservation program, be in excess of a 'normal supply' as defined in section 301(b)(10)(A) of this Act, he shall formulate and carry out a special agricultural conservation program, without regard to provisions which would be applicable to the regular agricultural conservation program under which, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, conservation payments in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable shall be made to producers who divert acreage from the production of designated grains to an approved conservation use and increase their average acreage of cropland devoted in 1959, 1960, and 1961 to designated soil conserving crops or practices including summer fallow and idle land by an equal amount.

"'(b) The Secretary may permit such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, canary seed, and flax, when such crops are not in surplus supply and will not be in surplus supply if permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage, subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such crop shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such crops, but in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which would otherwise be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses and no price support shall be made available for the production of any such crop on such diverted acreage.

"'(c) The Secretary shall not permit such diverted acreage to be grazed.

"'(d) The Secretary shall require the producer to take appropriate measures to keep such diverted acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents.

"'(e) The acreage eligible for payments in kind under such special agricultural conservation program shall be an acreage equal to the greater of forty acres or 20 per centum of the farm designated grain base. The Secretary shall, at the option of the producer, make an additional payment in kind for the diversion of not to exceed an additional 30 per centum of the designated grain base on the farm. The rate of payment in kind to be made by the Secretary on the 20 per centum reduction in the designated grain base on the farm shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated basic county support rate on the normal production of the acreage diverted from the designated grains on the farm based on its adjusted yield per acre. The rate of payment in kind to be made by the Secretary on the additional 30 per centum reduction in the designated grain base on the farm shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated basic county support rate on the normal production of the acreage diverted from the designated grains on the farm based on its adjusted yield per acre.

"'(f) The Secretary shall permit producers to divert for periods of from three to five years up to 50 per centum of the farm acreage of designated grains and in such event the rate of payment in kind to be made by the Secretary shall not exceed 60 per centum of the estimated basic county support rate on the normal production of the acreage diverted from the designated grains on the farm based on its adjusted yield per acre: *Provided*, That the same acres on the farm shall be identified and diverted each year during the period provided by this subsection.

"'(g) The Secretary may make such adjustments in acreage and yields as he determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production, and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop rotation practices, type of soil, soil and water conservation measures, and topography. The base period for the purpose of determining the adjusted average yield in the case of payments with respect to the 1964 crops shall be the four-year period 1959–1962, and in the case of payments with respect to any subsequent crop shall be the most recent five-year period determined by the Secretary to be representative for which statistics are available.

"'(h) To the extent that a producer proves the actual acreages and yields for the farm for the 1959, 1960, and 1961 crop years, such acreages and yields shall be used in making determinations.

"'(i) The Secretary may make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments in kind to producers in advance of determination of performance.

"'(j) The Secretary shall provide by regulations for the sharing of payments under this subsection among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis and in keeping with existing contracts.

"'SEC. 380. Only payments in kind shall be made and such payments in kind shall be made through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem for the designated grains which shall not be valued at nor sold for unrestricted use for less than the support price plus reasonable carrying charges and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, assist the producer in the marketing of such certificates at such time and in such manner as the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes of this Act. In the case of any certificate not presented for redemption within thirty days of the date of its issuance, reasonable costs of storage and other carrying charges, as determined by the Secretary, for the period beginning thirty days after its issuance and ending with the date of its presentation for redemption shall be deducted from the value of the certificate.

"'SEC. 381. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the event of a national

emergency or a serious drought, flood, or other natural disaster, the Secretary may place such limits on the extent that producers may participate in the special agricultural conservation program authorized by this Act as he determines necessary or he may, by mutual agreement with the producer, terminate or modify any agreement previously entered into pursuant to this Act.

"'SEC. 382. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this subtitle D.'

"(g) Effective with the 1964 crops of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, and rye, sections 321 through 339 of parts II and III of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, are repealed and parts IV, V, and VI of subtitle B are redesignated as parts II, III, and IV, respectively.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this section shall apply to the 1964 and subsequent crops of wheat, corn, grain, sorghum, barley, oats, and rye.

"(i) Section 301(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsections as follows:

"'(10) The term "designated feed grains" means wheat, corn, grain sorghum, and barley and, at the discretion of the Secretary, oats and rye.

"'(11) The term "designated grain base" means an acreage on the farm equal to the total of the following acreages:

"'(a) The average acreage planted to corn, grain sorghum, barley (and oats and rye if so designated by the Secretary), on the farm in the crop years 1959 and 1960 and the farm feed grain base established for the farm in the crop year 1961; and

"'(b) The highest wheat acreage allotment on the farm in the crop years 1959, 1960, or 1961, as established in such years by part III of subtitle B of title III of this Act prior to its repeal by this section; and

"'(c) The average acreage of wheat planted on the farm in the crop years 1959, 1960, and 1961 in the case of farms on which wheat was planted under the fifteen-acre farm marketing quota exemption as provided by section 7 of the Act of May 26, 1941, as amended (Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress), prior to its repeal by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962: *Provided*, That in computing such acreage the Secretary shall not also include the farm acreage allotment; and

"'(d) The average acreage of wheat planted on the farm in the crop years 1959, 1960, and 1961 under the thirty-acre wheat-for-feed exemption as provided by section 335(f) of this Act prior to its repeal by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.'

"(j) Section 301(b)(10)(A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(10)(A) "Normal supply" in the case of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, rye, rice, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be (i) the estimated domestic consumption of the commodity for the marketing year ending immediately prior to the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (ii) the estimated exports of the commodity for the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (iii) an allowance for carryover. The allowance for carryover shall be the following percentage of the sum of the consumption and exports used in computing normal supply: 15 per centum in the case of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, rye, and peanuts; and 10 per centum in the case of rice. In determining normal supply the Secretary shall make such adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions as he may deem necessary.'"

Mr. DOLE (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if this is the amendment which deals with the new program for feed grains and wheat and so forth?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

Mr. DOLE. Will you reserve your point of order?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves his point of order.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, the bill applies to wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, and at the discretion of the Secretary, oats and rye.

Its main features are: If the Secretary should find that there will be a supply of these designated grains in excess of a "normal supply," he would put into effect a special agricultural conservation program based on these four principles:

First. It would be voluntary. Price support and diversion payments would be available only to participants in the program.

Second. It would require land retirement and conservation as a condition of eligibility for program benefits. A minimum 20 percent would be required with an optional and additional 30 percent reduction allowed.

Third. It would use only payment in kind for making diversion payments. The Secretary could, however, advance the producer cash in anticipation of the sale of grain, but there would be no direct payments as provided under the 1963 feed grain program.

Fourth. It would be based on a market economy. The CCC release price for surplus grain in inventory could not be less than 105 percent of current support price plus reasonable carrying charges. When the supply of grain is back to a normal supply this release price would be 115 percent of the current support price plus reasonable carrying charges and CCC would be required to make equivalent market purchases for grain which has been sold as being out of condition. The release price for grain used to redeem payment-in-kind certificates would be at the current support price plus reasonable carrying charges. Other major provisions include:

First. Time: Applicable to 1964 and subsequent crops.

Second. Support price: 65 to 90 percent of parity.

Third. Base period: 1959–61.

Fourth. Diversion rates: Up to 50 percent of normal production times county support rate of first 20 percent reduction; also up to 50 percent on next 30 percent reduction.

Fifth. Longer term retirement: Up to 50 percent diversion payment for acreage diverted for periods of from 3 to 5 years.

Sixth. Advance payments: Up to 50 percent at signup time.

Seventh. Diverted acres: Control weeds and pests. Allow oilseed crops at up to one-half regular diversion rates.

Eighth. Small farms: Allow retirement of entire farm base if less than 40 acres.

After the present surplus of wheat and feed grains had been reduced to a "normal supply," price supports on wheat and feed grains would be set on the designated grains at 90 percent of the previous 3-year market average. If another surplus should develop, the special agricultural conservation program would go back into effect until the surplus was again reduced. All acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the designated grains would be repealed. There would be no referendum since this would be a voluntary program.

Example of H.R. 6547 on a wheat-milo farm

Assume: 50 acres wheat.
25 bushel yield.
$1.62 price support (per bushel).[1]
50 acres milo.
40 bushel yield.
$1.10 price support (per bushel).

Total base: 100 acres total base.
20 percent diversion required.

20 acres (acreage required to be diverted).
80 acres (can be devoted to either wheat or feed grains as farmer chooses—assume 40 acres of wheat and 40 acres of milo are produced).

Calculation:

40 acres wheat	40 acres milo
×25 bushel yield	×40 bushel yield
200	1,600
80	×$1.10
1,000	1,600
×$1.62	1,600
2,000	$1,760.00
6,000	
1,000	$1,620 wheat
	1,760 milo
$1,620.00	$3,380 gross

Example of H.R. 6547 on a wheat-milo farm—Continued

DIVERSION—20 ACRES

10 acres wheat
×25 bushel yield

250 bushels.
×.50 percent payment in kind rate

125 bushels
×$1.62

250
750
125

$202.50

$202.50 wheat
220.00 milo

$422.50 diversion payment

10 acres milo
×40 bushel yield

400 bushels.
×.50 percent payment in kind rate

200 bushels
×$1.10

$220.00

Total: $3,380.00 gross
422.50 diversion

$3,802.50 gross benefits

[1] Minimum support price under H.R. 6547.

Example of H.R. 6547 on a wheat farm—gross benefits

Assume: 100 acres wheat.
25 bushel yield.
$1.62 price support (per bushel).[1]

Calculation:
100 acres total base
×.20 percent diversion required

20 acres (acreage required to be diverted)
80 acres
×25 bushels per acre

400
160

2,000 bushels
×$1.62

4,000
12,000
2,000

$3,240.00 gross
405.00 payment in kind

$3,645.00 gross benefits

20 acres
×25 bushels per acre

100
40

500 bushels
×.50 percent payment in kind rate

250
×$1.62

500
1,500
250

$405.00 payment in kind

[1] Minimum support price under H.R. 6547.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] insist on his point of order?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I certainly do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to cite for the consideration of the chair rule XVI, clause 7 of the Rules of the House wherein the following is found:

> No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a piece of cotton legislation designed to eliminate an inequity which is referred to in the bill and in the report. It is not a feed grains bill. It is not a piece of wheat legislation. It is not a type of amendment which could be anticipated. Therefore I say, Mr. Chairman, it falls under rule XVI, clause 7, which would hold it to be out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard?

Mr. DOLE. I do, Mr. Chairman. I understand, of course, that under the rules of the House an amendment must be germane to the pending legislation and that perhaps the bill before us is well coated with "Johnson's wax," but my amendment would add "Polish". Ordinarily, coming from a wheat area I also understand you cannot amend a cotton bill with wheat legislation. That is ordinarily the case.

I would point out also that ordinarily cotton bills do not repeal feed grain laws. Yesterday the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], raised a point of order against the bill and he was overruled on the ground that it did not repeal a number of laws dealing with feed grains. The point of order was overruled by the Chair thus leaving rather clear implications as far as I was concerned, that there was, at least by inference, a repeal. On this basis I asked the highest authority present, the Speaker of the House, if at the proper time I could offer an amendment, a proper amendment, if it would be proper to offer such an amendment on this basis. And on page 23038 the Speaker indicated that it would be proper, at the proper time, for me to offer an amendment.

The cotton bill does contain provisions dealing with feed grains. We all agree on that, although some very reluctantly. The rule of germaneness which would ordinarily be a procedural block to a grain amendment to a cotton bill no longer applies. My amendment is to the same section of the bill which purportedly repeals these feed grain laws. My amendment is to section 3 of the bill which repeals section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949. It simply adds some new language on feed grains to take the place of that which is repealed.

Since my amendment contains a definition of feed grains similar to that which is included in the feed grain law which is repealed by H.R. 6196, I see no basis for an objection to it on procedural grounds.

The amendment is similar to the provisions of H.R. 6547, which 20 Members introduced on May 23 this year. It combines wheat and corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum into a single feed grain program.

And, on this basis and the endorsement of the Speaker as of yesterday, I have my case.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, today America is standing in a fork in the road of farm legislation. Down one road is the maze of a controlled economy in which an ever-increasing Federal bureaucracy, through subsidy and regulation, substitutes or tries to substitute its will for market factors and for free choice. Down the other road, while not always a smooth one, the route still offers agriculture a position as a dominant and vital factor in a private enterprise system, encouraged and helped by Government where necessary to overcome some specific problem or maladjustment, but free to move without unnecessary constraint to perform better its key part in our national life.

We have experienced this comparison in the handling of different crops during recent years. Those free from interference have prospered. We have seen, likewise, future implications by comparing the progress of American farming with farming under other systems of government. The Communist grain shortages have brought this home to all of us most vividly in recent months. In the May wheat referendum we saw the overwhelming conviction of the farm community on the issues involved and the importance of the choice of which road to follow. While this choice is vital to continued progress at home and to enjoyment by farmers of a fair share of our wealth, we should also reflect that the strength of our economy and our productive capacity may be the crucial factor in what remains a cold war but could still become a hot one. The choice made for agriculture can and should be an inspiration and a guideline for the proper direction of other lines of our national endeavor, the direction of freedom.

Coming from the State in which, in the wheat referendum more votes were cast in opposition than in any other State, I must point out that we in the Congress are still refusing to face up to the expressed desire of American farmers for a voluntary wheat program that is market related and takes a fair and sensible approach on land retirement. Therefore, I urge the Congress to face up to its responsibilities, both to the wheat farmers as well as to the country as a whole, and to enact meaningful legislation without further delay.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, in the Dole amendment now pending before the House we have an opportunity to do now for the nearly 2 million wheat farmers of this Nation what has been promised will be done in early 1964. If the Chair rules this amendment germane, and I believe it is, we can today approve a 1964 wheat and feed grains program which would be voluntary and would retain land retirement and conservation as a condition of eligibility for program benefits. The proposal, offered by Mr. DOLE, would provide price support and diversion payments only to those who retire acreage from production.

My colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], who represents the largest wheat-growing district in the United States, and who is a member of Wheat Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, has been a leader in the effort to secure a voluntary wheat program since the Nation's farmers rejected compulsory and mandatory control plans advocated by the administration earlier this year.

I concur with his findings, and those of the senior Member of the Kansas delegation the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] who yesterday wisely pointed out that we cannot turn our heads from 2 million wheat farmers while we rush emergency legislation to assist 850,000 cotton farmers.

Mr. Chairman, in my conversations with wheatgrowers in my congressional district I have found there is concern and deep interest in a voluntary wheat program for 1964. It is my understanding that the Wheat Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, under the leadership of the very able gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL], has been holding hearings and executive sessions on the problem quite regularly. We have heard that there is consideration of bringing a voluntary program which would be effective for the 1964 wheat crop to the floor early next year.

The time is getting late. Legislation passed at this time would allow the participation of most farmers who desire to join the program. The substance of the amendment has been before the Committee on Agriculture and the House of Representatives since its introduction as a comprehensive wheat and feed grain bill by a number of our colleagues after the rejection of the administration's compulsory program last May 22.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the consideration and adoption of this amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly wish it would be possible to bring a wheat bill out on the floor for the House to consider. Wheat farmers need a new law for next year. The Dole amendment would give them the same as the feed grain farmers presently have. They are not asking for an increase in Government cost to give wheat processors what the cotton mills will receive, only the same as the feed grain farmers.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, no longer should the people of America refer to the "sacred cow." If they wish to make reference to something sacred they should refer to the "cotton cow" or "sacred cotton."

For 2 days we have been witnessing another example of what can happen to an agricultural commodity raised in the South.

There is no question but that the cotton textile industry is in distress because of the price differential between what the domestic textile producer must pay for domestic cotton and what the foreign textile producer can buy identical cotton for from CCC stocks.

Just what is so sacred about cotton that the support price should not be permitted to drop by 2 or 3 cents or possibly 4 cents so that domestic mills would be in a more competitive position? Just why is the cotton producer so much more sacred than the wheat producer for instance?

In 1962 Congress passed a so-called wheat support bill which was so un-American in its provisions and conditions that the wheat farmer rejected it in a referendum. This was early in the spring of 1963 and yet neither of the Agriculture Committees of the House or Senate has taken any action to provide any legislative relief to the wheat farmer of America. His price will drop to possibly $1 or $1.25 per bushel. Apparently this is all right in the eyes of the Democrat-controlled Agriculture Committees. But rather than to see the producers of "king cotton" take any reduction in production price, the committee comes in stampeding the Congress for a brandnew subsidy program. This subsidy program opens a brandnew field for subsidizing any industry injured by imports. Now the taxpayer is to subsidize the industrial production of cotton goods. I ask, Mr. Chairman, why cotton is given preferred treatment. I know the answer as does every Member of this House.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Wheatgrowers in the State of Washington, as in other wheat-producing States, recognized that in voting "no" in the wheat referendum last May, that they were forced to accept an unsatisfactory alternative. This is why so many wheat farmers in my district wanted assurances from me before the referendum that there would be efforts in Congress to get enacted a voluntary wheat program this year. I assured them that I would make such an effort, and 2 days after the May 21 referendum I joined many of my colleagues from wheat States in introducing a voluntary wheat and feed grains program. I was pleased that hearings were scheduled by the Agriculture Committee. My farmers are concerned, however, that nothing further has been done with regard to wheat legislation this year.

I, too, am concerned, Mr. Chairman.

The Washington Association of Wheat Growers held their 1963 State convention on November 11 and 12 in Spokane, Wash., and I think my colleagues will be interested to know that this association, after carefully considering a number of major bills pending in Congress at this time which seek to deal with the wheat situation, passed a resolution stating that a national program is necessary to keep production of wheat within present markets and to stabilize farm income. The wheatgrowers favor a voluntary program, and so state this in their resolution.

State wheatgrowers associations have been meeting in wheat-producing States, as have other farmer organizations and I am informed that most associations feel that a national program is necessary.

Certainly our farmers have spoken out against compulsory programs, Mr. Chairman, but this does not mean that they want the rug pulled out from under them. Wheat farmers, like all Americans, want to be free from Government domination. They want to run their own businesses. They want freedom of choice. They want and need a voluntary wheat program.

For these reasons I fully support the effort being made at this time to pursue a remedial and voluntary wheat program.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

If it is not possible for the House to take action on Mr. DOLE's amendment it is at least appropriate that the subject of wheat legislation be discussed here today. Much has been said about the importance of the cotton industry to our economy. Even more could be said about the importance of wheat to not

only our economy but to the very survival of our society. Bread is often referred to as the staff of life and it is unquestionably true that without wheat we would be hard put to feed our people. We use about 550 million bushels of wheat each year to feed the American people. We have exported more than that much wheat during each of the last several years and this year we will approach 800 million bushels, not counting the possibility of selling wheat to Communist Russia.

The wheat and feed grain program which Mr. DOLE's amendment would authorize is one which in my opinion deserves favorable consideration. I am one of those who introduced this legislation in the House. I did so because being a farmer I thought I knew what many farmers wanted in a wheat program. They wanted, if possible, a voluntary program such as they had in the feed grain program which was strenuously supported by this administration. This is probably the most important feature of this proposed program. In simplest terms, it would add wheat to the present voluntary feed grain program. Anyone not wanting to participate in a Federal price support program would not be required to do so. He would be able to raise all the wheat he wanted to, but he would not be eligible for price support or land retirement payments. He could sell his wheat for whatever price he could secure on the market. He would not be limited to selling his wheat for export as in some of the voluntary programs that have been proposed.

When wheat farmers rejected the administration's certificate wheat plan in last May's referendum, they were not voting for no wheat program. They were rejecting a plan that seemed entirely too complicated and restrictive and hoping that Congress would give them a program that was fair and equitable. I believe our proposal is sound and would fulfill the obligation that Congress has to give the farmer something real instead of just hope.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that Mr. DOLE's amendment would be of benefit to the farmer. This cotton bill we are considering today will do nothing to help the cotton farmer, but from all the evidence presented here it would mean millions to the processing industry.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, we can with great justification assume that we have reached another milestone on the long, winding road of Government programs for agriculture. It becomes increasingly clear that we here in the Congress, along with leaders of all farm organizations must apply the utmost of our commonsense, knowledge, and ability to the framing of a farm program which will be effective and acceptable in the following respects: First, it must maintain or improve the possibility of increasing farm income; second, it must reduce the Government's role in the management of the affairs of our Nation's farmers and decrease the costs to the taxpayers; third, it must be basically voluntary in its application; fourth, it must apply to total wheat and feed grains production in order to avoid transfer of problems in one area to another and get at the problem of reducing surpluses; fifth, it should work toward restoring the normal grain trade to its proper place in the farm market economy; and sixth, it should not be a temporary or crash program which would be subject to radical changes from one crop year to another—it should be given the chance to prove itself.

Let me say that we have come a long way on that road in our bungling attempts to make adjustments for the tremendous increases in the productive capacity of our country's farmers. The trouble is that there have been too many detours, and all too often we have been on a road which would have led us to we know not where.

Looking back over the years we recall that in 1947 CLINTON ANDERSON, now U.S. Senator from New Mexico, became Secretary of Agriculture. He advocated a badly needed, long-range farm plan based on flexible supports—if a short supply in a commodity exists, raise supports to encourage production. When surpluses mount, drop supports, but always with a floor to protect the farmer. President Truman supported Mr. ANDERSON, and Secretary Brannan did, too, for a time when he took over the Department.

A year later, in 1948, both political parties stood for flexible supports, but by the spring of 1949, Secretary Brannan scuttled the idea in favor of his own infamous plan, and what chance could there possibly be for agreement on anything except to let the mistakes continue and the surpluses mount.

By 1952 the Republicans stuck with flexible supports and the Democrats campaigned for high rigid supports and through the next 8 years the battle was fought and refought to the utter confusion of everyone, and with a surplus problem that became increasingly a headache.

The Kennedy administration next moved in on the scene. They then proposed the Agricultural Act of 1961, known as the "omnibus farm bill," which attempted first to take over the functions of Congress, and second to obtain authority to place into operation the Cochrane theory of supply management over every one of the 256 agricultural commodities produced in America. The Congress was wiser than the controllers. It refused to give this authority. The proponents by the application of their concept would destroy the U.S. marketing system by placing controls over every segment of the marketing system, and thereby destroy the free market.

In the meantime the so-called emergency feed grain bill had been passed and I might say that this program has possibilities, the theory being that land would have to be retired in order to balance supply and demand, but now we find that those who were the strongest advocates of high supports and full parity for the farmer are administering agricultural programs with the farmers of the Nation struggling with a parity ratio of 77 percent for the first 6 months of 1963. This, I might comment, is the lowest parity figure since 1939.

Further examination of the history of farm legislation reveals that the Congress has been dealing with many separate commodities, many times attempting to legislate in one commodity only to have a problem break out in another. It is no great secret that the natural wheat-growing areas were asked to cut back in production while the door was opened for 15-acre producers to eventually produce more than the total annual surplus. Attempts have been made to cut back on the production of corn, while opening the door for grain sorghums. It is not so long ago that an attempt was made to permit the growing of barley on idle wheatland, and more recently a bill has been reported to permit the grazing of soil bank land.

So in reviewing the entire legislative conduct it becomes increasingly clear that there is a lack of across-the-board consideration and it is obvious that in our attempt to legislate by commodities we fail to recognize a basic need and that is to consider the total acres producing crops of all kinds and attempt to design legislation to encourage full participation in a land retirement program. This approach is necessary if we are to hope for adequate participation and to eventually bring supply and demand into proper proportion.

The bill that I introduced earlier in this session seeks to meet these qualifications, and I feel that there is a desperate need at this time to enact legislation, especially because of the situation that will develop in the area of wheat production. Statements have been made to the effect that the wheat farmer has indicated he wants no program, this judgment having been reached because of the wheat referendum vote. I do not believe that that is a proper interpretation to place on this action on the part of the farmer. In my judgment the farmer was saying, We do not want this type of a program, and I believe that they look to the Congress to come up with a more acceptable plan. I also am of the opinion that the proposal submitted by myself and others would be acceptable and would be endorsed by the wheat farmers of America.

I have further reasons for concern as to the wheat producers. While my district is largely a feed grain area, it is my opinion that if wheat prices are driven down, we will face still further competition in the feed grain areas which, of course, will result in cheaper feed and cheaper livestock. Already prices are distressing according to recent reports indicating that net farm income in the

Midwest is down as much as 15 percent—Wall Street Journal, July 10, 1963. The Department of Agriculture reports farm income—excluding Government payment—in 1960 at $11.1 billion; in 1961 at $11.1 billion; in 1962 at $11 billion; and in 1963, an estimated $10.5 billion. The farm parity ratio has stood at 77 percent for the past 3 months and that figure for the month of November is the lowest since 1933.

The bill that I have introduced is very simple in its application. It is entirely a voluntary program which requires not less than 20 percent land retirement and permits up to 50 percent. One feature that in my judgment will be attractive to the family livestock farmer is the provision in my bill that the farmer who takes grain as payment-in-kind, instead of cash, will receive a more liberal treatment. This is a means of encouraging the small farmer to participate, and in their instance usually feed grown is fed on the farm and needed on the farm. This approach will keep many bushels of grain out of storage and out of government ownership.

Questions may be asked to cost, but regardless of what approach is made in the field of agriculture, it will be costly. But it is my hope and the hope of many farmers that little by little the staggering surplus can be drawn down and we can again get agriculture to working in a more normal fashion. It is also our hope that we may establish better world markets in areas where food is a scarce commodity. This must be done by greater activity among farm organizations and people in the grain trade as well as the Government through Public Law 480.

I believe that the wheat growers of the United States deserve a better program than the one which will go into effect in 1964.

First. The present program will cause an extremely sharp reduction in wheat growers' income;

Second. If the present program is not radically altered, we are bound to be witness to a sharp expansion in wheat acreage accompanied by low price. These sharply low prices will make the wheat competitive with feed grains in the feed market; and

Third. An excess of feed supplies would ultimately drive down the prices of livestock and livestock products.

It should be noted that in the Midwestern States, between two-thirds and 80 percent of the farm income is derived from sales of livestock. I do not intend to stand idly by and watch the price structure for livestock and livestock products go into a nose dive.

It does not make sense to me to force the wheat grower to deplete his soil by overcropping in wheat in order to meet his expenses when at the same time this will cause irreparable damage to farmers clear across the conutry. Wheat growers and other farmers deserve better of their Government. It is for these reasons that I am strongly in favor of a voluntary wheat program which makes economic sense.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] desire to be heard further?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, in response to the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas, No. 1, we did not repeal the section to which the gentleman refers, the section dealing with feed grains. If we did, it does not include any reference of any kind or character to wheat.

Now, the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas deals with wheat. It could have dealt with hummingbird eggs or most anything else. If it had, it would not be germane to this bill, and since the gentleman includes an item which is not repealed or which is not referred to in this bill, therefore, his amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard further?

Mr. DOLE. I do, Mr. Chairman, briefly.

I might say, first of all, in response to the gentleman from Mississippi that our bill defines wheat as a feed grain. Therefore, that objection is taken care of.

Also, from the present feed grain law I read the following:

> The average acreage of wheat produced on the farm during the crop years 1959, 1960, and 1961, pursuant to the exemption provided in section 335(f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, prior to its repeal by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, in excess of the small farm base acreage for wheat established under section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be considered as an acreage for the farm, and the rate of payment for diverting such wheat shall be an amount determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in relation to the rates of payment for diverting feed grains.

In other words, we are talking about wheat in the present feed grain law, and the fact the previous "wheat for feed" exemption can be used in determining your feed grain base.

Mr. Chairman, I think on this basis it is completely germane, and I trust the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The Chair is ready to rule.

First, permit the Chair to refer to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] when he refers to a statement of the Speaker.

The Chair would assume that the Speaker referred to an amendment which would be a proper amendment and in line with the rules of the House, and not just any amendment.

Now, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] has had a point of order made against it by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] on the ground that it is not germane to the pending bill.

This is a situation where we have a bill referring to one commodity, cotton, and the gentleman's amendment would refer to other commodities. Clearly the gentleman's amendment is not germane because one individual proposition may not be amended by another individual proposition, even though the two may belong to the same class.

Therefore, the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi is sustained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I was surprised to learn that the chairman of the full Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], is going to ask for a rollcall on the amendment which was adopted in the House on a teller vote. That amendment, as all of you know, was one designed to knock out the proviso which would prohibit the possibility of a windfall to anyone through the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the members of the committee should know upon what they are going to be voting.

The first part of this section gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to make such payments as will eliminate the inequities. That is as far as we say we want to go. The proviso does not take into consideration inequities—it does not mention anything about inequities. It merely says that he shall make a payment at a price which is not in excess of the price that cotton is made available for export.

In other words, if they are paying an 8½-cent-a-pound export, then he would pay the mills 8½ cents per pound, not taking into account the fact that they do not have the same transportation costs, other handling charges and other expenses, that are involved in export shipments.

If you vote against this amendment, you will vote for a windfall for the mills that are trying to take advantage of this cotton legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman: I hesitate to speak on this bill. I do not come from a cotton-producing area nor do I have the experience in this body or on this committee to speak with the authority of the senior Members. But in my district we have lots of people who wear shirts and who pay taxes. And my instincts tell me that this bill is not the answer to the cotton problem for the Nation as a whole nor, indeed for the cotton-producing areas. My judgment on this is borne out of what study I have done and, more important, by my conversations with other Members more learned than I.

I know that cotton is an important industry and that the whole country is affected by its health or sickness and I do not approach this problem in a provincial manner. With the arguments that the present situation is intolerable I am in agreement. But not as intolerable as the one we will be in if the bill passes. And a bad situation does not call for a bad solution but rather for a bill to which we can all repair as offering

hope for a permanent solution, and one which, perhaps, can be applied to other commodities.

I cannot let this debate close without reference to a bill pending in this Congress which, in my opinion, does this and which, in any event comes closer to solving the difficulties in the cotton industry than does this one. I refer to the Talmadge bill. In committee I offered this as a substitute for the Cooley bill. I did not expect the motion to carry but I wanted to make a record because I think the Congress will come to the Talmadge bill, or something like it, in due time. And so many Members of this Congress and of the industry have told me privately that they agree that I am almost inclined to believe I am right. They all add that it would not pass. But this I cannot understand if they are all for it.

The proponents of the Cooley bill argue that it is needed to do away with the two-price system under which, they argue, our mills are at a disadvantage with foreign producers of cotton cloth. I assume this is so. But I cannot agree that the solution is to add a subsidy to a subsidy to a subsidy. And it is hard for me to see how the ruggedly individualistic free enterprise school of industrialists and agriculturalists can say it is. It seems to be simple commonsense to eliminate the problem caused by the export subsidy by eliminating that subsidy rather than compounding the error by adding another subsidy. This is the approach of the Talmadge bill and it seems to me highly preferable.

This year we have a bumper crop. Some 1.5 million bales will be added to our carryover. A combination of weather and improved technology have increased the yield per acre beyond any previous high. Reducing the support price will only encourage more production per acre in an effort to hold up farm income and in an absence of increased acreage.

Has not the time come when production quotas should be made on units of production—bales or bushels—rather than on acres if we are to continue with high price supports. This is what the Talmadge bill does. The present proposal, on the other hand, continues the acreage allotment system and even has a provision for an extra allotment for "export" of up to 20 percent of the base under certain conditions. It seems to me this compounds rather than solves the problem.

Mr. Chairman, there are many more ramifications of these two bills. Time and my knowledge limit my discussion. There are improvements which I would like to see in the Talmadge bill. It seems to me that enough has been said to show the advantages of the Talmadge bill over the present proposal, however, and I would be satisfied if the Congress can go at least this far. I am prepared to support it and I hope that the Senate will give it the consideration that I think it deserves.

Mr. WELTNER. 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. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that two-price cotton is an evil, nor that the elimination of two-price cotton should be a compelling order of business of this House. At one point, I felt that this bill might be the best means of ending two-price cotton that Congress might have before it in this session. Frankly, I had planned to vote for it, notwithstanding its serious defects. My reasoning at that point was that the bill might be amended in the other body by the substitution of a Senate bill generally known as the Talmadge plan.

Now, it was on that basis that I had considered supporting this bill.

In recent weeks, however, it has become more and more apparent that this bill, while ending two-price cotton, would create new evils equally as bad, if not worse. First, there is the matter of cost. Even the most conservative estimate shows this bill to carry a price tag of a quarter of a billion dollars more than the present program. That is a conservative estimate, and in all likelihood, cost will run $300 million during the first year.

Second, the deficiencies and inequities of the present cotton support system will in no way be eliminated or remedied by this bill. Therefore, we will continue a price support program which heaps millions of dollars upon large growers, and provides the small southeastern farmer the sum of about $5 a month. We will continue the 8½ cents per pound consumer subsidy for each pound produced in the United States. We will continue the embargo on foreign imports, along with the export subsidy and the nonrecourse loan program of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Third, in an effort to extricate ourselves from the dilemma created by the producers' subsidy, we are adding a mill subsidy. Subsidies are basically wrong. Two wrongs do not make a right, nor do two subsidies set this situation aright.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a cursory examination of the distribution of this proposed subsidy shows that six mills in America will receive almost a third of the benefit of this program. The largest mills, will receive the most. For instance, Burlington Mills, based upon its cotton consumption of 660,000 bales, is slated to receive the benefit of $28 million under this bill—almost 10 percent of the entire program. The attached table bears this out.

This bill is wrong. It is wrong for our Nation to obligate the huge sums required to carry it out. It is wrong for the taxpayer and consumer, who must pay this staggering new burden. It is wrong for textile mills to be the beneficiary of a new public dole. And it is wrong for the small farmer, whose unhappy circumstance is perpetuated by the strictures of this bill.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as much as I would like to see the end of two-price cotton, I cannot support this bill. It is a new spending program at a time when the tax cut demands stringent economy. It is a subsidy heaped upon existing subsidies. It is true that if any cotton bill is sent to the other body it might be amended by substitution of the Talmadge Plan. But that is the responsibility of another body, not this one. It seems poor policy for me to legislate in this House on the faint hope of substitution by the other House.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this bill when there has been pending in the Congress for several years a sound, economical and just plan for ending two-price cotton; for taking the Government out of the business of buying, selling, shipping, and storing cotton; for ending the vast disparities and inequities in the present cotton support system; and for returning to the cotton grower greater freedom of movement and opportunity for growth.

Mr. Chairman, everyone says that this bill has its defects; even the advocates of this bill acknowledge its many defects. Even they will readily admit that this is a poor solution. Yet they say it is the only cotton bill that can pass. I do not understand this reasoning. There is a better bill, whose superiority in acknowled not only by many Members, but by key figures in the administration, and in the industry. The Talmadge plan is vastly superior to this bill, and almost everyone admits it. If that be the case, then why not reject this bill and vote for a sound and simple solution to America's cotton dilemma?

Major cotton mills	Main plants	Sales	Operating profit		Cotton consumed	Benefits derived from Cooley bill	
			Amount	Percent of sales		Amount	Percent of all subsidy
		Millions	*Millions*		*Bales*	*Millions*	
Burlington	North Carolina	$1,010	$125	12.4	660,000	$28.0	9.6
J. P. Stevens	South Carolina	585	56	9.6	384,000	16.3	5.6
United M & M	North Carolina	502	40	8.0	330,000	14.0	4.8
Deering-Milliken (est.)	South Carolina	500	53	10.5	329,000	14.0	4.8
Cannon	North Carolina	231	31	13.4	274,000	11.6	4.0
Cone	do	220	14	6.4	268,000	11.3	3.9
Total (6 mills)		3,048	319	10.5	2,245,000	95.2	32.7
U.S. total						292.0	100.0

Sources: As to cotton mills, Moody's and Standard & Poor's.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, what a dark day this will be in the history of American agriculture if the House passes the bill now before us. The bill has been properly identified this afternoon as being nothing but a subsidy to industry under the guise of an agricultural bill. Yet we do not have the time or the opportunity to give a minute of consideration to the problem that presently confronts agriculture now with a parity price that is the lowest now since 1939, with net income down, and with further reductions coming. The proposition before us leads agriculture blindly down a road that is going to lead to his ruin. May I say to the House if we want to ruin all existing agricultural programs, and those coming, this is the best way in the world to do it. Imagine, a $16 million subsidy annually to one concern. Suppose for one single minute, if you will, there was a farm operation that was big enough to command that kind of subsidy. What a howl would go up in this House. Still today we are about to provide more than $600 million in subsidy to industry while we further reduce farm income. Only after reducing price supports on cotton can this bill be passed. Many of us have been begging and doing everything possible to direct some attention and favorable action on wheat legislation. Wheat farmers face a most difficult situation, it seems however that the only attention coming their way is when they are told how to vote. Where is the New Frontier in regard to farmers today, I have heard nothing but objection from the other side to everything in their behalf today. In the interest of farm families throughout the Nation I recommend defeat of the bill before us.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COOLEY

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: Page 2, line 23, strike out "to read as follows" and insert "by adding the following new subsection"; and

On page 2, line 24, strike out "(a)" and insert "(c)"; and

On page 3, line 14, strike out "(b)" and insert "(d)".

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, and that it should be considered on a parallel with the amendment just ruled on.

Mr. COOLEY. I have offered it because the gentleman says he wants it. If the gentleman does not want it I can withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The purpose of this amendment is to correct the technical references. That is the only purpose of it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I do this reluctantly because I did ask assurance of the chairman of the committee that this matter would be taken care of. But I do not want to make any exception to the rule. This is not germane. I do not want to have any part of that procedure.

Mr. COOLEY. It is germane, and I should like to have it adopted. It can go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair rules that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is germane, and therefore overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Does this deal with the feed grain provisions of the existing law?

The CHAIRMAN. No. It merely clarifies the matter in the report.

Mr. GROSS. What is the material in the report that is cured, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter for the gentleman from North Carolina to answer.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I introduced the amendment as the result of a complaint that came from that side of the aisle. If there is no ambiguity and you do not want it clarified, vote against the amendment. I think we should take the amendment because it is a clarification of something that appeared in the report and should be a part of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, would it now be in order to reconsider by unanimous consent the amendment I previously offered?

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to reconsider is not in order in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRANT

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRANT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of title 2 thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 213. 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, the Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, is directed to make payments, in cash or in kind, to persons other than the producers of such cotton, in such amounts as will make such cotton available for domestic use at prices not in excess of the prices at which cotton on comparable quality is made available for export, including such payments as are necessary to make raw cotton in inventory on the date of the enactment of this Act available for consumption at the level of prices established hereunder.'

"SEC. 2. Section 104 of the Agricultural 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 $10,000,000 annually, as may be necessary for the Secretary to carry out this special research program. The Secretary shall report annually 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.' "

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this substitute in an effort to be helpful. This matter of setting up a one-price system for cotton is something that the House Agriculture Committee has worked upon for a long time. Over a year ago, it became quite apparent to those of us who are interested in cotton that if the cotton farmer was to stay in business that it would be necessary that cotton sold domestically be made competitive with that sold to foreign markets.

With this in view, a meeting was held last fall in Memphis, Tenn., and since the opening of Congress in January this year, the committee has diligently and carefully considered every phase of this problem.

We realized that competitively priced synthetic fibers are taking the domestic cotton away from our own textile mills. There is no justification for the mills in this country having to pay approximately $42.50 more per bale for cotton than those in foreign lands.

For several years those interested in this problem have waited patiently for the Tariff Commission to grant some relief; however, after exhaustive hearings which were attended by many Members of Congress and other interested parties, the Tariff Commission refused to grant this much-needed relief. Therefore, it became necessary for some legislative action to be taken.

H.R. 2000, a bill introduced by the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, was a simple bill which came nearer than any of those since proposed in solving the problem in that it handled the matter of the equalization of this two-price system by giving the Commodity Credit Corporation the authority to make direct payments to persons other than the producers of cotton in such amounts as will make cotton available for domestic use at prices not in excess of the price at which cotton of comparable quality is made available for export, including such payments as are necessary to make raw cotton in inventory on the date of the enactment of this act available for consumption at the level of prices established hereunder.

I am offering this substitute, first, because I want to save the cotton industry from self-destruction and, secondly, it is equitable in that any subsidy payments made will fall upon all segments of the industry and the consuming public in

the same manner as the subsidy now paid upon exports.

I realize that over the coming years that cotton must be made more competitive with synthetic fibers, and for this reason, I have included in this substitute the authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to expend such amounts, not to exceed $10 million as will be necessary for the Secretary to carry out this special research program. Research upon this special problem will, I am sure, provide much-needed information which will be useful to the farmers—not only in increasing the amount of cotton grown per acre but will at the same time lower the cost of producing it by the elimination of pests, such as the cotton worm, boll weevil, and other cotton-destroying insects.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

The substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my remarks to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. I hate to add to your burden at this late hour, but there is one thing that has been a burden to me and that is the question of whether anything is being done with reference to the discriminatory practice of storing this cotton. As I understand it, and if my information is wrong, I wish you would correct me, there is a differential where reconcentrated cotton is stored for 30 cents a bale and less while other Government-owned cotton may be stored even in the same warehouse running from 46 cents to 51 cents because it is not subject to competitive bidding.

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

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. This bill does not touch the question of storage rates in one way or the other.

Mr. CASEY. I understand that. What I want to know is if you are doing anything about it.

Mr. POAGE. This bill does not do anything about it.

Mr. CASEY. Is the committee doing anything about this discrimination which, as I understand it, would cost the taxpayers millions of dollars because this cotton is not subject to competitive bidding.

Mr. POAGE. This particular matter has been referred to the oversight subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture. Frankly, I do not know what arrangements they have made as to further hearings on the matter, but it is presently before that subcommittee.

Mr. CASEY. I certainly hope they get some action on it.

Mr. Chairman, I take it from the answer received from the gentleman, that he is aware of a discrimination in the placement of cotton in storage.

I sincerely trust that the Agriculture Committee or a subcommittee thereof will immediately dig into this matter.

From the limited information I have, the Department of Agriculture procedures are costing the taxpayers of this country approximately $2 million per month more than it should for the storage of Government-owned cotton alone.

Competitive bidding would eliminate this practice which has in my opinion unjustly enriched some warehousemen.

The storage of cotton under loan should also be thoroughly gone into as it appears that the storage of this cotton is costing more than is reasonable in some instances.

I reach this conclusion and I am sure others of this House would, when you see reconcentrated cotton being stored for 30 cents per bale per month in the same warehouse continuing loan and other Government-owned cotton being stored at a cost of 46 to 51 cents per bale per month.

I respectfully hope the committee will give immediate attention to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, before action on this bill is concluded, I would like to make some further remarks in regard to this bill, and the problems confronting cotton farmers.

Mr. Chairman, people who are familiar with the cotton situation generally agree that new legislation or at least a new course of action is urgently required if the cotton industry is to avoid drastic readjustments and sharp downward acreage allotments.

Having said this, I want to point out that cotton programs have for many years contributed in a big way to the stability and success of the cotton industry. Most cotton farmers have been fairly well satisfied and many have prospered. This is definitely true of the cotton farmers in the district which I represent in Congress.

I firmly believe that if the cotton farmers in the district which I represent were convinced that they could continue indefinitely with the present program, and that includes the present acreage and price supports, they would much prefer the present program. They realize that the present program has its inequities and imperfections but I believe that they had rather continue with it indefinitely if they knew they could retain in future years the present acreage allotments and supports. In other words, if they knew they could, they had rather hold on to the program which they have, rather than take a chance on a new program which they fear may be far less satisfactory from their standpoint than the present program. I have the same fear which the farmer has in this respect. If I knew we could hold on indefinitely to the present program, I would much prefer it to taking the gamble on a new program which in my opinion will probably not be as satisfactory from the standpoint of the cotton farmer as the present program.

In the light of what I have just said, the natural question is, If the cotton farmers generally speaking like what they have, why are so many of them advocating a change? The reason is they just simply do not believe the present program can be continued indefinitely. They think, and in my opinion correctly so, that if the present program is continued a drastic additional reduction in cotton acreage will result.

The cotton carryover on August 1, 1960, was 7.5 million bales. The carryover on August 1, 1963, was 11.2 million bales, and the estimated carryover on August 1, 1964, is 12.9 million bales.

The alltime high carryover of cotton was 14.5 million bales on August 1, 1956. This shockingly high figure was largely responsible for the inauguration of the cotton export subsidy program under which we now pay an export subsidy of 8½ cents per pound on every pound of cotton exported, approximately $42.50 per bale.

Probably the major reason why a change in the cotton program is unavoidable is the fact that the consumption of cotton by American mills is not keeping pace with population growth, and the proportion of cotton used in relation to synthetic fibers in the production of textiles is on the downgrade, having taken a sharp downward turn within the last 2 or 3 years.

With this downward trend of cotton consumption by U.S. mills, relative to synthetics, it is inevitable that under the present programs surplus stocks of cotton will continue to mount. If this continues to happen a sharp reduction of acreage allotments to the farmer is inevitable. This is a major worry of the cotton farmer and the friends of the cotton farmer.

The major purpose of any cotton legislation should be to increase the consumption of American cotton by U.S. mills and bring about an increase in cotton acreage allotments to farmers.

After the debate on this bill is concluded today there will, no doubt, be a motion made to recommit it—send it back to the Committee on Agriculture. In my judgment the bill is far from satisfactory, but I doubt the wisdom of sending it back to the Committee on Agriculture.

I believe the better procedure would be to pass the bill for the purpose of sending it to the Senate for consideration. After the measure has been considered by the Senate committee and the Senate itself, the House will have an opportunity to act on the revised version of the bill. In the light of the facts as they exist at that time and in the light of the provisions of the final version of the bill, the House can determine whether or not such bill, as finally revised and amended, should be passed or defeated.

I realize that there will be a variety of views as to just what action should be taken today, but I believe the course which I have suggested is the best thing to do at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, in recent years this Congress has passed many bad measures of farm legislation. In fact, the agricultural economy of the Nation has been living under a crazy quilt of Government subsidies and controls which have afforded no solution to the problem of the American farmer; and, in fact, it has only compounded the

burden upon many farmers and certainly the American taxpayer.

But the bill we have been debating these past 2 days tops them all in legislative irresponsibility. Indeed, we find ourselves faced with a bill that will add a subsidy to a subsidy to a subsidy. We subsidize cotton on the world market to be competitive, then subsidize the cotton-grower; then seek to subsidize the textile industry in an agricultural bill.

One cannot help but wonder what the American taxpayer must think when he looks at this picture in perspective. Good judgment would certainly dictate that this Congress, knowing that this bill will not provide a solution to the plight of either the cotton or textile industry in this country, defeat the measure before us and write legislation which is directed to a more permanent solution to the problem rather than take the courses of political expediency which merely places a greater burden on the American taxpayer and consumer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of getting this legislation out of the way, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

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) 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, pursuant to House Resolution 464, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOEVEN. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOEVEN moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 6196, to the Committee on Agriculture.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 224, answered "present" 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

YEAS—179

Abbitt	Dole	Meader
Abele	Downing	Michel
Alger	Duncan	Minshall
Anderson	Ellsworth	Moore
Andrews, N. Dak.	Feighan	Moorhead
Arends	Findley	Morton
Ashbrook	Fino	Mosher
Avery	Fogarty	Nelsen
Ayres	Ford	Norblad
Baldwin	Foreman	Olson, Minn.
Baring	Frelinghuysen	Ostertag
Barry	Fulton, Pa.	Pelly
Battin	Gary	Pike
Beckworth	Goodell	Pillion
Beermann	Goodling	Powell
Belcher	Green, Oreg.	Quie
Bell	Griffin	Reid, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Gross	Reid, N.Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Grover	Reifel
Berry	Gubser	Rich
Betts	Gurney	Riehlman
Bolton, Frances P.	Haley	Robison
Bolton, Oliver P.	Halleck	Rogers, Fla.
Bow	Harding	Roudebush
Brademas	Hardy	Roybal
Bray	Harrison	Rumsfeld
Broomfield	Harsha	Ryan, N.Y.
Brotzman	Harvey, Ind.	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Harvey, Mich.	Saylor
Bruce	Hechler	Schadeberg
Burton	Herlong	Schenck
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Schneebeli
Cahill	Hoffman	Schweiker
Cameron	Horan	Schwengel
Cannon	Horton	Senner
Casey	Hosmer	Shipley
Cederberg	Hull	Short
Chamberlain	Hutchinson	Shriver
Chenoweth	Ichord	Skubitz
Clancy	Jennings	Smith, Calif.
Clark	Jensen	Smith, Va.
Clausen, Don H.	Johansen	Snyder
Clawson, Del	Johnson, Pa.	Springer
Cleveland	Jones, Mo.	Stafford
Cohelan	Kastenmeier	Stinson
Collier	Knox	Taft
Conte	Kunkel	Talcott
Corbett	Kyl	Teague, Tex.
Cramer	Laird	Thompson, La.
Cunningham	Langen	Thomson, Wis.
Curtin	Latta	Tollefson
Curtis	Leggett	Van Pelt
Dague	Lloyd	Waggonner
Dent	McClory	Weaver
Derounian	McCulloch	Weltner
Derwinski	McDade	Westland
Devine	MacGregor	Whalley
	Marsh	Wharton
	Martin, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.
	Mathias	Wydler
	May	Younger

NAYS—224

Abernethy	Corman	Fulton, Tenn.
Addabbo	Daddario	Fuqua
Albert	Daniels	Gallagher
Andrews, Ala.	Davis, Ga.	Garmatz
Ashmore	Davis, Tenn.	Gathings
Aspinall	Dawson	Giaimo
Baker	Delaney	Gilbert
Barrett	Denton	Glenn
Bass	Diggs	Gonzalez
Bates	Dingell	Grabowski
Blatnik	Donohue	Grant
Boggs	Dorn	Gray
Boland	Dowdy	Green, Pa.
Bonner	Dulski	Griffiths
Brock	Dwyer	Hagan, Ga.
Brooks	Edmondson	Hagen, Calif.
Brown, Calif.	Edwards	Halpern
Broyhill, N.C.	Elliott	Hansen
Broyhill, Va.	Everett	Harris
Buckley	Evins	Hawkins
Burke	Fascell	Hays
Burkhalter	Finnegan	Healey
Burleson	Fisher	Hébert
Byrne, Pa.	Flood	Hemphill
Carey	Flynt	Henderson
Celler	Forrester	Holifield
Chelf	Fountain	Holland
Colmer	Fraser	Huddleston
Cooley	Friedel	Jarman
Joelson	Murphy, N.Y.	Selden
Johnson, Calif.	Murray	Sibal
Johnson, Wis.	Natcher	Sickles
Jonas	Nedzi	Sikes
Jones, Ala.	Nix	Siler
Karsten	O'Brien, N.Y.	Sisk
Karth	O'Hara, Ill.	Slack
Keith	O'Hara, Mich.	Smith, Iowa
Kilburn	Olsen, Mont.	Staebler
Kilgore	O'Neill	Steed
King, Calif.	Osmers	Stephens
King, N.Y.	Patman	Stratton
Kirwan	Patten	Stubblefield
Kluczynski	Pepper	Sullivan
Kornegay	Perkins	Taylor
Landrum	Philbin	Teague, Calif.
Lankford	Pilcher	Thomas
Lennon	Pirnie	Thompson, Tex.
Lesinski	Poage	Thornberry
Libonati	Poff	Toll
Lindsay	Pool	Tuck
Lipscomb	Price	Tupper
Long, Md.	Pucinski	Tuten
McDowell	Purcell	Udall
McFall	Quillen	Ullman
McIntire	Rains	Utt
McMillan	Randall	Van Deerlin
Macdonald	Reuss	Vanik
Madden	Rhodes, Ariz.	Vinson
Mahon	Rhodes, Pa.	Wallhauser
Martin, Calif.	Rivers, S.C.	Watson
Martin, Mass.	Roberts, Ala.	Watts
Matthews	Roberts, Tex.	Whitener
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.	Whitten
Miller, N.Y.	Rogers, Tex.	Wickersham
Mills	Rooney, N.Y.	Widnall
Minish	Rooney, Pa.	Williams
Monagan	Roosevelt	Willis
Montoya	Rosenthal	Wilson, Bob
Morgan	Rostenkowski	Wilson, Charles H.
Morris	Roush	Winstead
Morrison	Ryan, Mich.	Wright
Morse	St Germain	Wyman
Moss	St. Onge	Young
Multer	Scott	Zablocki
Murphy, Ill.	Secrest	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Farbstein	Thompson, N.J.

NOT VOTING—29

Adair	Hanna	O'Konski
Ashley	Kee	Passman
Auchincloss	Kelly	Rivers, Alaska
Becker	Keogh	Rodino
Bolling	Long, La.	Shelley
Bromwell	McLoskey	Sheppard
Fallon	Mailliard	Staggers
Gibbons	Matsunaga	Trimble
Gill	Milliken	White
Hall	O'Brien, Ill.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Rodino against.

Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Rivers of Alaska against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Bromwell for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. McLoskey for, with Mr. White against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Gill with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Fallon.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Shelley.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Staggers.

Mr. CANNON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CASEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO]. If he were present, he would have voted "no." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

If he were here, he would have voted "nay." I, therefore, withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 216, nays 182, answered "present" 7, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

YEAS—216

Abernethy	Hagen, Calif.	Philbin
Addabbo	Halpern	Pilcher
Albert	Hansen	Pirnie
Andrews, Ala.	Harris	Poage
Ashmore	Hawkins	Poff
Baker	Hays	Pool
Barrett	Healey	Price
Bass	Hébert	Purcell
Bates	Hemphill	Quillen
Blatnik	Henderson	Rains
Boggs	Holifield	Randall
Boland	Holland	Reuss
Bonner	Huddleston	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brock	Jarman	Rhodes, Pa.
Brooks	Joelson	Rivers, S.C.
Brown, Calif.	Johnson, Wis.	Roberts, Ala.
Broyhill, N.C.	Jonas	Roberts, Tex.
Broyhill, Va.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Buckley	Karsten	Rogers, Tex.
Burke	Keith	Rooney, N.Y.
Burkhalter	Kilburn	Rooney, Pa.
Burleson	Kilgore	Roosevelt
Byrne, Pa.	King, Calif.	Rosenthal
Cannon	King, N.Y.	Rostenkowski
Carey	Kirwan	Roush
Celler	Kluczynski	St Germain
Chelf	Kornegay	St. Onge
Colmer	Landrum	Scott
Cooley	Lankford	Secrest
Corman	Lennon	Selden
Daddario	Lesinski	Sibal
Daniels	Libonati	Sickles
Davis, Ga.	Lindsay	Sikes
Davis, Tenn.	Lipscomb	Siler
Dawson	Long, Md.	Sisk
Delaney	McDowell	Slack
Denton	McFall	Staebler
Diggs	McIntire	Steed
Dingell	McMillan	Stephens
Donohue	Macdonald	Stratton
Dorn	Madden	Stubblefield
Dowdy	Mahon	Sullivan
Dulski	Martin, Calif.	Taylor
Dwyer	Martin, Mass.	Thomas
Edmondson	Matthews	Thompson, Tex.
Edwards	Miller, Calif.	Thornberry
Elliott	Miller, N.Y.	Toll
Everett	Mills	Tuck
Evins	Minish	Tupper
Fascell	Monagan	Udall
Finnegan	Montoya	Ullman
Flood	Morgan	Utt
Flynt	Morris	Van Pelt
Foreman	Morrison	Vinson
Forrester	Morse	Wallhauser
Fountain	Moss	Watson
Fraser	Multer	Watts
Friedel	Murphy, Ill.	Whitener
Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.	Whitten
Fuqua	Murray	Wickersham
Gallagher	Natcher	Widnall
Garmatz	Nedzi	Williams
Gathings	Nix	Willis
Giaimo	O'Brien, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Gilbert	O'Hara, Ill.	Wilson, Charles H.
Glenn	O'Hara, Mich.	
Gonzalez	Olsen, Mont.	Winstead
Grabowski	O'Neill	Wright
Grant	Osmers	Wyman
Gray	Patman	Young
Green, Pa.	Patten	Zablocki
Griffiths	Pepper	
Hagan, Ga.	Perkins	

NAYS—182

Abbitt	Baldwin	Berry
Abele	Baring	Betts
Alger	Barry	Bolton, Frances P.
Anderson	Battin	
Andrews, N. Dak.	Beckworth	Bolton, Oliver P.
	Beermann	
Arends	Belcher	Bow
Ashbrook	Bell	Brademas
Avery	Bennett, Fla.	Bray
Ayres	Bennett, Mich.	Broomfield
Brotzman	Harrison	Pucinski
Brown, Ohio	Harsha	Quie
Bruce	Harvey, Ind.	Reid, Ill.
Burton	Harvey, Mich.	Reid, N.Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hechler	Reifel
Cahill	Hoeven	Rich
Cameron	Hoffman	Riehlman
Casey	Horan	Robison
Cederberg	Horton	Rogers, Fla.
Chamberlain	Hosmer	Roudebush
Chenoweth	Hull	Roybal
Clancy	Hutchinson	Rumsfeld
Clark	Ichord	Ryan, Mich.
Clausen, Don H.	Jennings	Ryan, N.Y.
	Jensen	St. George
Clawson, Del	Johansen	Saylor
Cleveland	Johnson, Calif.	Schadeberg
Cohelan	Johnson, Pa.	Schenck
Collier	Jones, Mo.	Schneebeli
Corbett	Karth	Schweiker
Cramer	Kastenmeier	Schwengel
Cunningham	Knox	Senner
Curtin	Kunkel	Shipley
Curtis	Kyl	Short
Dague	Laird	Shriver
Dent	Langen	Skubitz
Derounian	Latta	Smith, Calif.
Derwinski	Leggett	Smith, Iowa
Devine	Lloyd	Smith, Va.
Dole	McClory	Snyder
Downing	McCulloch	Springer
Ellsworth	McDade	Stafford
Feighan	MacGregor	Stinson
Findley	Marsh	Taft
Fino	Martin, Nebr.	Talcott
Fisher	Mathias	Teague, Calif.
Fogarty	May	Teague, Tex.
Ford	Meader	Thompson, La.
Frelinghuysen	Michel	Thomson, Wis.
Fulton, Pa.	Minshall	Tollefson
Gary	Moore	Tuten
Goodell	Moorhead	Van Deerlin
Goodling	Morton	Vanik
Green, Oreg.	Mosher	Waggonner
Griffin	Nelsen	Weaver
Gross	Norblad	Weltner
Grover	Olson, Minn.	Westland
Gubser	Ostertag	Whalley
Gurney	Pelly	Wharton
Haley	Pike	Wilson, Ind.
Halleck	Pillion	Wydler
Harding	Powell	Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Aspinall	Farbstein	Herlong
Conte	Hardy	Thompson, N.J.
Duncan		

NOT VOTING—29

Adair	Hanna	O'Konski
Ashley	Kee	Passman
Auchincloss	Kelly	Rivers, Alaska
Becker	Keogh	Rodino
Bolling	Long, La.	Shelley
Bromwell	McLoskey	Sheppard
Fallon	Mailliard	Staggers
Gibbons	Matsunaga	Trimble
Gill	Milliken	White
Hall	O'Brien, Ill.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Conte against.

Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. Farbstein against.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Gill for, with Mr. Duncan against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Hardy against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Bromwell against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Hall for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. McLoskey against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Mailliard against.

Mr. Matsunaga for, with Mr. Gibbons against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Adair.

Mr. White with Mr. Staggers.

Mr. Fallon with Mrs. Kelly.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

A FIRM EXPERIENCED HAND

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy was growing in stature and by the end of a second term he would have been considered as one of a handful of great Presidents. This was the appraisal of President Kennedy made by Malcolm S. Forbes, publisher and editor in chief of Forbes, a national financial magazine.

Mr. Forbes pays tribute to the late President in an article appearing in the December 1, 1963, issue of Forbes.

In the same article Mr. Forbes pays tribute to Lyndon Johnson, saying—

No unelected—and few elected—Presidents have come into office with better preparation for the job.

Under unanimous consent I include with my remarks Mr. Forbes' article:

A FIRM EXPERIENCED HAND

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

Three and a half years ago I worked hard for the election of Richard Nixon to the Presidency, and as a delegate to the GOP convention happily voted for his nomination. During the Democratic convention I rooted for Lyndon B. Johnson in the conviction expressed often to friends that, "If a Democrat should win, he'd be the best one." Kennedy? Too young, too inexperienced. Attractive, eager, but not mature enough.

At lunch with two friends 48 hours before President Kennedy's death, we discussed at length how glad we were that he was President; that in foreign affairs, American objectives, hopes, and ideals had been made clear and had been kept clear; that the President had displayed firmness without resorting to shallow and explosive brinksmanship. We commented on how no Republican President probably would have dared to ask for the tax reduction so necessary to our maximum economic expansion.

We rounded out the conversation by concluding that Kennedy would undoubtedly be reelected and that by the end of his second term he would be considered as one of the handful of great Presidents.

In 36 months there are few specific legislative milestones on which historians can peg an evaluation of President Kennedy's administration but his greatness as a man is firmly established. With wit and wisdom and calmness he met world crises, and continually concerned himself with measures that would benefit the human lot. The TV program "Conversation With the President," showed his conception of the job and his remarkable grasp of the problems of our time.

On these pages Forbes in past months has on several occasions supported his actions and proposals.

The man is now beyond support, but some of the measures and the need of them remain.

What now? What about Lyndon Johnson?

I can recollect no unelected—and few elected Presidents who have come into office with better preparation for the job. In the three most immediate problems facing the country President Johnson had unusual responsibilities under John Kennedy.

He was knee deep in defense problems, particularly in matters of space.

In the field of civil rights he headed the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

In connection with foreign relations he has in recent months acquired firsthand familiarity with most of our allies and friends abroad.

Before this exposure to national responsibility on the Executive level he, in title and in fact, led the legislative branch as majority leader of the Senate. Virtually every important legislative measure during President Eisenhower's last 6 years achieved passage primarily because of Johnson's help. His support of foreign aid and trade, of NATO and the UN, social security and expanded civil rights is a matter of record, both in words and deeds.

In one very significant area Johnson's skill exceeds that of the late President—how to get things through Congress.

President Johnson displays one attitude strikingly similar to President Eisenhower's: An almost-fervent belief in the free enterprise system. Anybody tempted to sell securities because of uncertainty about the new administration should listen to a replay of the Texas TV station's interview with the President and Mrs. Johnson at the LBJ Ranch, recorded a few weeks ago. No Republican, no conservative, no business leader, no Vermont Yankee ever gave greater or more continuous expression of conviction about free enterprise and the American way of economic life than the new President of the United States.

In our profound misfortune we are fortunate that the new hand at the helm is an experienced, firm one. President Johnson knows unusually well the process of governing and the problems facing the Government. He knows unusually well men in government and particularly the men now in his government.

In despairing over the still-unbelievable deed of assassination, we certainly need not despair over our country's present leadership and future prospects.

PRESIDENT NKRUMAH IN RADIO MESSAGE HONORS MEMORY OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, "Man of His Century" was the tribute to President John F. Kennedy in a memorial radio address by President Nkrumah to the people of Ghana. I am extending my remarks to include President Nkrumah's radio message, honoring the memory of our martyred President:

PRESIDENT NKRUMAH IN RADIO MESSAGE HONORS MEMORY OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

It is with deep sorrow that I speak to you today and pay tribute to the memory of the late President John F. Kennedy, a great world statesman, and a relentless fighter for equality and human dignity.

The whole world has been shocked and bewildered at President Kennedy's tragic death by assassination in the prime of his life. In spite of his brief term of office, President Kennedy has made an indelible mark on the history of our time. He will be remembered as a distinguished champion for peace and the rights of man. His inspiration, his tremendous courage, his integrity and the warmth of his feeling for his fellow men will be a beacon to those who share his convictions and aspiration.

John Kennedy's achievements in international affairs have been remarkable. We in Africa will remember him above all for his uncompromising stand against racial and religious bigotry, intolerance, and injustice. His courage and steadfastness in pursuing the objectives of racial equality in his own country will always remain as his greatest contribution to the struggle against racialism and racial arrogance.

* * * * *

President Kennedy was a remarkable man and a man of his century. Born to wealth, he was yet deeply sensitive to the problems and hopes of the common man and of the underprivileged. This aspect of his character was reflected both in his domestic and international policies.

His ideas on economic aid, social welfare, and world peace were far in advance of large sections of influential opinion in his own country. As the youngest President ever of the United States, he was truly a representative of our century—a century of expanding opportunities for all the elimination of poverty, ignorance, and disease, and the establishment of a new order of truth, equality, and social justice.

With a true sense of history John Kennedy carried on in a most dramatic manner what Abraham Lincoln began 100 years ago; like Lincoln he was prevented from carrying his endeavors to the great heights he had set for himself by an assassin's bullet. As a man endowed with great human warmth, his relationship with people was always friendly and sincere. I was privileged to meet President Kennedy and his wife in Washington in 1961 not long after he became President of the United States. In fact, I think I am right in saying that I was the first Head of State to whom he granted audience immediately after he had been sworn in as the President of the United States. I was deeply impressed by his wisdom and sincerity.

His presence, his sense of understanding and appreciation of the grave issues confronting our world, and his genuine interest in the solution of the problems confronting developing countries made me regard him even then as a man from whom the world could expect great things, as a man who could become one of the most important leaders of our time. It really takes a man like John Kennedy to say, and I quote from his writings: "A man does what he must in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressure and that is the basis of all human morality." We in Africa can have no more appropriate epitaph to John Kennedy's memory than his own words spoken in his inaugural address: "Whether you are citizens of America or of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice that we shall ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward with history, the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

To his dear wife and children, I send deepest condolence on my own behalf and on behalf of the people of Ghana.

NEW WHEAT PLAN

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with Senators MILTON YOUNG of North Dakota, and FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, in introducing legislation to amend the present wheat law. This is, of course, extremely important to North Dakota, which derives more of its income from the sale of wheat than any other State in the Nation.

The present law has far too many complications, as was pointed out by the farmers who refused to go along with it in the wheat referendum. The plan we are suggesting would amend the present law to make it voluntary. There would be no referendum. The act would be far easier to administer than any of the wheat plans that have been promoted by the Department of Agriculture. Actually, our bill is closely akin to the principles of the old McNary-Haugen farm law.

I believe sincerely that both taxes and Government expenditures must be cut. Other wheat legislation before Congress could cost the taxpayers up to $2 billion annually. Our program would be self-

supporting if the President chose to have processors acquire the marketing certificates.

The North Dakota Farm Bureau and the National Grange have both from time to time favored a two-price approach to solving our wheat problem. This over a period of years has been attractive to me because the American farmer certainly deserves full parity for that wheat which he produces to be consumed in America. After all, for the machinery he buys, the fertilizers he uses and all the other costs of his production, he is paying American prices.

At the same time, no farmer can expect the taxpayers to continually subsidize him for producing grain that is neither needed nor consumed. And, too, the American farmer under this approach would be free to plant as much wheat as he desired, and this freedom of opportunity is something that the farmers of our country have wanted for a long time.

I think this act would be good for North Dakota and the Nation for a number of reasons, which I shall summarize:

First. It preserves the cherished American tradition of freedom of choice. Those farmers wanting no program at all could stay out. Those who feel they need price supports could participate.

Second. It provides full parity for that wheat produced for domestic consumption.

Third. It is a much less complicated program and can be administered with a minimum of cost to the taxpayer and a minimum of interference with the farmer.

Fourth. There would be an interchangeability feature by which a farmer could substitute his feed grain acres for wheat and vice versa.

Fifth. It would allow freer export of American wheat, giving us the opportunity of using our God-given abundance as a positive weapon for peace in the world.

And lastly, the price for wheat would be set in the marketplace, with the result that we in North Dakota would get more for our quality wheat.

The Secretary of Agriculture, of course, would determine each year what amount of wheat we need to meet both domestic and export requirements. The amount set could be not less than 1 billion bushels. Each year the Secretary would announce what acreage was needed to meet the necessary annual production goal. The State, county, and farm allotments would be determined with the national allotment in the same manner as allotments are now determined.

The national allotment for next year using this formula which would require the production of approximately 1.2 billion bushels would be about 50 million acres.

It now appears entirely possible that present export levels could be maintained or even increased. In the event of an increase, of course, acreage allotments would be somewhat higher. A minimum export level would be set by the Secretary as provided under existing law which the Secretary has announced at $1.30 per bushel. The individual farmer would receive, however, 100 percent of parity, which is currently $2.51 per bushel, for that portion of his wheat consumed in the United States—approximately 500 million bushels. This would give a blended price of about $1.80 per bushel to the participating farmer for all of his wheat.

The market price would be set entirely by the demand for that particular type of wheat sold, and if the farmer were raising wheat which has always commanded a premium, or if expected heavy exports materialize, the farmer would of course receive a higher blended price.

Besides the assured blended price of at least $1.80 a bushel, farmers complying with the program who reduced their acreage would receive diversion payments the same as we have had under wheat and feed grain programs for several years.

The President of the United States would have discretionary authority under the provisions of this bill to make wheat-certificate payments directly through the Commodity Credit Corporation as is done under the present wheat and feed grain program. Or he could elect, by requiring the domestic processors to purchase the wheat certificates as is presently required under the wheat-certificate law, to make the program largely self-financing.

The elimination of most, if not all, Government storage payments would be another great saving. The repeal of wheat marketing quotas and marketing penalties would be a part of this new wheat price support proposal. Provisions for acreage allotments, however, would remain in effect. If and when the acreage allotments were required by the Secretary of Agriculture, those farmers complying would be entitled to marketing certificates which would provide their price support. Those failing to comply with allotments would be able to raise all the wheat they want to and sell it free of penalties on the open market but would not get any benefits of the wheat program. This choice might well be elected by many farmers who feel they do not need price supports.

The program would be a true domestic parity plan which has been known more commonly as the two-price plan. The bill would utilize the mechanics of the present law to allocate marketing certificates which would be restricted to that portion of the wheat crop needed for domestic food consumption.

The major advantage, of course, of such program would be that wheat exporters would not be required to purchase certificates, making foreign sales of wheat much more possible and much more feasible.

This allowing of a wheat export of American wheat would give us the opportunity to use our food as a positive weapon for peace in the world.

I would like to include the following explanation of the bill from technical counsel:

EXPLANATION OF BILL

SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill provides for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program. It would—

(1) Repeal existing provisions for margeting quotas.

(2) Provide full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption.

(3) Permit certificates to be issued for wheat held over from a prior crop where the current crop is underplanted.

(4) Permit the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates, in which case all certificates would be redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation.

(5) Repeal the provision for montary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat. Under the bill acreage allotments would be proclaimed every year. The amount of the allotment and its apportionment among States, counties, and farms would be as provided by existing law. Marketing certificates would be utilized as under existing law, except that they would be restricted to the portion of the crop needed for domestic food consumption, and the support level for certificate wheat would be full parity, instead of 65 to 90 percent of parity. The remainder of the crop would be supported at the level now provided for noncertificate wheat, and certificates would not be required for export wheat. The President would determine, in accordance with the objectives of the act, whether processors would be required to obtain certificates for wheat processed for domestic consumption, or whether the wheat for domestic consumption should move at the world price, with the certificate issued to producers being redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill would be applicable to the 1964 crop, the acreage allotments for 1964 being those heretofore apportioned.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

Section 1 repeals the existing provisions for wheat marketing quotas. That is its sole purpose.

Subsection (a) provides that, instead of proclaiming marketing quotas when the supply would otherwise be excessive, the Secretary shall determine a production objective each year and proclaim a national acreage allotment designed to achieve it. The formula for determining the production objective would be the same as the present formula for determining the amount of the marketing quota; the national acreage allotment would be the same as under existing law; and the national acreage allotment would be apportioned to States, counties, and farms as under existing law. Acreage allotments could be increased as under existing law, but the existing provision for termination is deleted.

Subsection (b) deals with the provisions in sections 334 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the existing law for preservation of acreage history where the marketing excess is stored to avoid payment of marketing penalties. Subsection (b) makes purely technical amendments to give recognition to the fact that under the bill there will be no marketing penalties after 1963. History would continue to be preserved, however, where the marketing excess was stored in accordance with the existing provisions during the years 1959 through 1963.

Subsection (c) repeals Public Law 74, 77th Congress, which deals with wheat marketing penalties; and amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 by striking out section 336 which deals with the marketing quota referendum, section 338 which deals with transfers of farm marketing quotas, and provisions in various other sections which have no meaning in the absence of marketing quotas. Paragraphs (8) and (9) of Public Law 74, which deal, respectively with rice marketing penalties and support for the 1941 through 1946 crops are obsolete, and their repeal merely strikes out ineffective provisions. Rice marketing penalty

rates are now established by section 356 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Subsection (d) amends section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the price support provisions for wheat, to eliminate references to marketing quotas. Section 107(2) now provides for the support level for noncertificate wheat "if marketing quotas are in effect." Subsection (d) makes section 107 (2) applicable every year. Section 107(4) at present provides for the support level when marketing quotas are not in effect. The bill would repeal section 107(4), since a marketing certificate program would be in effect every year, and the support levels for certificate and noncertificate wheat are intended to be governed by sections 107(1) and 107(2) every year. Subsection (d) also amends section 107(5) which now defines "cooperator" differently when marketing quotas are in effect and when they are not in effect. Under the bill there would be only one definition of "cooperator," and various provisions of section 107(5) relating to marketing quotas would be deleted.

Subsection (e) makes changes in headings in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 required by the deletion of quota provisions.

Section 2 provides price support at full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption.

Subsection (a) increases the support level for certificate wheat to full parity (from the 65 to 90 percent of parity now provided for).

Subsection (b) limits the quantity of marketing certificates issued to producers to the quantity of wheat estimated to be needed for domestic food consumption (instead of including such portion of the estimated exports as may be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture as is now provided).

Section 3 would permit marketing certificates to be issued for uncertificated wheat on hand from prior crops, where the normal yield of the planted acreage is less than the farm wheat marketing allocation. The farm wheat marketing allocation is the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment multiplied by the national allocation percentage. Under existing law marketing certificates are to be issued for the farm wheat marketing allocation, but not more than the normal yield of the planted acreage, plus the amount of wheat stored from a previous crop to avoid penalty which is released because of underplanting the allotment. Since the bill repeals marketing quotas, there no longer would be any wheat stored to avoid penalty. The bill would permit certificates to be issued for any wheat stored from a previous crop to make up the amount of the farm wheat marketing allocation.

Section 4 would authorize the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates to cover the amount of wheat processed by them for domestic food consumption. This section also repeals the requirement that exporters acquire marketing certificates for wheat exported by them, since it is the purpose of the bill that the noncertificate wheat move freely into export. The President might suspend the requirement that processors acquire certificates either in whole or in part. If he determined, for instance, that the regulation of commerce would be better served by requiring the processors to acquire certificates for a part of the wheat processed by them, he could so provide. The suspension might be for an entire marketing year or a shorter or longer period, as determined by the President.

Section 5 repeals the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat. Producers would continue, however, to be subject to loss of eligibility for wheat price support and marketing certificates, if they produced crops on such acreage.

Section 6 would make the bill effective with the 1964 crop. The allotments heretofore established for the 1964 crop would be effective without further action, and the support levels provided by the bill would be applicable, notwithstanding the results of the quota referendum heretofore held.

SUBPENA POWERS FOR PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill the terms of which, by attaching legislative connotations to the investigation of the late President's tragic murder, will provide the power to subpena witnesses and to take testimony under oath subject to the penalties of perjury. Such an authority is indispensable to an adequate investigation, which has far-reaching ramifications as we all know.

Even our great FBI does not have the power to compel testimony under oath. This is a fact too few are aware of. In the discharge of its heavy responsibilities to find and present all the relevant facts surrounding this awful crime, the American people are entitled to the assurance that the report of the Commission shall be based upon sworn testimony. This is particularly important as we reflect on the fact that the alleged murderer Oswald was an admitted Marxist and had sought citizenship in Communist Russia.

For more than 10 years I have urged repeatedly that affiliation with Marxism, and Marxism-Leninism as one variation, raises the most serious questions of loyalty to the United States and hence of security in this Nation. Paul Sweezy testified before me in years past that he was a Marxist. Yet the U.S. Supreme Court held the State Legislative Investigating Committee could not inquire concerning his activities at our State university. I believed then and continue to believe that such a fact, without more—and there was much more—raised many relevant questions of material concern ot the safety and security of the State of New Hampshire and to the United States. There have been others in America who have been and are Marxists—too many others in this great, free land.

It is interesting to note that now the Chief Justice of the United States heads a fact-finding Commission that is bound to be concerned with the question of whether Oswald acted on his own or at the behest of others, or in concert with others. It is indisputable that Communist affiliations of this alleged killer are material, whether Castro or Comintern inspired.

It is not unreasonable to anticipate that in the process of this immensely important investigation the distinguished Chief Justice and his outstanding colleagues on the Commission will encounter and of necessity have to resolve some of the great problems of relevancy and pertinency involved in the implacable enmity that is the Communist conspiracy to destroy America. Unfortunately, this has often been glossed over by some of the judiciary in applying judicial precepts to efforts of State legislatures and the Congress to keep posted on Communist activities in the United States.

This is a new and important role for our Chief Justice. Let us hope that the decisions of the high court will not prove to be roadblocks as the Commission seeks to establish all the facts surrounding this despicable crime.

OUR MARTYRED PRESIDENT—JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the tragic assassination of President Kennedy has dealt a heavy and tragic blow to the people of the whole country, as well as to the people of my own district.

Expressive of that sentiment in my own area of upstate New York, Mr. Speaker, is an eloquent tribute paid to our late beloved President by the Reverend Edward O'Heron, assistant pastor of St. Mary's Church in Cortland, N.Y., which I now include in the form in which it appeared in the Cortland Standard of November 25, 1963.

FATHER O'HERON'S EULOGY TO PRESIDENT

Because a eulogy of the late President delivered several times in the past 2 days by the Reverend Edward O'Heron of St. Mary's Church has been so well received, the assistant pastor was asked this morning to repeat his words at the solemn high requiem mass held at the church.

Following is his tribute to John F. Kennedy:

"Speech is always inadequate to describe the thoughts and feelings of a human being. During these sorrowful hours since the news flashed of our national tragedy in Dallas, speech is never so inadequate as it is at this time. In a way it seems almost sacrilegious to say anything. It seems that there is nothing to be done and nothing to be said except to be quiet—and to reflect—and to pray.

"At the same time, however, as human beings we are compelled to speak. We are creatures of body as well as soul. Whenever we feel deeply, whenever we love deeply, whenever we mourn deeply, our nature demands that we express ourselves, even though it be ever so inadequate."

"In the opening words of the Gospel of St. John we read the following words, 'There was a man sent from God whose name was John.' Today we Americans can well apply those words of the evangelist to the President whose death we now mourn. 'There was a man sent from God whose name was John.' In recent months we have lost two men sent from God whose names were John, the one a Pope and now a President. In some ways they were so different from each other, the one the son of a millionaire, the other the son of a peasant sharecropper. Yet at the same time they were so much alike, so dedicated to the needs of others, so sensitive to the sufferings of others.

"We will leave it to the world's orators the task of eulogizing John F. Kennedy as Chief Executive or politician or supreme

commander. We will leave it to the historians to assess his place in history. Today we wish only to speak of John F. Kennedy as a member of the family, a member of your family, a member of my family. Just how much a part of your family he was is seen by the fact that if you had been informed on Friday afternoon of the sudden death of one of your own blood relatives, your sorrow could hardly be any deeper or any more heartfelt than it is right now at the death of President Kennedy. One concise sentence from the news wire service summed it all up with the words, 'Everyone's bright young brother has been killed.'

"This is perhaps the greatest lesson we can learn from the life of John F. Kennedy. He has shown us that in spite of our political differences, in spite of our religious differences, we are in fact members of the same human family, we are brothers with the same Father in heaven.'

"On Friday morning at a breakfast talk in Fort Worth, Tex., John F. Kennedy had this to say, 'This is a very dangerous and uncertain world—We would like to live as we once lived but history will not permit it.' He went on to say, 'No one expects that our life will be easy—certainly not in this decade and perhaps not in this century.' John F. Kennedy was right. Our life will not be easy. As we realize today how much poorer we are without him, let us also not forget to be grateful for the fact that we are so much richer for having had him with us. How he took our narrow, self-centered attitude toward life and toward other people, and broadened our vision to encompass every human being on the face of the earth. How well he has given us the lesson and the challenge of the service of God not merely through prayers but the service of God through the service of men. Perhaps it all comes down to this. As we mourn the death of a great American, a member of our family, and pray for his soul, let us not forget to include prayers of gratitude, gratitude that for us Americans in the 1960's there was a man sent from God whose name was John. May the God who he served so well give eternal peace to his valiant soul."

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. RYAN of New York. 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 York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to learn that on November 26, 1963, the Board of Education of the City of New York adopted a resolution which endorsed and recommended to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives approval of my bill, H.R. 8198. I would like to bring this resolution to the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be included at this point:

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958—H.R. 8198, 88TH CONGRESS, RE AID TO LINGUISTICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Resolved, That the board of education endorses and recommends to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives the approval of the proposed amendment to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (H.R. 8198, 88th Cong.), dated August 21, 1963, permitting the use of funds appropriated under title III of said act to be used for the acquisition of equipment for use in teaching the English language to students whose primary language is not English.

EXPLANATION

The board of education has approved the establishment of experimental language laboratories in schools at the elementary and secondary levels, with costs to be met in part through grants available under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 for foreign language instruction.

The proposed amendment would permit the use of funds received under title III to be extended to the acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment or for expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in providing education in the English language for students whose primary language is not English.

In the language category, the original bill limited assistance to foreign language instruction. The amendment will permit the use of Federal funds granted under title III of the National Defense Education Act to be used for linguistically handicapped children in any modern language.

It is expected that a particular benefit will be derived by non-English-speaking children through improvement of techniques in English language instruction.

THE TIME FOR CONGRESS TO ACT ON CIVIL RIGHTS IS NOW

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday a discharge petition to bring the civil rights bill, H.R. 7152, to the floor of the House will be filed. Because of the obstructionism of the Committee on Rules this procedure will be followed. It is my hope that the required 218 signatures will be obtained promptly so that the House will be able to debate and vote on this vital legislation this year. As I understand the parliamentary situation, December 23 will be the first date the bill could be brought to the floor under the discharge procedure.

Mr. Speaker, December 23 is a date which may conflict with the plans of the Members for a Christmas recess. However, I believe that the enactment of civil rights legislation this year is so essential that the House should remain in session until that unfinished business is completed. There could be no more fitting memorial to our beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

One week ago, President Johnson challenged the Congress to act:

> We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in the books of law.

The Washington Post, in an editorial published today, puts its finger on the obligation of the Congress to the Nation to complete the business before us. I hope that each of my colleagues will read and seriously consider this editorial of December 4, 1963, which I include at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS MUST ACT

Congress, on the very eve of the holiday season, faces a legislative chore sufficient to engage it for weeks of a normal session and for months of a session proceeding at the speed with which it has moved this year.

Civil rights, the tax bill, and the appropriation bills are on the top of its pile of work, but there is a lot more unfinished business. Congressmen, like the rest of us, relish a holiday interlude. But the country is entitled to say to Senators and Representatives who protest at continued unremitting toil: "You asked for work when you hired out." That they did, and the work they hired out to do has not been completed.

If Congress takes a customary adjournment with so many of its tasks unfinished there will be a ghost at every Christmas board, as well as a turkey. Or to use a more current metaphor, there will be two turkeys—the one the Congressmen are eating and the one that represents the session they have just quit.

The work that the Congress came here to do is unfinished. The people have a right to ask Congressmen to finish it. An administration does not have the right to insist that Congress approve everything for which it asks. It does have a right to ask that Congress dispose of the program one way or another. The public, too, has a right to expect that Congress will vote on the matters before it; a right to demand that it permit the administration program to come to a decision.

Congressmen, individually, may feel it is unjust to blame them. No doubt the session has been wearing—perhaps more wearing than when the legislative machinery moves more swiftly. They may say that it is not their fault, but the fault of the rules and the system. But the House makes its own rules. The Senate makes its rules. If the rules preclude expeditious action, why hasn't each body changed its rules? It is to be hoped that next session Congress will at last take a look at the structural defects that have made it one of the most lethargic legislative establishments in the history of democratic government. Now, Congress will have to finish this session's work with the rules as they are. Whatever the defects of the rules, they can still act if Senators and Representatives are sufficiently determined to act. The time has come to end what amounts to a congressional sitdown strike.

The session should proceed on an emergency schedule. Absences in either Chamber should not be allowed lightly. The whole legislative program should be pressed on a crisis basis. There should be no thought of a long holiday recess or adjournment. Private citizens, so far behind in their personal endeavors, would content themselves with a rest on Christmas Eve and Christmas Day and then get on with their work. They have a right to ask their Representatives and Senators to do as they would do in the conduct of their private affairs. The work of the Nation is not less important.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader

if he can give us any information as to the legislative program for the remainder of the week.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we hope to announce the legislative program for next week on tomorrow. The House will meet during the balance of the week, that is tomorrow, Friday, and Saturday, because the leadership has been notified that objection would be made to going over.

But there will be no legislative business for the balance of the week except such as might be called up under unanimous-consent request.

There will be no conference reports as was previously indicated.

On tomorrow, as previously announced, we of course will have tributes to the memory of our late President.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Can the distinguished majority leader tell us if it is anticipated there will be any business at all tomorrow other than the eulogies to the late President?

Mr. ALBERT. There may be a unanimous-consent request to send bills to conference. Beyond that I know of nothing. There will be no legislative program.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Will there be an attempt to get unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Normally that request would be made.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to advise the gentleman I will object to any unanmious-consent request for that purpose. As I understand it, the Committee on the Judiciary has a bill that they want considered on the floor of the House and that Calendar Wednesday is available to them for that purpose.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, when any Member notifies me that he will object, I would respect that notice and would not make the request.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman is very courteous and I am making such notification.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, I would respect it.

COEXISTENCE—IS IT POSSIBLE?

Mr. MORSE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the feasibility of coexistence with the Soviet Union is a major debate facing the Nation. Despite the preponderance of evidence dramatizing complete failure of the coexistence theory, the State Department is charging ahead with frantic efforts to appease and coexist with the morally evil philosophy of communism.

I include with my remarks an article which appeared in the Hairenik Weekly of Thursday, November 28, entitled "Coexistence—Is It Possible?" written by Ruben Chudlarian.

Mr. Chudlarian is a noted expert in this field, a former member of the faculty of Central Asia University, and came to the United States from the U.S.S.R. as a political refugee. He is the author of a number of works, among which are "Americans Built Communism," "U.S.S.R.-Prison Nations," for which he received the All-American Conference Award in 1959; "Khrushchev's Call," for which he was awarded the George Washington Medal in 1961, and others.

COEXISTENCE—IS IT POSSIBLE?

(By Ruben Chudlarian)

Is coexistence possible between communism and capitalism? This is the most discussed problem of our day. It is also the least understood.

The writings of Marx and Lenin assure us that the scholarly Mao Tse-tung is correct in his contention that the founders of the Communist philosophy excluded the possibility of the coexistence of capitalism and communism; his assertion therefore that "Khrushchev is a traitor to Communist ideology," is just. But misinterpretation of the meaning of coexistence leads to serious errors. To understand its real intention let us lay open to the attention of the world Khrushchev's ideological cerebrations.

Reporting to the Plenum of Central Committee CPSU (see Pravda, June 19, 1963), Khrushchev asserted: "There cannot be any thought of coexistence between two ideologies: Communist and capitalist * * * the ideological war will continue until capitalism perishes from the world." He went on to say, "Our party considers coexistence as the right way which leads to the victory of communism over capitalism."

Now then, turning our attention to the program of the CPSU, accepted at the 22d Congress, we read that "by 1980 * * * people will live under communism," and that "the state is bound to wither away." It is obvious however that the government in Russia cannot be liquidated while it is beleagured by states with other systems. To meet this, the program says, "To insure that the state will wither away completely it is necessary to make a final settlement between capitalism and communism in the world arena in favor of communism." It is evident that Khrushchev, the creator of this program, believes that the "final settlement," another term of "coexistence" will assist him to achieve his goal.

There is another cause that worries the party. As long as democratic countries continue to exist, there will remain the opportunity for people to get rid of a way of life—communism—to which it is difficult for human nature to become accustomed. The only way to wrest the hope of freedom from the people and force them to submit to the Communist way of life is to destroy the agent of unrest—the democratic world.

From this brief observation the logical conclusion is that the building of communism can be realized only after the destruction of Western democracy, Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung agree in this regard; therefore, both of these leaders, one of orthodox Marxism, the other of the "modernized" version are our enemies. The difference between them is that while Mao Tse-tung openly announces his aims, Khrushchev's method calculated to destroy world independence is crafty. The latter's political activities are the reflection of a personality immune to all decency. Khrushchev demonstrated this when he denounced Stalin, whose close associate he had been, and declared that he himself had played no part in the murder of millions of people.

As the savage he is, he pulverized the bones of Hungarian women and children under Russian tanks, and then blandly declared that the Hungarian working class had been responsible for suppressing what he termed "two counterrevolutionary uprisings."

With unsurpassed cynicism he threw up the Berlin wall, declaring it a step "to defend the freedom of East Berlin working people from American imperialists."

With typical sneakiness, calculating that he would force the United States to its knees before him, he installed his missiles in Cuba. One can enumerate dozens of such ignoble deeds on the part of the chairman of the U.S.S.R. and the general secretary of CPSU, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev.

Taking into account Khrushchev's methods and philosophies in prosecution of state business, sober-thinking Americans are at a loss to explain how our statesmen dare risk a nuclear ban agreement with such a person and, generally, with Communists, who for 45 years have subscribed to Lenin's point of view that "It is naivete to take a treaty with a bourgeoisie government seriously." (Dr. Kim et al., Istoryia, SSSR—Epokha Sotsializma, Moscow, 1958, p. 116.)

But understanding permeates us when we examine deeply the motivations which often guide our statesmen. In a cover story, couched in high-powered language, Time (see Aug. 2, 1963) pictured the "great deeds" of a certain U.S. diplomat. In reading this masterpiece of huckstering, one imagines him a veritable star in the firmaments of statesmanship. But if Mr. Luce, the editor-in-chief, had put to himself the question, "What has democracy gained from that diplomat's activities, this same individual who for long years has been working in the field of creating correct relations between the United States and the Communist empire?" Mr. Luce might receive this answer:

Thanks to the diplomacy of the this diplomat, one-third of humanity is groaning under the dictatorial weight of the Communist parties; and if such stars should continue to contribute to the cause of democracy, we can be certain that the remaining two-thirds of mankind, still free, will in the next decades join their brethren in Communist captivity.

Remarkable indeed are Khrushchev's sayings about such opinions. He points out that "Americans * * * the world gendarmes of imperialism, have lately performed the role of gendarmery in psychological warfare." He sneers, "The gentlemen from Washington imagine that they can shatter our belief in the Communist cause." He cited a well written poem (see elsewhere) concerning this matter. And the party plenum laughed and applauded him at length. "Some rotten ideologists," he continued, "have invented a theory of hybridization; that means the fusion of communism with capitalism by moderation of the first and the modernization of the second." (Apparently he referred to Walter Lippmann's pet theory.)

What are the ways of coexistence with which Khrushchev shall inevitably destroy capitalism? There is no need to enumerate the many devices Communists use for such a purpose. Everybody knows about them. However, lately, he has been using his tools so shrewdly as to fool even the venerable old men in the Vatican. He sends his son-in-law to the Pope to show that he is not the enemy of Christianity. (We advise the clergy who preach that Christianity can exist with communism to read the opinion of the party about it in Izvestia, June 2, 1963.)

By this maneuver, Khrushchev helped the Communists to gain a considerable victory in the recent Italian elections. He proved at the same time that through the policy of coexistence, everything can be achieved.

Let us consider what consequences will follow on the so-called nuclear test ban treaty, lauded as a "turning point in the history of mankind." (This may be correct but the question is: Is this a turning point toward world slavery or freedom?)

1. This treaty leads to the disunity of the Western World, already shaky because of economic conflicts among nations of the European Common Market and others.

2. France's refusal to accept this treaty creates a situation whereby the United States and England and their ally Soviet Union now must consider France as some sort of enemy of humanity.

3. With some reason, West Germans are suspicious of the sincerity of our Government. The fact that East Germany has signed this treaty means that the United States has acknowledge her de facto. This is contrary to the interests of Bonn.

4. Our friendship with the Soviets will strangulate the struggle of the Russian intelligentsia against the Party dictatorship, a struggle inspired by Western psychological warfare against Communist ideology. (Intellectuals who raise their voices against the Party are called in Communist jargon "kulak supporters of American capitalism.") This movement is one of the mightiest forces Khrushchev fears. A study of the text of his speech, as it appeared in the March 14, 1963, issue of Pravda shows, that Khrushchev approached the problem of the Soviet intellectual strata with a gingerly nervousness of precedental proportions. His vexation with the Russian intelligentsia can be compared with Tsar Alexander III who was considered as "a triumphant pig threatening to eat the moon." So too Khrushchev.

5. With this treaty we simply augmented Khrushchev's prestige in the Communist camp as well in the world arena. (Reason prompts us to support neither Khrushchev nor Mao Tse-tung, to let them gorge on each other. Such a scene would heap increasing discredit on the Marxist ideology.)

6. The hypocritical friendship of the two forces will tend to slacken the watchfulness of our industrialists. They will increase their trade with Soviets and with it increase its potentials, thus accelerating Moscow's economic offensive. It can be foreseen that in a few years the world trade in oil will be the first victim; the steel industry will follow, and so on.

7. Whereas we will carry out honestly our end of the treaty, there is no guarantee that Khrushchev will do the same. It is misleading to feel that we can control Russia's actions. If our intelligence service is so poorly organized that the Government has little correct information as to what is going on in Cuba, what then of our intelligence of Russia? Her spaciousness alone (United States of America, 3 million square miles: U.S.S.R., 8.6 million square miles) allows her to conduct every kind of secret operation, particularly in the North Siberian and in the Arctic Ocean regions.

In addition to these and other circumstances that will follow from this treaty, it must be strongly emphasized that we gave a considerable boost to the cause of International Communist movement from our actions in this regard. That the negotiation and the treaty was signed in the capital of Soviet Union led the wide masses of people all over the world to believe as Izvestia (see July 29, 1963) said, that the Communist Party proved that it strives for peace, that it is on guard for the welfare of mankind, and that Soviet Union has become so strong as to force the "American imperialists to give up their savage longing for war."

The Kremlin, the site of the early tyrant-tsars who tormented the unhappy moujik, and in our days of "enlightened" civilization, of the Communist tyrants who have murdered about 12 million persons: the Kremlin, the most terrible place on earth, now is shining brighter than the sun, now a more important shrine than Jerusalem and Mecca.

Khrushchev can be proud that he has realized his nation's "historical mission" that Russia has the duty of "saving civilization from the decadent West."

For years the international Communist movement has been cultivating in the peoples' minds the idea that Washington is the den of capitalist obscurity. They have achieved their aim. By heightening the importance of the Kremlin, we have downgraded our Washington.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the historical and unchallenged logic of this article, I hope that the true sentiments of the American public will be considered by the State Department planners, and that a policy of ultimate victory in the cold war rather than surrender through coexistence will be adopted. I urge the Members of Congress, representing as they do all citizens of our great land, to use our collective influence to halt the dangerous and self-defeating foreign policy course now being charted.

COVER-UP ON OSWALD?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am more than ever convinced that any investigation of the assassination of John F. Kennedy must center upon the State Department's role in bringing defector Lee Harvey Oswald back to the United States. I have introduced House Joint Resolution 812 for this purpose.

Why was Oswald in Minsk? Was it because there is a Soviet espionage school there? How did his wife, apparently the daughter of a Red army intelligence colonel, happen to be in Minsk? What has the girl in the Embassy in Moscow who interrogated Oswald for hours, really have to say about this?

In introducing this report of suppression of news from the Washington Post of Sunday, December 1, I must warn about our being diverted by false issues and attempts to cover up the facts. The public does not want a whitewash or a phony witch hunt. The Washington Post article follows:

DIPLOMAT IS SILENCED ON OSWALD

TOKYO, November 30.—The American consul who handled the case of Lee Oswald when the accused Presidential assassin tried to renounce his U.S. citizenship in Moscow in 1959, says he has been ordered by the State Department not to discuss the case.

Richard Snyder, now First Secretary in the U.S. Embassy here, said the order was based on the fact that Oswald's case was now under judicial investigation and, therefore, it would not be appropriate to say anything.

Snyder did indicate, however, that Oswald never formally renounced his U.S. citizenship.

Oswald is reported to have complained to American correspondents in the fall of 1959 in Moscow, where he was living at the time, that Snyder had tried to talk him out of renouncing his American citizenship.

COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT

Mr. MORSE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when one single telephone call can cancel a sole source procurement and convert it into a procurement where American industry is given a chance to work the cost-reducing magic of competitive purchasing, all is not peaches and cream with the military purchasing agents of our country.

Yet, this is exactly what has happened in the case I shall detail for you today. The Army said it had to buy 141 pulse transformers from only one bidder because it had no plans, specifications, or drawings.

After a simple telephone call from me, the Army found drawings in the Navy, secured them, and now plans to buy the item competitively. What kind of testimony is this to the efficiency of our military procurement people?

I think it actually demonstrates how superficial is the work being done in procurement sections. It shows just how inadequate and inefficient is the coordination of our military services.

Mr. Speaker, how many hundreds of cases such as this are there that I, with my small staff and limited time, am unable to uncover? How much money is being wasted each day on just such purchases with such flimsy justifications?

This latest case came to my attention on July 30, 1963, when I saw a bid document for these pulse transformers among the 50-odd documents received from the Small Business Administration that day.

The document explained that the Army proposed to buy, from one source with no competition, 14 of these pulse transformers. Its reason was "no drawings available."

This aroused my interest and I telephoned Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, then head of the Army's Electronics Materiel Agency, in Philadelphia, Pa. I said to him that he might find drawings had been purchased several times and should exist. This was based on informal information available to me from industry.

General Stanwix-Hay said he would look into the matter. On August 7, 1963, he reported that the transformer had been bought on at least three previous occasions without competitive bidding.

He also wrote me:

As a result of your inquiry, the Navy was queried as to the availability of drawings. An affirmative response was achieved, and drawings are being obtained to determine their adequacy for competitive procurement.

Later, on October 25, 1963, I received another report, this time from Brig. Gen. Wesley Franklin, the new commander at Philadelphia. He informed me that Navy drawings had been secured August 22 and that subsequent events proved adequate technical data does exist and has been secured from Navy by Army.

General Franklin concluded his report to me thus:

> It was determined that a sole source procurement was not appropriate. Consequently, the RFP (request for proposal) was cancelled and these requirements are planned to be procured on a competitive solicitation.

When that competitive procurement takes place, Mr. Speaker, it is my prediction the price will fall by at least 50 percent or more and the taxpayers will have won another victory.

The outcome of this case is simply more evidence that the right hand of military procurement does not know what the left hand is doing. This is just one small transaction. There are hundreds, maybe thousands more just like it.

These reports prove conclusively that only superficial attention was given this matter by the Army. But for quick action, the taxpayer would have been the loser. This is typical of the way in which some procurement people take the line of least resistance and the easy way out, in order to make their jobs easier. They may have succeeded in the past, but now they are being exposed; and, as a result, more and more competitive procurements are being conducted by the military.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the kind of work my study has turned up over a continuing period. This is why I continue to fight for competitive procurement, for full disclosure of information and for more efficiency in the expenditure of the tax dollar.

Is it any wonder, in the light of what has been exposed, that the Defense Department tried to shut off my source of information—the bid sets that I pick up every day at SBA?

Mr. Speaker, what is needed in military purchasing at all levels is harder and more efficient work. Every avenue must be exhausted before competitive bidding is ruled out.

We are winning battle after battle, but progress is still too slow. Although the military is slowly admitting its mistakes and correcting them, a complete revamping is needed from top to bottom to really get the job done.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SHEVCHENKO A MONUMENT TO WORLD FREEDOM

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the late President Kennedy was a man of varied literary and scholarly interests, as well as a leader in the cause of world freedom. When he saw the power of the word giving eloquent and immortal expression to the coviction of world freedom, he perceived an everlasting greatness which he himself was quick to honor. This he did in the case of the Ukrainian poet laureate and national hero, Taras Shevchenko, when in 1961 he joined with others to say:

> We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage.

EUROPE'S FREEDOM FIGHTER TARAS SHEVCHENKO 1814–61

When Shevchenko's monument to world freedom will be unveiled in our Capital next May, it will also be a monumental tribute to all Americans who, like the late President, have with knowledge and perception understood the universal symbol of Shevchenko for world freedom. Indeed, the statue will honor the understanding and vision of our late President.

It was my privilege to join with other Members in the 86th Congress in support of the legislation authorizing the erection of a statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko. For those in our country who still were unfamiliar with East European history, we in that Congress made possible the publication of a documentary biography of Shevchenko. The House of Representatives Document No. 445, titled "Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko 1814–61," sets forth both the paramount reasons for the statue and the highlights of Shevchenko's universal significance as reflected in his works and life. The foreword of the booklet, written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, explains these reasons clearly and forthrightly, and I append this foreword to my remarks at this point:

FOREWORD

There is a rapidly growing interest on the part of Americans in the affairs and history of Eastern Europe. The conditions and challenges of our times demand and intensify this necessary interest. Needless to say, it is in our own national interest to cultivate and broaden this intellectual concern so that the products of our knowledge and understanding may be wisely and pragmatically applied toward our survival as an independent and free nation.

As this thriving interest expands and deepens, new names and new places will emerge within the compass of our knowledge. Those who fought for freedom and those who perpetuated tyranny and despotism will be ordered accordingly in our minds. In this inevitable process the name of Shevchenko and the place of Ukraine sooner or later will be understood and appreciated by Americans generally. This is particularly true because the two are inseparably bound with man's persistent struggle for expanded freedom, the struggle which is crucial for us.

One of the chief reasons for this documentary biography of one of the most outstanding freedom fighters in Eastern Europe, within the tyranny-ridden Russian Empire itself, is, of course, to facilitate and abet this mounting American interest in the invincible forces at work in the imperial successor to that Empire, the present Soviet Union. Another reason is the fact that 1961 marks the Shevchenko Centennial, the hundredth anniversary of the death of this immortal East European freedom fighter. Free and honest men will celebrate the year in informed memory of the enduring works of Shevchenko in the service of freedom: Totalitarians in Moscow's present farflung empire will distort these works in a futile endeavor to claim this historic figure as one of theirs.

Concretely, why should every thinking American know the significance of this centennial, the historic meaning of Shevchenko, and the fundamental importance of his Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.? Clearly, there are six basic reasons justifying the necessity of such knowledge:

1. For quite a number of years now, we have been told—and rightly so—that we should understand other peoples and other nations in our own interest as well as in the interest of truth itself. In response to this sound urging, this brochure is an open invitation to learning about another nation and its personification. The prime motivation behind it has no relation to any sentimental attachment to a figure that existed a hundred years ago; rather, it is a live and intelligent recognition of his perennial spirit in the present and for the future. This is not just a literary memorial of things accomplished in the past but, more so, an important means to utilize in our day the work and the symbolic value of an immortal so that victory over the dark forces of Russia's imperialist totalitarianism may be assured. The man is buried on the bank of the Dnieper near the town of Kaniv, but as the English author, W. R. Morfill, puts it, "The tomb of the poet is the object of special reverence among his countrymen, the Mecca of the Ukrainian patriots."

2. The observance of the Shevchenko Centennial by free men everywhere goes beyond the person of this champion of liberty. Shevchenko has a symbolic and inspirational value not for just a few people but actually for over 40 million and countless more. As concerns his native Ukraine alone, we are dealing in essence with a nation of over 40 million, which happens to be the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain and the second largest nation within th U.S.S.R. itself. Subtract this captive non-Russian nation from the U.S.S.R. and Moscow's economic, military, political and cultural claims, largely built upon imperial piracy, become heavily deflated.

One need only delve into the record of the anti-Communist and anti-imperialist Russian resistance on the part of the Ukrainian nation from 1918 to present date in order to grasp the full meaning of Shevchenko. This record is readily accessible even in the archives of our own Government, the reports of the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression and also of the House Un-American Activities Committee and others. Indeed, our memorials bear a much broader significance. They impinge with striking effect upon the hearts, the minds, and souls of millions of people. Thus, in the incessant cold war it is vitally important for us, in favor of our own American interests, to symbolize in every respect our friendship and spiritual affinity with the large Ukrainian nation. As early as 1877, Charles Dickens well perceived the power of Shevchenko and his writings when he observed that Ukrainians "worship the memory of Shevchenko."

3. A further observation which deserves equal emphasis is the fact that Shevchenko is not only a national figure of a given people but is also a luminous personality in the whole course of contemporary East European history. Beyond peradventure of doubt, his role forms a prominent chapter in the fight of humanity for freedom. His works dwell not only on the oppression of the Ukrainian people but also on the enslavement of every other nation raped by the Russian masters, which means the Poles, Lithuanians, Georgians, and many other non-Russian peoples. He strongly protested the denial of civil rights to the Jews in the Russian Empire of the white czars, and fought persistently and courageously for the freedom of nations and the liberties of individuals. As the contents of this brochure disclose, his solid stature in world literature is also a point of fact not to be overlooked. A contemporary of Abraham Lincoln, he, too, dedicated his life to the emancipation of nations and men from the bondage of Russian imperialism and totalitarian tyranny.

4. Our great tradition and all that it uniquely entails has rubbed off on many nations and innumerable people throughout the world. Shevchenko is a crystal-clear example of this irresistible process. His works make explicit reference to Washington, and the ideals, progress, and just laws of our Nation, founded ultimately upon the moral and political principles enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, constitute a powerful source of inspiration and hope to Shevchenko and his Ukraine.

5. There can be no doubt that despite the genius of freedom thought found in Shevchenko's writings, Moscow will, through its formidable propaganda organs, pollute and distort his contributions to humanity in the course of the centennial. The Russian totalitarians have had to reckon with the immense popularity of the bard among the Ukrainians and other peoples. Their attempts to degrade him as a "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist" have seriously backfired. Spuriously, they characterize him as a "revolutionary democrat" who fought against Russian tsarism but not against Russian imperialism and colonialism in behalf of the independence of Ukraine and other subjugated non-Russian nations in the former white empire. In brief, reading Shevchenko will convince any objective person that he belongs to us, not to tyrannical Moscow, past or present.

6. Finally, it will be recalled that in July 1959, Congress passed an extremely significant measure, namely the Captive Nations Week Resolution. For the first time our Government recognized the essential fact that there are even more numerous captive nations within the U.S.S.R. than exist in so-called satellite Europe. Shevchenko's Ukraine is one of them, the largest in all of captive Europe. It is evident that this document is genuinely in the spirit and intent of that resolution, which is now Public Law 86-90.

There is a good deal of foolishness in our thinking about the Soviet Union. Our lingering misconceptions and myths about this uneasy empire structure only contribute to the success of Moscow's worldwide propaganda of deceit and lies. We consistently give vent to the impression that the Soviet Union is a gigantic monolith, flexing its military, economic, and political muscles. The overriding fact is that it is the very opposite of a monolith or a "nation." Actually the existence of the majority captive non-Russian nations within the so-called state of the U.S.S.R. shows it to be an unsteady empire and a prison house of nations, capable of crumbling under a real test of comparative strength. For us, their existence is as great—if not more so—a deterrent against the outbreak of a hot global war as the strength of our composite military posture.

The U.S. celebration of the Shevchenko Centennial will demonstrate to Moscow that we are perfectly aware of and sympathize profoundly with the freedom aspirations of the Ukrainian people and other captive nations in the present Red Russian Empire. It will also show that we proudly take Shevchenko as our own and view with repugnance Moscow's brazen exploitation of his name and his works. For truly he was in the vanguard of national and individual freedom in Eastern Europe, the striking antithesis of traditional Russian totalitarianism. Our memorial to him plainly symbolizes the spirit of Washington which Shevchenko called and died for in all of captive Europe and Asia. This unforgettable figure lived 100 years ago, but by his words, soul, and thought he is with us today in the fight for world freedom and the liberation of the numerous subjugated nations under the yoke of imperialist and colonial Moscow.

In this noble spirit, the essays in this document furnish many rich insights into the nature of the hero and the challenges of his times which substantially were no different from those facing us today. Words are inadequate to express fully our popular gratitude for the efforts and clear foresight of the Honorables Paul C. Jones, of Missouri; John Lesinski, of Michigan; Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan; John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts; Jacob K. Javits and Kenneth B. Keating, of New York; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, and many others who advanced the idea of appropriately observing the Shevchenko Centennial. Their unstinting aid and the superb assistance offered by the members and staff of the Senate Rules Committee, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, and Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, will long be remembered. This biographical document would not have been possible without the special efforts of the prominent and distinguished Representative of Michigan, the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI. The magnificent cooperation of the membership and staff of the House Administration Committee in the preparation of this document draws our everlasting thanks.

Moreover, the solid contributions provided by the several testimonies on Shevchenko in March 1960 have laid a firm groundwork of understanding for the centennial. The testimonies are available for reading purposes in the offices of the House Administration Committee. They were prepared and submitted by Representative Bentley, Senator Javits, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki, president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Mr. Dmytro Halychyn, president of the Ukrainian National Association, Mr. George Wolynetz, Jr., national commander of the Ukrainian American Veterans, and Mr. Mykola Lebed, president of the Prolog Research and Publishing Association.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

INEXCUSABLE IGNORANCE

Mr. Speaker, in light of all that has been written and said about Shevchenko, it is inexcusable for anyone who has an interest in this highly important project to display ignorance of his stature as a universal poet, as an early freedom fighter in the Russian Empire, a firm adversary of all forms of oppression and, above all, a living spirit of freedom and independence for the captive non-Russian nations in and outside the Soviet Union. Recently, contradictory editorials in the Washington Post have unfortunately put on such a display, and a member of the National Capital Planning Commission has overstepped himself in his attempt to use these false editorial opinions for a reconsideration of the Shevchenko site.

The reaction to the smear campaign has been swift and heavy. A voluminous amount of letters sent to the Post have not been published. However, I should like to join my colleagues in offering two examples of this reaction. One is a pungent letter written and sent by Rev. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, to Mrs. James H. Rowe, Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission. The other is a letter published in the November 19, 1963, issue of the Evening Star, which praises that paper's writer, Robert J. Lewis, for his fair and excellent article "The Status of a Statue," November 10. I include both as part of my remarks:

NOVEMBER 18, 1963.

DEAR MRS. ROWE: One of our Washington newspapers gave space recently to some belated protests against the erection of the Shevchenko statue.

This sort of thing, as you well know, is nothing new. There is scarcely a monument now gracing this memorial city but what, before its accomplishment, was the target of some critic.

Certainly no person who has the historic background of knowledge to realize the notable significance for the free world of the Shevchenko statue will have any doubt as to the appropriateness of this likeness of a freedom lover and a tyrant hater to be raised in this land of the free. It is no wonder the project has thrilled millions of patriotic hearts in America.

It is as ridiculous for the Kremlin masters of deceit to claim Shevchenko as one of them as it would be to profane history by saying that Washington was an ally of Benedict Arnold in his perfidy, or for it to be represented 100 years from now that the gangster, Valachi, was really a member of an organization to enforce the Ten Commandments. For the Moscow conspiracy against decency to reach back and unblushingly tell the world that if Shevchenko lived and wrote today he would be the mouthpiece of the butchers of Budapest, and of the horrors poured out on Shevchenko's own country, the Ukraine, is to insult the intelligence of both the free world and those fettered behind the Iron Curtain.

The Ukraine is enslaved now even more than it was under the czarist autocracy. It was the ruthless Soviet revolutionaries who stopped the ringing of jubilant bells in the Ukraine as they were pealing out the emancipation for which Shevchenko fought and wrote. For Khrushchev, whose hands drip with Ukrainian blood, to claim any kinship with this noble patriot is enough to make angels weep at such blatant hypocrisy. Nothing arouses this dictator more than the resolve of America to keep before the conscience of the world the Red regime's crimes of genocide, deportation, and liquidation. Shevchenko's voice cries out against the present Russian colonialism. They can't explain his calling those who degrade their fellows "a cursed crew" and asking "when shall we get another Washington?"

This monument will be reared in the one nation which stands with its massive might against world domination of the slave system—it will be a rainbow of hope to all the captive peoples now yearning to breathe free. No more effective blow against the mobilized forces of evil vowing to bury us can possibly be made than the erection of this statue.

I am enclosing my article of some time ago, "Wanted—Another Washington," from the Washington Star.

I feel sure the membership of the National Capital Planning Commission is so high grade that any falsely based criticism will not affect the decision it has already wisely made regarding the Shevchenko statue.

With every good wish, I am,

Yours cordially,

FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS.

[From the Evening Star, Nov. 19, 1963]

STATUS OF A STATUE

How refreshing to have read Robert J. Lewis' very fine article, "The Status of a Statue." In it, Mr. Lewis ably demonstrated his insight of the symbolism of the Shevchenko movement and its impact on Americans, if we wish to continue to sustain our image as a beacon of hope to all freedom-seeking and freedom-loving people, and the consequences if we do not.

The present smear campaign and brazenness in disputing the integrity and decisions of two Presidents, Congress, and Government officials, the extraordinary intolerance recently demonstrated by a few bigots, certainly displays an absolutely antonymous concept of the justice for which we stand.

Most assuredly, the statue of Taras Shevchenko would give Washington, in the words of Mr. Lewis, "cause to rejoice that human brotherhood and understanding once again have affirmed the cause of freedom." The decision is ours; the decision is American.

VERA A. DOWHAN.

A GIFT TO KHRUSHCHEV?

Mr. Speaker, unless some in our midst are intent upon giving Khrushchev a valuable gift by dishonoring Shevchenko and all his works in behalf of freedom, the forthcoming statue will not only honor the man but also stand as concrete evidence of our American resolve to work with all captive nations for the common cause of world freedom. The statue will be an enduring symbol of universal brotherhood toward freedom for all. For the enlightenment of those who would offer Khrushchev the valuable cold war gift, I submit at the conclusion of my remarks a very illuminating article titled "Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet of Freedom," which was written by Pauline Bentley and published in the UNESCO Courier, July-August 1961—one among countless informative articles on the poet of world freedom:

TARAS SHEVCHENKO: UKRAINE'S POET OF FREEDOM

(By Pauline Bentley)

A 100 years ago a poet who was one of the world's great champions of freedom died in St. Petersburg. This year, his centenary is being celebrated not only in his own land, Ukraine, but throughout the Soviet Union, and in many great cities of the world including the American Capital, Washington, where a statue is to be raised in his commemoration. This man's name is Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet and patriot who not only established his country's literature high among world letters, but who actually lived his poetry. A torchbearer of liberty, his whole life mirrored the sufferings of his oppressed country and the unconquerable, indomitable will of its people to freedom.

The vast territory of Ukraine with its population of 40 million stretches from Poland and Czechoslovakia to the Black and Azov Seas, and is the second largest nation within the U.S.S.R. Of it Voltaire wrote "L'Ukraine a toujours aspiré à être libre," for its history is one of endless invasion and national effort to throw off oppression. Its literature goes back to the 10th century but at that time it mostly made use of an artificial language based on the ceremonial Church Slavonic; only in 1789 (the year of the French Revolution) did the Ukrainian writer Kotlyarevsky introduce the spoken language in literature and so lay a foundation for Shevchenko to elaborate on.

Taras Shevchenko was born in a village near the banks of the Dnieper in 1814; he was born a serf, a scrap of humanity without rights or privileges, belonging entirely to the local landlords. It is perhaps difficult to imagine what harsh misery the enslaved poverty of serfdom meant to the Ukrainian peasant at this time, but the waves of change which had brought American independence and the French Revolution, which had washed away the old autocratic orders in Europe and North America, had rippled to stagnation before reaching the East.

In 1814 Ukraine was still a feudal land under czarist tyranny. The fertile beauty of the countryside of Taras' childhood stood in cruel contrast to the living conditions of his people but both these aspects of the life around him affected him deeply; from one he learned a passionate patriotism, a love of his country which was to remain undimmed by exile or absence, and from the other he learned a hatred of tyranny, of oppression and injustice which inspires his poetry with the divine fire of liberty.

"O dear and quiet land
O my Ukraine
Why do they plunder thee?
Why has death come to hut and lea?

"Break your chains and live as brothers.
In a foreign country
Do not seek and do not search for
What is nonexistent.

"In your home, you'll find your justice
And your strength and freedom.
The world has only one Ukraine
Dniepro cannot be found elsewhere."

As a boy Taras showed early a vivid imagination and a passion for drawing. When he was left an orphan at the age of 12, he sought a teacher and from a brutal drunken clerk did learn to read and write though this man's harshness finally drove him elsewhere. He quickly exhausted the meager local sources of learning open to him and after a disconsolate spell of village cattle-minding, he was summoned to work as scullion in the manorial kitchens. From there he attended the young master, Pavel Vasilyevitch Engelhardt, who took him as part of his retinue on his travels.

A new world opened up before Taras; he wonderingly absorbed all he could of this unaccustomed grandeur, and secretly studied the art treasures housed round him. One night in the Engelhardt establishment at Wilno, the master returned late to find Taras absorbed in copying a print by candlelight. He had the boy flogged next day for his temerity but was so impressed by the quality of the copy that he decided to allow Taras to study with the Wilno painter, Rustem, and later, on moving to St. Petersburg, apprenticed Taras to the painter Shirayev, a harsh and cruel master who turned his pupils into drudges.

Taras had little leisure, but in the white nights of the early summer he would go to the Summer Gardens of St. Petersburg to sketch the ancient statues there for his own pleasure. It is on such an occasion that he is said to have met a fellow Ukrainian, Ivan Soshenko, who was studying at the Imperial Academy of Arts.

Soshenko introduced Taras to his friends, to the Imperial Academy circle and the famous painter Bryulov, who at once decided that Taras must study at the academy too. As a serf, Taras was ineligible to do this. Engelhardt proved unwilling to part with his talented protege and finally only agreed to sell him his freedom for the almost prohibitive price of 2,500 silver rubles.

To raise this sum, Taras' new friends rallied round; Bryulov interested the celebrated poet Zhukhovsky who commissioned a Bryulov portrait of himself and had it auctioned by private lottery. On April 22, 1838 (a year after the death of Pushkin) Engelhardt received his 2,500 rubles; Taras Shevchenko became a free man for the first time in his life.

From the grime of Shirayev's garret he was transported to the enchanted halls of the academy where his work won him acclaim and whence he graduated honorably in 1845. He made many friends in the open-hearted Bryulov circle, including the actor Shchepkin, and he began thirstily to fill the gaps in his education, absorbing all he could of literature and the arts, but underneath all his sophisticated activities he could not forget Ukraine, the sufferings of his people or the family he had left there unable to share his freedom.

There arose in him a new passion, to express all his homesickness and love for his country in Ukrainian verse. Years later he wrote of this period spent in Bryulov's studio in these words. "And what did I do in that holy of holies? It is strange to think of it. I occupied myself with writing Ukrainian verses * * *. I cherished in my heart my blind Kobzar and my bloodthirsty Haydamaky as in the shadows of the wild steppes I saw pass before me the shades of our good hetmen.

"Before me stretched the steppe, studded with burial mounds. Before me lay my fair, my unhappy Ukraine in all its chaste loveliness. And I mused, lost in thought; I could not tear my inner eye from that enchanting beauty. It was a vocation, that was all."

It was a vocation. In 1840 an enthusiastic Ukrainian merchant found Shevchenko's verses while sitting for his portrait in the artist's studio and immediately published them at his own expense. Shevchenko called the little book "Kobzar," after the name of the old Ukrainian wandering folk-bards. Keeping to the traditional folksong form and within the romantic current of the day, he idealizes the stern and bitter conflicts which the Kozaks of old had waged for independence, glorifying the Kobzars who alone had kept alive the memory of Ukraine's heroic age.

"Kobzar" marks an epoch and the beginning of a new Ukrainian literature; it throws a bridge between its ancient treasures, the later work of Kotlyarevsky, and modern literature. For the first time a major poet emerges to pour out his heart in his native tongue and express the sufferings of his people and their past. And because he lived so deeply in their thoughts and feelings, they accepted his poems as their own songs and composed music to them: Today his works are in almost every Ukrainian home and are sung throughout Russia.

But his poetry is more than just folksong; it has the magic simplicity and melody of pure verse. "Owls are calling/ sleeps the forest/ stars are shining brightly * * *." "Like the sea the field whitened/ by the driving snowflakes. * * *" Countless country images reflect the poet's mastery of his art. Together with this evocative lyricism, his poems are permeated with his innate humanism.

No one knew better than he the harshness of the peasant way of life. In the theme for instance of the village girl transgressing the moral code, he poignantly and repeatedly makes a plea for compassion and tolerance. In his long epic poem "The Haydamaky," which came out in 1841 and recalled the 1768 revolt of the Ukrainians against their Polish overlords, he writes "Why should people destroy each other? * * * Only see, they are the same kind of people, they could live, they could be friends."

In 1843 he gave way to his intolerable longing and returned home to Ukraine; he

was welcomed everywhere as a national poet, portrait commissions flowed in, all doors were open before him, but the terrible sufferings he saw among the peasants on his travels throughout the country brought about a sharp change in his work. His idealization of the Kozak epoch gave place to stinging castigation of the enslavement, despotism and tyranny he saw everywhere exercised on behalf of the Czar Nicholas I. He became openly rebellious to every institution, whether religious or civil, which seemed to tolerate such terror, cruelty and injustice as were suffered by the Ukrainian serf. He began a series of poems which from a literary standpoint are considered his most perfect. Politically they were dynamite; they could not possibly be published in the Russia of that time and their circulation even in a private album which Shevchenko called "Three Years" figured greatly in his arrest in 1847.

Among these poems, "The Great Grave" recounts in mystical terms the immortal freedom-loving spirit; "The Dream," written in a form of fantastic satire, contains an acid attack upon the Imperial family in which the poet ridicules the Court and likens the Empress to a dried mushroom; the whole poem is one of his bitterest attacks against tyranny.

"The people's loud cries and their laughs are not heard—
They strip the patched clothing from off of the beggars
They strip with the hides—for the poor must find shoes
For youthful young princes. They pummel the widow
To pay her poll taxes; they fetter her son
Her son, her one son, the only child that she has;
Her hope—and they send him away to the army
But for a while—yet in filth and in mud
The boy is soon bloated—from hunger he dies,
His mother is reaping the wheat at forced labour."

In another poem, "The Caucasus," Shevchenko celebrates the struggle of the mountain people for their freedom. He sent this poem to Paris to the Polish revolutionary and poet, Adam Mickiewicz, a follower of Mazzini, and it shows his widening interest in the cause of freedom not only in Ukraine but everywhere.

"And our human spirit dies not
And our freedom dies not.
It is for us to keep on weeping
With bloody sweat and bitter tear.
And mix each day with our daily bread
Truth will rise and so will freedom.
And meanwhile the streams are flowing
Streams of blood are flowing."

At about this time appears the poem "The Feeble Minded" (Jurodyvyj) in which Shevchenko, a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln, wrote:

"When shall we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law
And receive we will some day."

In Kiev during this period he found sympathetic friends among a group of young Pan-Slavic revolutionaries called the Society of Saints Cyril and Methodius; their revolutionary ideals for peasant enlightenment and emancipation encouraged him to write "The Heretic," a poem honoring the Czech reformer Jan Huss and glorifying him not so much as a great scholar but as a representative of the common people.

"Seer you caught the glimpse of freedom,
Freedom and of truth,
And the Slav wide-scattered family,
Sunk in dark and slavery,
You collected all together."

The existence of this society was betrayed to the authorities in February 1847 and they acted swiftly and savagely suppressed it. By April Shevchenko and his friends were arrested and sent to St. Petersburg. In prison there the poet produced a number of verses in which he expressed his concern for the future of his country and the fate of his people. His main indictments were the "outrageous and to the highest degree insolent" poems and the "Three Years" album confiscated at his arrest.

On May 30 he was sentenced to serve as an ordinary soldier in the bare Orenburg steppe, "a broad, unlocked prison." On his sentence file papers Tsar Nicholas I wrote in his own hand, "under the strictest supervision with a prohibtion of writing and sketching."

Shevchenko had been free for only 9 years; now he was back in a bondage more terrible than before, torn away from Ukraine and condemned to live among rough and brutalizing soldiery in the remotest area of eastern Russia. At first sympathetic officers allowed him clandestinely to draw and write,

"Am I to live in this sad plight,
Still many years, forever wasting.
But I am looking, while my heart's flying,
To a dark garden in Ukraine."

When the St. Petersburg authorities got to know of this, the Czar's instructions were carried out to the letter. Shevchenko was sent to a still wilder place, the fortress of Novopetrovsk on the Caspian Sea. Of this place he wrote, "Sand and stones; if only there were one blade of grass, only a tree, but nothing." The endless drill, the absolute deprivation of any creative work or interests wore him away. "There is nothing more bitter than to recall freedom in captivity," he wrote at this time, but even though his health was affected, his spirit remained unbroken and he was able to note in his diary, "all this unspeakable grief, every kind of degradation and harshness passed as if without touching me. * * * Not a single aspect of the inner me was changed."

He was to languish nearly 7 years in Novopetrovsk since, even after the death of Nicholas I. Imperial feelings were still tender from the "dried mushroom" episode. The new Czar Alexander did not include Shevchenko in his general amnesty, and not until 2 years more had passed did friends finally secure his release, when he returned to St. Petersburg to enjoy great moral and political prestige.

One of his first compositions after being freed was "The Neophytes," a daring comparison of the czar with Nero, for Shevchenko had returned from exile with his hatred of czarism equaled only by his hatred of slavery—for him these two evils were related and he never counted the cost in fighting them.

No other European literature has a comparable protest against serfdom and there is no other poet of genius sprung from the serfs who has shown up the ugliness of serfdom with such powerful effect as Shevchenko. He contributed much to the abolition of serfdom by influencing liberal public opinion which played a large part in inducing Alexander to initiate liberal reforms.

He interested himself in etching at the academy, becoming an academician in 1860, and achieving work which caused other artists to call him the "Russian Rembrandt." A Negro actor, Aldridge, came to the city and played Othello there: Shevchenko had always been deeply influenced by Shakespeare; he was much moved by Aldridge's performance and the two men became friends. And he continued to write, raising the flaming banner of his verse in the same causes of justice and liberty as before. Although he risked immediate retaliation, he did not hesitate to sign a statement defending the civil rights of the Jews which where in question, and he consorted openly with the leading radicals of the day including Chernyshevsky who spoke up for a new edition of "Kobzar," which was allowed to be published in 1860 provided none of the post exile poems were included in it.

But despite his valiant spirit, Shevchenko returned broken in body and weary from his exile. Personal unhappiness and loneliness weighed heavily upon him and his last poems, including "Mary" in which he deliberately changes the sacred story to that of an ordinary peasant woman, have more austere, often Biblical, sources: They carry a message emphasizing mankind's need for truth and love and brotherhood.

Against the day of peasant emancipation he wrote a primer for use in schools, but his very last poem is a swansong and a testament of faith that he will in another world—"on Phlegethon, or on the Styx in heaven, or on Dniepro, that mighty river * * *" find a happiness which this life denied him and which, toward the end, he most pathetically sought.

He died on March 10, 1861, and was buried as he had asked:

"In a lofty tomb
Out upon the steppes unbounded
In my own dear Ukraine;
So that I can see before me
The wide stretching meadows
And Dniepro, its banks so lofty,
And can hear it roaring."

His grave lies near the small town of Kanev where in 1939 a memorial was raised to him which has been called "an object of special reverence among his countrymen, the Mecca of all Ukrainian patriots." So it is, but this poet of Ukraine, who took his language as it had been developed, and by the power of his genius ensconced it in modern literature, this apostle of liberty, enemy of all oppression, Taras Shevchenko, goes beyond the narrow limits of one country. He is a poet of humanity; his message of brotherhood and love, truth and justice, and above all, of freedom, is worldwide in scope, universal in significance. Other poets have sung his song, other poets are perhaps better known, but none by the pure identification of his life with his inspiration deserves greater homage or recognition.

(NOTE.—Taras Shevchenko's first fame came as a painter, especially for his portraits. But his fame today rests with the poetry in which he captured the heart, soul, and image of his native Ukraine. As early as 1860, translations of his poems appeared in Poland, and only a little later Czech and Bulgarian translations also appeared. In 1870, Georg Obrist translated his poems into German and 6 years later they were published in French. By 1903 his works were translated into English. In the past 50 years, Shevchenko's poems have been translated 400 times into 41 languages, numbering 12 million copies. In the poet's native language, for Ukrainians around the world, his works have been published 245 times in almost 7 million copies.)

SALVATION ARMY SERVES POLICE AND GUARDSMEN AT U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Ernest W. Holz, most able divisional

commander of the Salvation Army's National Capital Division, rendered a very fine service at the U.S. Capitol on the night of November 24–25, which I wish to bring to the attention of the House today. The need for immediate action was imperative. It is noteworthy that Bridgadier Holz, as usual, worked tirelessly and unceasingly when his services were needed for mankind. Personally, I would like to commend him for the outstanding job he is doing in the Nation's Capital, as divisional commander of the Salvation Army.

Answering a call from the U.S. Capitol Police on Sunday evening, November 24, when it was decided to keep the rotunda open so that hundreds of thousands of citizens lined up might pay respects to their beloved late President, 30 Salvation Army officers, under the direction of Brig. Ernest Holz, divisional commander, provided food and hot coffee throughout the long, cold night to the hundreds of police and guardsmen on duty.

Over 300 gallons of coffee, 325 dozen doughnuts, 1,200 sandwiches, and 20 gallons of hot soup were served to about 4,500 persons.

For most of the police and guardsmen, who had been on duty from 20 to 36 hours, it was the only source of food and refreshment. Many have stated that they could not have made it through without the help of the Salvation Army.

Assisting the local Salvation Army division were three completely equipped mobile canteens from the Salvation Army headquarters in Philadelphia, Pa., who responded to the request of Brigadier Holz and immediately dispatched the units, which arrived at the Capitol shortly after midnight.

Salvation Army personnel remained on duty until Monday morning when the President's casket was removed for the funeral journey to the cathedral.

NOVEMBER 27, 1963.

Brig. ERNEST W. HOLZ,
Divisional Commander, Salvation Army, National Capital Division, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BRIGADIER HOLZ: The assassination of the late President, John F. Kennedy, and the subsequent plans and arrangements in connection with the funeral caused a number of emergency situations in the Metropolitan Police Department whereby officials and men were called upon to serve for extended continuous periods of time, even as much as 36 hours. Such a situation occurred at the U.S. Capitol on the night of Sunday, November 24, and continued through the morning of the 25th, when members of the force were on duty to handle the large mass of citizens who came to pay their last respects to the deceased lying in state in the Rotunda.

The night was cold; the men had been on duty for more than a full tour and in need of nourishment; due to the nature of the occasion and the day, business establishments were closed; and we were faced with the possibility of losing some of our much needed manpower due to illness because we were unable to provide warm food and drink for the men's consumption. It was at this time that your local unit arrived with hot coffee and doughnuts and from the reports I have received personally from my men it was a most welcome sight. Recognizing that the local unit was not sufficient for the occasion, one of your foresighted and efficient deputies placed a call, I understand, to you for additional equipment. Arriving on the scene at approximately midnight three of your emergency disaster units from Philadelphia commenced dispensing hot soup, sandwiches, coffee and doughnuts, through the early morning hours until their mission was accomplished.

I cannot be too high in my praise of the Salvation Army and its personnel for the outstanding assistance rendered on this occasion. You have made a multitude of friends within this department and among the general public by your considerate and much needed action in this emergency. Please convey my deep appreciation, and that of all officials and men on duty in the vicinity of the Capitol, to each member of your fine organization who devoted his time and energy for that purpose.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT V. MURRAY,
Chief of Police.

P.S.—In a TV interview on WTOP "News Night" program, Tuesday, the 26th, I had publicly expressed my appreciation to the Salvation Army, but when the program was shown that part was deleted.

NATIONAL POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C.

THE SALVATION ARMY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIENDS: The Washington police officers were completely shocked and grieved with sorrow of the sad news of the violent and unexpected death of our great late President, John F. Kennedy. Our routine duties in all types of emergency are clear and our superior officers decisions are swift and we were faced with long and arduous duties in connection with the funeral arrangements. We were mourning, cold, hungry, and tired after or rather during the millions of other mourners' visit to our town to witness this historic and sad occasion.

But almost as a bright light from the darkness appeared the symbol of the Salvation Army, and with them they brought warmth and spirit to the many downhearted policemen and people in the cold air. This indeed was a great act and deed of mercy, as the officers mostly were working on their day off and had not eaten a good hot meal for many hours. Your sacrifices were certainly to the very highest human aspects.

As representative of this great organization of police officers throughout the United States, I thank you in their name. For me personally I would like to say that I have fulfilled my pledge to the United Givers Fund for many years, because I know that services such as yours is needed very much by mankind.

May God bless you and keep you forever.

Yours sincerely,

PAUL V. BROWN,
State Vice President.

LET'S VOTE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lend my support to the discharge petition that will bring the President's civil rights bill before the floor of this House.

I do not attack the committee structure of this honorable House, neither do I wish to criticize any committee chairman or Member of this body. On the contrary, I have continuously defended my colleagues throughout this entire session when unwarranted or misinformed critical comment has been made by the press or by individuals.

However, it will soon be Christmas 1963. For many months now we have waited for a civil rights bill to reach the floor. We are still waiting. The House Judiciary Committee spent 6 months of this year in studying the merits of the Presidential recommendations. That committee did approve a bill and did make a number of changes in the original request.

Surely, the majority of the Members are ready to cast their votes on this subject. I believe the time has come for the House to work its will. Either the civil rights bill is to be passed or it is to be defeated. The choice must be made if possible before the next session begins.

The President of the United States addressed this House on November 27 last. He said in part:

> This is no time for delay. It is a time for action. * * * 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.

I support the call for action so eloquently expressed by the President. I intend to sign the civil rights discharge petition at the first available opportunity. I urge all my colleagues to join me in this attempt to have the House work its will at the very earliest moment. Let us decide this matter in 1963.

THE INDIGO DYE INDUSTRY VANISHES FROM THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, last year in the course of debate on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 I voiced regret that several amendments did not find their way into the final bill. While I supported the trade legislation and voted for the bill in the House, I did so with the expectation that constructive and necessary amendments would be made to the bill in the other body.

I particularly cited the need for qualified industrial advisers to serve as consultants to our negotiators during the bargaining sessions. While the bill specifically provides that opportunity shall be given to interested persons to present their views, all of such activity is expected to take place prior to the time of actual negotiations.

We all know, however, that in a subject as complex as this, it is impossible to anticipate every matter with might arise and that judgments will have to be made on the spot. The question is whether those judgments will be naive or informed.

During last year's discussions I said:

> All of us recognize that there is within the framework of this bill a potential for great damage to domestic industry. Most of us are concerned lest the negotiators for other countries be better qualified and more

knowledgeable than our own. Certainly detailed knowledge of the industry in question, particularly when it is one of great complexity, is essential.

A recent occurrence within my own district only serves to reinforce this conviction. The largest employer in Salem County is the Du Pont Co., with the company's largest plant, the Chambers Works, located at Deepwater, N.J. This plant, one of the earliest organic chemical plants in this country, dates from World War I when European sources of dyes and other compounds were cut off by blockade of transoceanic shipping.

This fall, Du Pont announced that an increase on low-priced foreign imports had forced it out of the indigo dye business. Indigo was not only one of the first, but also the largest volume dye manufactured at Chambers Works. Incidentally, the closing of this facility leaves American textile mills with only one domestic manufacturer of indigo dye.

Commenting on the closing in a New York speech, William M. Roth, deputy special representative for trade negotiations, noted that the company announcement stated that personnel will be absorbed into other plant operations. This, he said, indicated that the chemical industry was strong enough to weather the impact of tariff reductions.

Gentlemen, whether or not the industry can withstand the impact, these jobs are gone and future jobseekers will not be employed at the indigo unit. Moreover, I am told that over half the people at Chambers Works are engaged in the production of dyes and dye intermediates. If many other dyes go the way of indigo, it will obviously be impossible to take up the job slack in other operations at the plant.

The impact of the Trade Expansion Act and the negotiations under it have yet to be felt. Now that the administration has made it clear that essentially all domestic industry is listed for 50 percent tariff reductions, it is almost certain that some industries will cease to exist, with resulting unemployment and attendant problems.

Certainly, before such situations develop, the minimum that should be done is to see that the effect on U.S. industries of tariff reductions by the United States and tariff concessions obtained from foreign countries is fully understood in the light of the realities of the business world.

It is for this reason, lest the indigo shutdown become a harbinger of the dislocations to come, that I again strongly urge the President to appoint and utilize qualified advisers from industry, both before and during negotiations.

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. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, on Monday, December 16.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, December 10.

Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. MORSE), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to 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. BEERMANN to include an article in the remarks he made today in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HOEVEN to include certain tables and extraneous matter in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. LEGGETT (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) to revise and extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD during general debate today in Committee of the Whole and to include therein extraneous matter and certain tables.

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

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. WYMAN.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. DENT in 10 instances.

Mr. GRABOWSKI.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1565. An act 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; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1931. An act to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1698. An act 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; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2279. An act to authorize the transfer of the Piegan Unit of the Blackfeet Irrigation project, Montana, to the landowners within the unit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 134. An act to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards;

H.R. 976. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and add certain lands to the Salem Maritime National Historic Site in Massachusetts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2905. An act to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land;

H.R. 2906. An act to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing;

H.R. 2467. An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; and

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1243. An act to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 5, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1408. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report to the Congress on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period January 1 to June 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1409. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 16th report on operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8507. A bill for the relief of certain medical and dental officers of the Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8937. A bill for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8999. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of certain inhabitants of the United States living in the area inundated by the sudden floods of the Rio Grande

as a result of the construction of the Falcon Dam, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 931. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site and the Johnstown Flood National Memorial in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8970. 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 579. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7457, a bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts; without amendment (Rept. No. 996). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. 1014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier; with amendment (Rept. No. 965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORSE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1384. A bill for the relief of Areti Siozos Paidas; with amendment (Rept. No. 966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1520. A bill for the relief of Jozefa Trzcinska Biskup; with amendment (Rept. No. 967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1521. A bill for the relief of Josip Luzic; with amendment (Rept. No. 968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Valeriano T. Ebreo; with amendment (Rept. No. 969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1211. A bill to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade; without amendment (Rept. No. 971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1129. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Bollers and Earlene Bollers; without amendment (Rept. No. 973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1269. An act for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co. of Phoenix, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1392. A bill for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1403. A bill for the relief of Capital Transit Lines, Inc., of Salem, Oreg.; with amendment (Rept. No. 976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Frank Mramor; without amendment (Rept. No. 977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2818. A bill for the relief of Elmer J. and Richard R. Payne; with amendment (Rept. No. 978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4682. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred T. Winfield; without amendment (Rept. No. 979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5500. A bill for the relief of Lt. John P. Mann; with amendment (Rept. No. 980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5584. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ransom C. Aplin; with amendment (Rept. No. 981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5858. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Local Union No. 746 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5941. A bill for the relief of Julian A. Erskine; without amendment (Rept. No. 983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6092. A bill for the relief of Alexander Haytko; without amendment (Rept. No 984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6320. A bill for the relief of Walter L. Mathews and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6876. A bill for the relief of Capt. Wilfrid E. Gelinas, U.S. Air Force; with amendment (Rept. No. 986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7788. A bill for the relief of Jack B. Fisher; without amendment (Rept. No. 987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8085. A bill for the relief of Roy W. Ficken; with amendment (Rept. No. 988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8323. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8392. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Laborers' Pension Fund of Hudson County, N.J., as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8828. A bill for the relief of John T. Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8849. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Nicholas A. Stathis, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8878. A bill for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans; without amendment (Rept. No. 993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8930. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; with amendment (Rept. No. 994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8931. A bill for the relief of Maj. Victor R. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 995). 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. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 9344. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9345. A bill to provide for a highway bridge across the Missouri River between Bismarck, N. Dak., and Mobridge, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9346. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9347. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 9348. A bill to prohibit certain shipments of firearms in interstate or foreign commerce by a licensed manufacturer or dealer, and to prohibit the transmission of firearms in the U.S. mails; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9349. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 9350. A bill to provide for a highway bridge across the Missouri River between Bismarck, N. Dak., and Mobridge, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 9351. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9352. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide for the performance by the Federal Housing Administration of certain additional functions with respect to housing loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9353. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the late President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 9354. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States, of any Member of the Congress of the United States, and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 9355. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.J. Res. 834. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and

controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 835. 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. JONES of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 836. 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. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 837. Joint resolution authorizing the U.S. Capitol Historical Society to sell its publications in the rotunda of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 838. Joint resolution authorizing the commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 839. 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. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 840. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 841. 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.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 9356. A bill for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 9357. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pompeyo B. Montemayor and Mrs. Angeles P. Montemayor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9358. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose N. Medrano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9359. A bill for the relief of Michele Guzzo, Concepcion Guzzo, Fabia Guzzo, and Miguel Guzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9360. A bill for the relief of Cyriac J. Thengumthiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 9361. A bill for the relief of Kathryn Choi Ast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.J. Res. 842. Joint resolution to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

447. The SPEAKER presented a petition of G. T. Apthorp, city manager, East Cleveland City Commission, East Cleveland, Ohio, to enact civil rights legislation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Hundred-Billion Budget for Fiscal Year 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed beyond words when I read in the Washington Post this morning that President Johnson is expected to send a budget request to Congress for fiscal year 1965 of over $100 billion and that the President plans a deficit for fiscal year 1965 of $8½ billion, and at a time when our Federal debt is crowding $310 billion, or $7,000 for each American family, on an average, or their children or their grandchildren to pay, somehow, some way, some day or else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, and as one who has never played politics with any issue which affects the lives and pocketbooks of all our people, I recently had high hopes for a balanced budget in fiscal year 1965, which begins July 1 next, but irrespective of the newspaper report above mentioned, I shall, along with the economy minded Members of our committee and of Congress, work constantly and I hope effectively for a balanced budget for fiscal year 1965 and for every year thereafter. To be worthy of our place we can, we will, we must do no less, and without partisan politics, fear, or favor.

Mr. Speaker, that is my pledge to the American people, and I am quite certain I speak for all the conservative Members of Congress, as well as a great majority of our already overburdened American taxpayers.

A Resolution To Give the Presidential Commission the Power To Compel Testimony Under Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, because I feel strongly that investigation of the facts attendant upon the tragic assassination of President Kennedy should adhere to the highest requirements of probity, I have today introduced a House joint resolution that would give the Presidential Commission the power to compel testimony under oath. It would also require that the results of the investigation, together with recommendations for legislation, if any, should be reported to Congress.

The far-reaching ramifications of this horrible crime committed we believe by an admitted Marxist with a record of residence within the Soviet Union can have serious effect upon both our internal security procedures and our foreign policies. The American people are entitled to have the Commission's report based upon sworn testimony that was given subject to the penalties of perjury. It is too important a matter to be left in the realm of rumor, conjecture, or hearsay.

A copy of the House joint resolution I have proposed is as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 838

Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of records

Resolved, That the Commission established pursuant to Executive Order 11130, dated November 29, 1963, to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy is authorized, for the purpose of carrying out its duties under such Executive Order, to hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places within or without the United States including any commonwealth or possession thereof, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission may deem necessary and advisable. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the Commission, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman may authorize any member of the Commission or its staff to conduct on its behalf any part of the investigation herein provided for and in such event and for such purposes any member so authorized shall have all of the powers herein granted to the Commission.

For the purposes of this resolution the Commission is authorized to sit and act at such times and places during the First or Second Sessions of the 88th Congress, recesses and adjourned periods, and to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical and other assistance as may be required.

The Commission shall report not later than the first day of the First Session of the 89th Congress to the Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

The expenses of this investigation shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

Equality of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, made a very effective address last week before the Washington Urban League's Equal Opportunity Day Committee's 1963 Observance.

He took this occasion to announce a new training for apprenticeship program for Washington, D.C. In view of the interest of the Congress in this subject, I am certain my colleagues will find his remarks particularly meaningful and timely.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the text of the Secretary's speech, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR W. WILLARD WIRTZ AT THE WASHINGTON URBAN LEAGUE'S EQUAL OPPORTUNITY DAY COMMITTEE'S 1963 OBSERVANCE, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 18, 1963

Sitting last evening at my desk at home, beneath a picture of the original author of Equal Opportunity Day, I found myself repeating his grandly simple reminder that "all men are created equal"—and then looking up and asking "Are they?"

In what meaningful sense are all men created equal?

Lincoln spoke directly to the error that had developed in a nation's thinking: that in the act of creation itself there was an intended distinction which was marked by the color put in children's skins. Until that false notion was corrected nothing could be accomplished.

Today, too long a century later, that earlier ignorance has been substantially overcome. If there is not yet unanimity in the Nation there is nevertheless a clear consensus that accords with our conscience. Americans are agreed now that life was not designed in the pattern of discrimination.

Yet we gather here today with the consciousness that there is much more to it than this—and that what lies ahead requires something beyond the recognition of a divine equity.

It is as though in this historic 100th year, we had climbed a mountain called discrimination, only to find on approaching the summit that what lies ahead is another mountain called disadvantage.

If the error in men's minds a century ago warranted the reminder that "all men are created equal," the necessity today is that we face squarely the limitations within which this is true.

For the fact is that each child brings with him very different gifts from God.

The fact is that with his first breath a child's endowment becomes principally whatever portion of advantage or disadvantage the circumstances of his environment confer upon him.

In the century ahead, the requirement upon America is that it be dedicated to the proposition that men will correct the inequalities which men have created, that the inequities children inherit will be lifted from them.

So I speak today of equal opportunity that includes much more than freedom from denial of opportunity when the chance comes. If equal opportunity is to mean anything it must include the right to be ready.

I realize that my thinking today is particularly of equal opportunity in the field of employment. This is partly because of the nature of my own responsibilities, and partly because I think the equal right to work is perhaps closest to the surface—if not the heart—of a great many of today's long-overdue current demands. Perhaps this is because equality in employment presents some of the hardest problems which lie ahead.

I mention only a few of the key factors here.

There will be loss, not gain, from any person's demanding or receiving a job for which he is not qualified.

Honest and sincere men reach different conclusions about whether previous discrimination warrants preference now—to "even things up." My own strongly held view is that such preference could be justified only on an assumption that this is a matter of competition between two sides. It isn't, and there is great importance in avoiding and eliminating any mistaken grouping along color lines. The victims of preference would be individual human beings, and more likely than not today, persons who are themselves opposed to discrimination.

To think in terms of quotas is again to think in terms of two groups, which is the thing to be avoided. I believe strongly in the necessity of a Federal fair employment practices act, but surely such a law must be written in terms of the absolute of equality, with no exceptions of any kind.

To believe in equality of opportunity except as it increases competition for one's own job is selfish hypocrisy. Discrimination is no less ugly for its being inspired by self-interest, entirely unrelated to racial prejudice.

Nor can it be questioned that more than equality is not only justified but is required so far as preparation for opportunity is concerned. There is no unfair hurting of someone else if preference in education is accorded those who have been previously disadvantaged. Here there is only the necessary compensation for the ravages of a century of unfairness.

I take this appropriate occasion to announce a new training for apprenticeship program for Washington, D.C., which may become a model of what can be done to break this cycle of unemployability.

Within a month, a new MDTA experimental demonstration project will get underway, sponsored by the National Institute for Labor Education, acting for the AFL–CIO and the Department of Labor. The project will give 100 Washington youngsters a chance to upgrade their skills so that they may become apprentice carpenters.

It is expected that the majority of the trainees will be out of school, out of work, Negro youths ranging in age from 17 to 21. None of these youngsters would be able to qualify as apprentices without the type of training they will receive in this program. Many of them will not have completed any kind of high school program, nor will they have had a close association with the building trades through family or friends.

The value of the project is that it will preserve the standards of apprenticeship training, while opening the doors to new opportunities for youngsters who otherwise would be facing the blind alley of the unskilled.

Surely the single most critical front in the current battle for meaningful equal opportunity is the education of the presently disadvantaged minority group youth. I suggest that this minority can be best described not in racial terms at all but in terms of all disadvantaged youth. We who are here today hate the bigotry of racial prejudice with all that is in us, especially when it is inflicted on a child. But the hurt to a child is no less when he is denied a fair chance for any reason beyond his control. Racial discrimination is no worse in its effect than the discrimination which results from poverty, from chronic unemployment, from growing up in a slum or in a broken family.

It is not enough today to be against discrimination. That's easy now. If we are to be true to ourselves we will buckle down to the job of preparing the next generation to seize opportunities they do not (because they cannot) know they have. They were not created equal, or they lost their birthright the moment they drew their first breath.

We have effectively opposed the folly of discrimination. Now we must stop the fallout of disadvantage. We must get through to these boys and girls that there is opportunity beyond what they have seen at home.

If we believe what we say, we will put our best schools in the slums, not in the suburbs.

If we believe what we say, we will make a flat commitment to all American boys and girls that they will receive all the education they are willing to use, right on through college.

If we believe what we say, we will adopt the education program President Kennedy has presented to the Congress, the vocational education program, the Youth Employment Act, and the proposed amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Equal opportunity will not come merely by preventing the denial of opportunity to those disadvantaged by reason of race or previous condition of environment. That's like trying to get rid of dandelions by cutting off the tops. Equal opportunity will come only by digging out the roots of inequality, by giving those who are least ready for opportunity the preparation they need. "It is here," it has been said, "that 'more than equality' makes sense; and today anything less makes no sense at all."

"A nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." What Lincoln was saying, of course, was that what fault there is, what inequality, is not of God's making, but of man's, and that it is man's to correct.

Jack F. Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that today under unanimous consent I am able to extend my sincere congratulations to Mr. Jack F. Mills who has been named executive director of the Republican National Congressional Committee, effective January 1, 1964.

Over the years Mr. Mills has provided valuable assistance to many of my colleagues. He has been a good friend, and a credit to all of us in public service.

I know my colleagues who have worked with Jack will agree that his reputation and character over the years is truly a record of which we can all be proud. He has served his Nation in commendable fashion.

May I take this opportunity to introduce Jack Mills to my colleagues who have not yet had the opportunity to meet him.

Jack was born in Milwaukee, Wis., September 14, 1920. The son of Mr. and Mrs. Annette (Christy) Mills, he is married to Anna Lenor Butke and the father of four children. He has been an executive in industry and earlier in life was the assistant golf professional at the Milwaukee Country Club.

Since coming to Washington he has shown initiative and ambition, and has helped shape the image of public service of which we are all proud.

Why Businessmen Make Good Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following from Nation's Business, issue of November 1963:

The business community has a vital stake in improving government at all levels, and there is much that businessmen can contribute.

This is the opinion of Representative HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, a Williamsport, Pa., businessman who has been in Congress since 1960. Mr. SCHNEEBELI, a Republican, was first elected to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Representative Alvin R. Bush. He was reelected in the general election of 1960 and again in 1962. He is a member of the influential Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI is a businessman of 30 years' experience. He is a commission distributor for the Gulf Oil Corp., owner of an automobile dealership and part owner of another Gulf distributorship in a nearby community and two wholesale-retail tire outlets. An Army captain during World War II, he served as commanding officer of a high-explosives plant at Kingsport, Tenn.

An active interest in civic affairs led Mr. SCHNEEBELI into politics. He served as president and campaign chairman for the Community Chest and was campaign committee chairman for YWCA and Williamsport Hospital fund drives. He also was appointed to the school board.

Then he was persuaded by the directors of the Williamsport Chamber of Commerce to act as coordinator of its first political action course. The course was in progress when Representative Bush died, and a number of the city's leading citizens prevailed upon Mr. SCHNEEBELI to run for the vacant seat. He won the special election in April 1960, and in the two general elections since, increased his winning margin from 4,200 to 40,000.

In this interview with Nation's Business, Representative SCHNEEBELI tells why he believes more businessmen should run for public office, what qualities they have that are useful in solving Government problems, and explains how he has put his own business experience to use in the House of Representatives.

"Question. Mr. SCHNEEBELI, have you found your business background helpful in Congress?

"Answer. It is a terrific asset, particularly in the committee on which I serve, the taxation committee. I feel that I can do a pretty good job because, being a taxpayer of some consequence, I am allergic to high taxes. On the other hand, having to meet a payroll, I recognize the fact that we should raise the money to pay our expenses. So I have an interest in both ends of the problem, and I think my business background, together with my education in business administration at Dartmouth, helps me grasp a lot of the intricate problems of the Ways and Means Committee.

"There is much to learn, and I am still very much in the learning process. There is much that I don't know, but I am an eager student and try to keep an inquiring mind.

"Question. What qualities and abilities does the average businessman have that are useful when brought to bear on problems of government?

"Answer. First of all, government should be operated as close to a profit and loss basis as business. The experience of a businessman in trying to balance a budget and show a profit is an important counterbalance to those people in Congress who don't seem to have much concern in this area, who feel that all social programs are justified regardless of cost. We have a little more realistic approach—a business cannot succeed unless it shows some sort of profit or surplus.

"Secondly, I think businessmen tend to deliberate a little more on the broad reactions to and results of a decision. Where we have used our own money in business we have been circumspect as to what the final answer is going to be. We are a little broader in our outlook, I think, in determining all angles to a problem.

"A businessman also brings into politics certain characteristics of ethics and morality. Certainly in local business you must have these qualities or you are not likely to be successful.

"I think that experience in handling labor, finance, management, sales promotion, and all the various aspects of business gives us a little deeper appreciation of the many problems that go into a decision here in Washington.

"Question. Do you feel it is important that more businessmen run for public office?

"Answer. We are witnessing a gradual decrease in the number of people in politics who are simply political professionals. In their place, more and more, I believe we will find business and professional people and others with experience outside the field of politics alone. This is a healthy trend and one which is essential if we are to have sound government in the years ahead.

"Since government is getting into the affairs of business so deeply in so many areas, it certainly should be a matter of concern that government would be sympathetic to and appreciate business problems. And who knows better what the business problems are than a businessman?

"I think the professional politician gradually is going out, and I think that people in the professional and business world are gradually recognizing their responsibilities in this area. The trend is from restricted activity—accepting civic responsibility in local affairs and philanthropic drives—to a more active participation in politics on all levels.

"They recognize the problem and they are doing something about it.

"Question. Businessmen feel they have a vital stake in taking part?

"Answer. Very much. All we have to do is think about the tax bill, for example. If we can reduce the taxes of business by 10 percent, we will have accomplished something very beneficial to the whole Nation.

"Question. What active roles other than elective office can businessmen take in politics?

"Answer. Well, they can serve in several capacities. They can serve on a finance committee of a political party, which is very important. They can serve on the executive committees of district and county organizations. They can serve as committee people and ward workers. They can lend their interest and presence and active participation in politics in many areas—as a candidate, in financing the party, and as an active worker.

"Question. Has holding public office been a rewarding experience?

"Answer. It has been very enriching in broadening my appreciation and concept of our many national problems and it has been very challenging. I often meet with the heads of large corporations. As Congressmen, we meet with people of this type continually. We get to know their thinking. We probably are in an area of higher executive influence and contact than were we to stay home in business.

"The problems we have to cope with here in Washington prepare us for handling big business problems. If we have any basis for advancement, it would be furthered by the contacts we make in this type of work.

"Question. So the experience is valuable for the businessman who enters politics?

"Answer. There is greater personal development than if you were to stay with a single corporation, because you have access to many more people with divergent ideas. This is much better preparation for handling a big corporate job.

"It gives you a concept of problems on a national scale and you are thinking of things in a broader sense, which is also becoming more and more a top corporate problem.

"Question. How does being a political decisionmaker in Congress differ from being a business decisionmaker?

"Answer. First of all, the business decision in my case is local, limited or personal, while in Congress it is more impersonal, of national consequence generally, probably more philosophical, and on a much broader scale, with much deeper implications all around. The problems here are deeper and more disturbing.

"I usually sleep much better with my business problems than I do with my congressional problems.

"Question. Does it require a different approach to get things done in Congress than in running your own business?

"Answer. Yes. In Congress you tend to take an academic approach to problems in trying to grasp their broad significance. Secondly, in trying to decide your stand on an issue it is almost like being judge or jury. Thirdly, there are political aspects of party policy and loyalties which have some importance. Your business problems are a lot more immediate, limited, and specific.

"In Government you are dealing with the public bank account. You are very concerned with doing the right thing. The problems are always new and usually more difficult to delineate specifically and solve.

"Question. Have you found that compromise is a more important part of accomplishing something in Congress than in business?

"Answer. Yes. In business it is usually yes or no. But in Congress there are so many aspects. Take this tax program. There were 35 or 40 different areas in which changes were recommended or made. Well, you might be able to subscribe to 80 percent of them, but the only way you get 80 percent of them is to accept 20 percent you don't like. In business you would be more apt to take the 80 percent and discard the 20 percent. We don't have that choice here.

"Question. Do you think that most companies are doing enough to encourage their executives to take part in politics?

"Answer. I don't know that most companies are. Many companies do a very effective job. Some of the larger companies I know should do more.

"One of the largest companies, A.T. & T., is doing a marvelous job. Another large national corporation is doing virtually nothing, and I have told the chairman of its

board that I think it is unfortunate his company doesn't get into this area more. So much of their future is tied up in what happens in Washington that it behooves them to see that the representatives who are down here are not unsympathetic to the fact that business helped to create a lot of what is good in America.

"I believe there is a strong trend toward big business encouraging political participation at all levels, and this is good for the country.

"Question. Do most corporations support their executives once they get into politics?

"Answer. Corporations which encourage their employees to get into politics certainly should and do support them because they recognize their responsibility in creating this interest.

"Gulf Oil, for example, with which I am affiliated, has a salaried employee from Scranton, Pa., who happens to be Democrat and who recently was elected to the State assembly. So Gulf does not necessarily just reflect the Republican viewpoint, because their other man in politics from Pennsylvania is a Democrat.

"Gulf Oil was one of the original leaders in urging businessmen to get into politics. Much of this spadework was done by Archie Gray, former executive vice president.

"Since my election, there have been no pressures or political overtures from Gulf or any of my other business connections. As a matter of fact, in committee I voted in favor of the two tax provisions regarding additional taxation of oil companies, which were contrary to the interest of the major oil companies.

"Question. What is the best way for a businessman to get started in politics?

"Answer. He should create in the public mind the knowledge that he is interested in public service. He can do this by working with community projects and by not limiting himself to his business alone. Being a good community worker is probably the best background.

"Question. How did you set up your political organization?

"Answer. At the outset, I capitalized on my knowledge of organizing people with a common objective. I had a meeting each Monday of the first 2 months with people whose opinion I valued and people who had some practical experience in politics.

"In the first 2 months I went around to the other seven counties, visiting newspaper editors, county chairmen, people interested in politics, radio stations, and so forth. I wanted to let people see and know who HERM SCHNEEBELI was. They had no idea, since I was new at this work.

"Then I got to the practical matter of going around to Republican political meetings being organized for our special election.

"Suddenly the special election became a big national issue because it preceded the 1960 presidential election. Political pundits were looking for straws in the wind, and I guess I was one of the straws. The Republicans were determined they weren't going to lose this seat, which they had held for years, despite the fact they had a businessman who had never run for politics and had to be sold as a candidate. And the Democrats, realizing they had a pretty good proposition, began pouring in an awful lot of money. It was pretty rough going for an amateur.

"Question. How big was your winning margin?

"Answer. In the special election I won by 4,200 votes. The following November I ran against the same person and won by 20,000. In 1962, I won by 40,000.

"I attribute this increase to, first of all, hard work in Congress; and secondly, sales promotion work which I had learned in business. I became aggressive and advised the people that I was their Congressman in order to help them, and asked what their problems were and what their views were. They liked this approach, which was learned through business experience.

"Question. Since your election have you retained your business interests?

"Answer. Yes. I go home about every other weekend and I spend about 5 or 6 hours a month on my personal business. I think that it is just as well that quite a few Congressmen have an independent income so they aren't beholden to the office and can express an independent view at times.

"I am not a professional politician in that respect, and I think this independent income is an asset to me in making an independent, impersonal decision.

"Question. Do you hope to stay in Congress or do you eventually plan to go back to full-time business?

"Answer. From what I have seen down here I think one of the most difficult problems is for some people to realize when their term of contribution and worthwhile service is ended.

"Although there aren't too many instances of this type, there are a few people who tend to stay too long, and I hope I don't get in the same sort of situation. But it is difficult to be too self-critical in trying to arrive at a proper appraisal of when our service is declining."

Address of Hon. John S. Monagan on Water Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, water pollution control and abatement is a matter of great concern to the people of Chicago, and the address this week of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], was an event of importance.

I am extending my remarks to include the full text of Congressman MONAGAN's speech before the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators, delivered in Chicago on December 3, 1963:

I am delighted to be here today to discuss with you some of the problems of water pollution control and abatement. As you know, your association testified earlier this year before the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, on which I serve, at its water pollution control hearings in Washington. Your association made a significant contribution to the subcommittee's record. I hope that my remarks here today will be as useful to you as your association's testimony has been to our subcommittee.

The water crisis of the century is not the shortage of water itself, but the shortage of usable, clean water.

Water pollution has become the Nation's single most desperate natural resources problem. Almost all of our major streams and rivers and lakes are suffering increasing pollution. This pollution jeopardizes our water supplies, menaces the public health, destroys aquatic life, and disgraces our environment. It is a direct result of rapid growth in population and ruban living, plus the unprecedented technological advances of industry in the past two decades.

The impact which the increasing population and the growing urbanization of our country have on our clean water supply can easily be understood in terms of a few figures.

In the 63 years since 1900, the Nation's population increased from 76 to 180 million; new towns and cities sprang up where only farms or wildernesses existed; villages of 3,000 or 4,000 expanded to 50,000 and more; cities of 100,000 are approaching or have exceeded a million in population.

In 1900 the Nation's urban population was 30 million. It has grown beyond 125 million in the sixties. By the year 2000, the urban population of the United States may exceed 300 million.

Water pollution control problems caused by the increases in population are already urgent. In the remaining 36 years of this century they will become overwhelming unless a basis for dealing with them is laid today.

The sources of pollution in our Nation's rivers and streams are almost innumerable. Untreated wastes are still being dumped into rivers and streams in many parts of the country. Oils, garbage, chemicals, acid drainage from mines, and many other substances, including new chemicals such as synthetic fibers and detergents, pesticides, radioactive wastes, and a number of other items that we could mention, are ruining our waters.

Water demands are increasing every day. Vast quantities of water are required to produce 1 ton of synthetic rubber, or a ton of high-grade paper, or a ton of cold-rolled steel.

New or developing industries will, within the next few years, more than double the demand for good quality water. We will have to reuse our waters as they pass from the land to the sea, and unless we take bold and concerted action to meet this expanding demand for reusable water, the United States will, within the next generation, face economic retardation and a resulting impairment of our national strength to an almost unprecedented degree.

The control of water pollution thus involves the health and economic destiny of our entire Nation. We have an equally great responsibility to maintain clean waters for recreation, propagation of fish and wildlife, and preservation of the esthetic beauty of our country.

It was for these reasons that the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, established the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House of Representatives to make an extensive and intensive inquiry to appraise how effectively Government agencies and others are dealing with the problems of our Nation's increasing water pollution and to determine what can be done to improve the techniques for preventing or controlling the rising pollution levels of so many of our Nation's rivers, streams, and other surface waters.

The Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee has held extensive hearings in Washington, as well as in different regions of the country, including New England, the Middle Atlantic area, the Midwest, and the Pacific Northwest, and this week in Texas. I assure you that the Congress is deeply concerned about the problems of water pollution.

During these intensive hearings, almost 200 witnesses submitted information. Government and industry representatives, as well as other interested citizens, testified.

While reflecting substantial achievements of State and Federal officials, the testimony before our subcommittee has revealed the rapidly growing backlog of needs that must be met to carry out successfully a national water quality control program.

Under the Water Pollution Control Acts of 1956 and 1961, much more must be done. New projects are required—to keep pace with population growth—in the field of municipal

waste collection and treatment. In addition, the testimony before our subcommittee revealed that there are 15 million Americans today who are not served by any sewers or treatment works. The method of sewage treatment employed today is the same in principle as that used by the Egyptians 2,000 years ago. That is not progress.

Both municipal and industrial wastes have presented pollution problems for some time. The newest pollution problem comes from the fast growing companies producing synthetics and chemicals which find their way into watercourses. These chemicals include pesticides, radioactive materials, detergents, and fertilizers. Testimony showed that many of these chemicals do not respond to biological treatment and that they persist in streams for a long time. They are increasingly troublesome sources of pollution with far reaching and still unpredictable effects on our rivers and streams. Some of the wastes carry both immediate health hazards and long-term genetic hazards which have not yet been adequately appraised.

These newer pollution problems, as well as the growing backlog of conventional problems of treating municipal and industrial waste, indicate the compelling need for major new efforts in the reduction and prevention of water pollution. Recently enacted Federal legislation is pointed in the right direction. Yet we are faced with the inescapable fact of the deterioration of water quality, a fact which clearly demonstrates the need for new preventive efforts.

These efforts must be made by the States and local agencies by enforcing antipollution laws which are available to them and by strengthening those which are shown to be inadequate. In addition to the preventive efforts required through the enforcement of antipollution laws, there is a great need for more sewage treatment works to handle effluent from cities, industries, and farms, and for the development of new methods to treat chemical, pesticide, and radioactive wastes.

Though much remains to be learned about many of these problems, water pollution control cannot wait upon the development of all the answers. Our present state of knowledge in many fields is sufficient for the imposition and vigorous enforcement of controls to safeguard the public health and welfare, and to provide for the quality and quantity of water which our rapidly expanding population and economy require.

Among the new pollutants are the hard detergents which are found in most soaps and cleaning solutions. They have been a serious nuisance in a number of streams where the foaming has been excessive. The companies manufacturing detergents have assured us that the chemical formula of their products is going to be revised so that they will be degradable and susceptible to treatment in our treatment plants. This is something that must be done. Legislation is pending in Congress, as we know, to forbid the manufacture and sale of so-called hard detergents. I think that the work of our subcommittee is going to encourage progress in this area.

I must admit that at times during the hearings it sounded as though we were making no progress at all in pollution abatement. Water pollution seemed to be as bad as it was 50 years ago. At that time we were losing lives from waterborne typhoid; now we are losing lives from waterborne hepatitis.

Perhaps one of the most encouraging parts of the hearings was to learn of the great amount of research that is being done at all government levels, and by industry and other private concerns. I think that this accelerated research and development work now taking place will do great things for the overall pollution abatement program.

The responsibility for research and for the management of water pollution falls on all water users, as well as on local, State, interstate, and Federal agencies. The simple reason for this is that streamflow does not recognize political boundaries. So from the beginning we have recognized that streams may transcend local areas and become a national concern. The problem of pollution is so enormous that it is big enough to give everyone a share in its solution.

Water pollution is expensive. It costs the individual, the businessman, the community, and the Nation. No one escapes the economic loss brought about by the pollution of our most valuable resource.

Some of these losses or damages are evidenced by the additional costs which must be met, such as construction, operation, and maintenance of water treatment facilities.

But the bulk of the costs of pollution cannot be directly tabulated.

How is the impairment to health measured in dollars? Or the loss of recreational facilities, depreciated property values, or the failure of industry to expand?

While these indirect consequences of pollution cannot be expressed in precise dollar terms, they are nevertheless real and constitute a critical barrier to the fulfillment of local and national economic goals.

Pollution control measures combat these adverse conditions and produce economic benefits associated with the improved water quality. These benefits are often not apparent to the public, however, because they constitute insurance for future use of water as well as for immediate use.

The taxpayer must realize that while it costs money to prevent or combat water pollution, the return is great in attracting thriving and expanding industry and producing healthful community water conditions.

Water pollution is not new and the problem has become more serious for three primary reasons: (1) rapidly expanding industry, (2) growing and shifting population, and (3) use of more water per person. The problem of water pollution is more acute in some areas than in others, and is especially severe in some areas. It is the key part of the whole complex problem of wise water use.

We are not running out of water, but now and in the future we will have to use our streams more wisely to meet our growing needs.

Although significant progress has been made in managing water pollution, we are not keeping up with growth and demand and we need, therefore, to step up study, research, and all other efforts if we are to head off a very real water supply crisis.

In stepping up these efforts, there are responsibilities facing all of us as water users. We need to work as effectively as we can at the individual and industrial level, and through the most effective agencies we can use at the local, State, interstate, and Federal levels.

Most important of all, the different classes of water users, including industry, must cooperate to guarantee that the needs for the differing and sometimes conflicting uses of water are met in a safe and equitable manner.

At the beginning of my remarks I stated that unless a basis is laid now for dealing with the water pollution problems of the next 30-odd years, these problems would be absolutely overwhelming by the year 2000. A good first step toward meeting the challenge of the year 2000, occurred on October 16, when the Senate passed a bill (S. 649) introduced by Senator MUSKIE to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The bill would accomplish, in brief, the following purposes:

1. It would express the national policy "to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and * * * for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

2. It would establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer comprehensive programs, interstate cooperation, enforcement measures to abate pollution, establishment of water quality standards, and pollution by Federal installations.

3. It would provide for an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the Secretary of that Department to supervise and direct the administration of that Department's functions related to water pollution.

4. It would authorize appropriation of $20 million annually for 4 years research and development grants, up to 50 percent of the estimated reasonable cost of demonstration projects for separating combined sewer systems;

5. It would increase the individual dollar ceiling limitations of Federal grants for construction of waste treatment works from $600,000 to $1 million for a single project, and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a joint project involving two or more communities;

6. It would authorize an additional 10 percent in the grant for construction of waste treatment works if the project is certified as conforming with a comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area;

7. It would authorize enforcement measures to abate pollution when any person is prevented from marketing shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce as a result of such pollution and action of Federal, State, or local authorities;

8. It would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after public hearing and consultation with all interested parties, to prepare and to encourage the development of regulations establishing standards of water quality for interstate waters;

9. It would provide that waste water discharges by Federal installations shall be controlled under permits issued by the Secretary of HEW.

10. It would establish a procedure to evaluate progress in the development of decomposable detergents which will not cause or contribute to the pollution of surface and underground waters, to develop standards of decomposability for such detergents, and to authorize the promulgation of such standards at such time as detergents conforming to the proposed standards of decomposability are generally available to the manufacturers of detergents.

11. It would establish audit procedures concerning expenditure of construction grants.

12. It would state the authority of the Secretary of Labor over labor standards governing construction of federally aided waste treatment facilities.

The Muskie bill, as well as a companion bill which I introduced earlier in the House of Representatives (H.R. 9007), are now pending before the House Public Works Committee, and hearings on these bills will be held this week, beginning tomorrow, December 4.

I do not take the position that our water resources cannot survive without the enactment of each of the provisions in these bills. I have been a legislator far too long to believe that the Nation, or its natural resources, will stand or fall on the enactment, or failure of enactment, of a particular provision. But I do believe that taken altogether the provisions of these bills represent a most important and worthwhile effort to meet our water resources problems before it is too late.

Achieving cleanliness in our streams will entail the making of judgments and the weighing of competing factors of economics and the less tangible benefits of recreational, esthetic, and wildlife values. The lines which must be drawn will vary from area to area, from stream to stream, from basin to basin, and will depend on the varying

judgments of many people. There will undoubtedly be disagreements between those who believe in utilizing the full assimilating capacities of the streams, and those who believe that streams are more important for fishing, boating, and swimming. There will be differences between those who believe that water pollution control is solely the job of the locality, the State, or the region, and those who believe that the Federal Government must take an increasingly vigorous role in the control and reduction of pollution.

Our subcommittee recognizes these many problems and differing attitudes. We are examining all the available facts, opinions and recommendations on this subject from every part of the country. We are using them to stimulate action in many quarters. From our findings and recommendations will undoubtedly evolve legislation, executive action, research, and new points of view.

The hearings and investigations by our subcommittee are not yet complete. I am convinced, however, that the subcommittee has already created a heightened awareness on the part of Government officials responsible for the Federal water pollution control program. It has sharpened administrative practices and stimulated more imaginative and creative policies.

For example, when our hearings disclosed how little has been done to control water pollution caused by drainage of acid waters from both existing and abandoned coal mine works, the Secretary of the Interior gave personal emphasis to create an intensified effort within the Interior Department on that subject. Similarly, as a result of our subcommittee's inquiry, many Federal agencies are now scrutinizing their own waste discharge practices and much progress is being made to reduce or abate their pollutional effects. Various agencies are also examining their statutory authority with respect to water pollution control, and I anticipate that various bills will be introduced to eliminate deficiencies in the existing law on this subject.

The subcommittee's hearings have also served another significant purpose which, I feel, is all too often neglected—that of educating the public. The great number of newspaper reports and articles appearing in professional and trade publications regarding the subcommittee's hearings leave no doubt that we, along with other groups, have made a deep impression on the public conscience. Where before there was apathy, there are now the stirrings of widespread citizen concern over the preservation of our water resources. In a democratic society such as ours, that is the all-important beginning of a solution to a problem.

The Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators has secured for itself, by virtue of its constant and diligent efforts, a vanguard position in the crusade to preserve the Nation's water resources. Please accept my congratulations for the work you are doing. We Members of Congress are happy to be associated with you in this great enterprise. I know we will succeed.

Congressman William L. St. Onge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome back to our body a good friend and respected colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

Never has the Second Congressional District of our State been so well represented as by my worthy associate who has been sorely missed during his absence from this Chamber. I join my fellow Congressmen in greeting our compatriot and know that he will bravely join us in the fight to enact the policies formulated by President Kennedy and now embraced by President Johnson which will insure the continued growth of our Nation.

Ships That Pass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter in answer to a letter from Mr. Baldwin of the Lumber Institute.

Dear Mr. Baldwin:

The tone of your letter and the attached agenda plus the NAHB attacks on H.R. 2513 shows pretty much how the so-called export trade increase and dollar balances have deteriorated since a few of us stood up against the misnamed Trade Expansion Act in 1962.

All of the propaganda to the contrary the most telling statistics can be read in the waterline of the outgoing ships from the lumber terminals in Dundalk, Baltimore, Md.

While in session I live below Annapolis on the Chesapeake Bay. I see the ships coming into our ports loaded to the waterline, I see them going out floating high, wide, and easy.

When they are low in the water they're on an outward voyage you can bet it's foreign aid, military vehicles or wheat and other Public Law 480 shipments.

What doesn't seem to phase the sophomoric economists, the unwitting victims of the hard sell artists of the international trade profiteers is that when imports squeeze the domestic market it results in depressed prices, lowered profits for expansion and investment, static labor wages and automated unemployment.

We talk about percentages of domestic market when measuring imports with little or no consideration given to the spread of the imports. For instance if the lumber imports are 70 percent of U.S. market and probably a lot more when one checks into all types, forms and prices containing lumber products are counted, it doesn't mean that the loss of business is spread evenly over all U.S. lumber producers. It can hit one producer harder than another. In fact, it can and has put the regional or marginal producer out of business and bids to put the average producer on the shelf in a few short years.

You ask what I think can be done. It's beyond what I think, it's now a problem of reversing millions of pages of propaganda and endorsement of unsound economic trade policies.

This can only be done if all the industries affected would courageously and unselfishly do what the industrial trade profiteers have done, join together all their efforts and awaken to the fact that one by one they have no power or effect upon Congress or the press, or the people, or the President.

Let's be realistic. No U.S. industry can survive in a free-trade world so long as we have fixed costs of production based upon raw materials, labor, taxes, and services in the United States which are for all practical purposes mandated by Government with local, State and Federal tax agencies, union contracts and protection for unions under our Constitution, antitrust and antiunemployment laws.

No sane person would advocate wiping out the systems of check and balance contained in the above mentioned and other laws of our Nation and yet the very same persons who scream to high heaven if we ever attempted to cut out social security, unemployment compensation, etc., are in the forefront demanding so-called free trade with nations whose basic costs of production are in no more reasonable or measurable terms comparable to ours.

I've been to Europe and Asia, Hong Kong to Japan. I've seen their production facilities, their costs of labor and their government commissions for export products. I've seen the most modern plants in the world being run by 7-, 15-, and 25-cent-an-hour labor.

The problem isn't one of labor alone anymore than it's one for the lumber industry alone.

As you note more than a hundred Members of Congress signed a petition in behalf of the lumber industry. More than 200 signed a petition to help save the shoe industry.

Individuals and regional groups comprising a sizable majority of both Houses of Congress have at one time or another signed petitions or introduced legislation seeking quotas for this or that product or industry. Many others have dropped antidumping bills into the hopper.

It's strange but true, Congress is made up of in the main of protectionists—protectionists for their individual district's products but collectively the Congress is for so-called free trade.

Why is this the case? The answer can be oversimplified by saying that they are looking after their own skins locally and yet nationally they are make-believe statesmen.

This is true, but it isn't the whole reason for the paradoxical position of being for and against a subject matter at one and the same time.

Basically all of us are both protectionists and freetraders. We want protection for what we sell and we want bargains for what we buy. Few of us seem to grasp the full picture. When any one worker is displaced by unsound trade practices and policies, every other worker loses.

When any one industry suffers all others suffer. Only recently have some of the more able newsmen started to cut out the chaff from the wheat and are telling the truth about the import-export trade policies and their effect upon our National economy.

One such newsman, Jack Anderson, writing in the syndicated news column "Washington Merry-Go-Round" slapped the fake figures and false picture painted about the steel industry. You will note that he covers the fact that U.S. oversea investments have created the overexpansion in steel production and we are just starting to see the results of free trade between unlike economics in a given world surplus product.

We've seen this in cotton, wheat, peanuts and other agricultural products. We are entering the final stage of the cotton fiasco when Congress votes on an additional $300 million subsidy for cotton, this time we pay it to the textile mills.

Shades of free trade seem to be forming a shroud around the U.S. free enterprise system. The formula for cotton, subsidy out of the U.S. treasury for cottongrowers, payments to cotton warehousers, purchases by U.S. Government, resell to foreign textile

mills for $42.50 less than domestic mills, floods of cotton textile hit U.S. market, U.S. textile mills lose income, workers lose jobs, Government proposes $42.50 gift (credit on purchases) to U.S. mills to save U.S. industry.

The cost of subsidy on cotton from and to textiles will be greater in dollar value than the entire cotton export dollar collected by U.S. Government.

This then is the order of doing business in any line of U.S. product thrown into the profit-seeking calendar of international trade.

When we finally realize that free trade is only sound in iron competitive items and job protection is as important to a democracy as military defense, we will come up with a formula for world trade that will more closely resemble fair and equitable trade between competing economics.

We should never tariff goods we do not produce whether manufactured, mined or farmed. No other nation should, unless its customs are revenue measures and not protective measures.

Before putting before you exerpts from Jack Anderson's story on steel let me remind you that glass, rubber, cheese, mushrooms, in fact anything from soup to nuts is on the list in the hands of Christian Herter and in the forthcoming Kennedy round of GATT meetings we may set the stage for the embalment of free enterprise, individually owned and operated U.S. industrial complex.

The story on steel follows:

"STEEL AID ABROAD BOOMERANGS

"(By Jack Anderson)

"More details can now be told about the foreign aid fiasco in steel—how American generosity has built up foreign steel industries, putting dozens of our own mills out of production and thousands of workers out of work.

"By unofficial count, 179 foreign steel plants have received American loans or grants since World War II. This aid has enabled them to install machines and adopt techniques more modern than our own.

"Thus the U.S. steel industry through its tax payments not only has helped to finance its foreign competitors but has obligingly provided them with better equipment.

"No wonder the American share of the world's steel output has dropped from 46 percent in 1950 to 25 percent today. U.S. steel products have been pushed out of two-thirds of their former markets, causing a sharp production slump.

"Foreign mills built at American expense are now turning out wire and rod so cheaply, for instance, that imports have captured 30 percent of the U.S. market. Even steelplate, the bread and butter of the industry, is beginning to roll in from abroad.

"STEEL FRANKENSTEIN

"Typical example: With the best of intentions, Uncle Sam helped to rebuild Japan's war-wrecked steel industry until it is now taking customers away from U.S. mills.

"From 1955 until 1960, 10 great Japanese steelworks received foreign aid grants amounting to $155,300,000. Nine more mills were granted Export-Import Bank loans totaling $121,100,000.

"The Yawata Iron & Steel Co. for example, received a $5,300,000 grant in 1955, a $26 million loan in 1957, another $20 million grant in 1959, and still another $26 million loan in 1962. Its blast furnaces are now producing more steel than most American mills.

"Even as French President Charles de Gaulle was tightening the screws on American products, Uncle Sam doled out four separate loans totaling $6,556,000 to France's giant Union Sud du Nord steel works in 1960–61. A smaller $66,000 grant went to Miferma, another French steel company.

"Dictator Franco got $59,513,000 in grants for nine Spanish steel plants, the largest an $18 million grant for the Altos-Hornos Viscaya works in 1961. The Empresa NAC Siderurgica mills received several American grants, the latest a $6,600,000 payment last year.

"In Latin America, Mexico and Argentina received the most U.S. aid. Altogether 22 Mexican steel plants collected $90,780,236 from Uncle Sam, then promptly began shipping steel plate across the border to U.S. customers. Another 22 Argentine plants received $88,580,560 in U.S. handouts.

"STEEL FOR REDS

"The only Communist country whose steel production got a U.S. boost was Yugoslavia. Uncle Sam granted the Yugoslavs $15 million to purchase a U.S. steel mill in 1961. Earlier, Yugoslavia's Niksic Iron Works was given $5,610,000 in American counterpart funds.

"The largest single grant was arranged in 1959 by Tom Dewey, the two-time GOP presidential candidate, for Turkey's Eregli Steel Mill. Amount, $129,600,000.

"The loan was granted, incidentally, while Vance Brand was the Government's development loan chief. He promptly retired from the loan fund to become a high-paid consultant, and later a director of Koppers, the company that did the engineering on the Turkish steel plant.

"Even our prosperous northern neighbor, Canada, once received a $5,700,000 Export-Import loan to aid her steel industry.

"Around the world, foreign steel mills have been subsidized by the American taxpayers. Unhappily, the American desire to better the world has reached the point that we are in danger of crippling the goose that lays the golden eggs."

I know this is more than you bargained for but I can't let up in what I believe to be the most dangerous situation, economically, this Nation found itself in our generation.

We cannot blend the exact science of economics, the inexact science of world diplomacy and the will of the wisp of commercial world trade without disaster.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

Twentieth Anniversary of International House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it was just over 22 years ago that our country entered the bloodiest war in the history of mankind. As my colleagues in the House and Senate know, this terrible war marked the beginning of the end for isolationism in America; that is, the isolationism as it was known in the two decades and more after World War I. In the 1920's we returned to what was mistakenly called normalcy, only to be devastated in the 1930's by the great depression. In the first decade, we were concerned with satisfying our pleasures; in the second, with easing our pain. Then came the cold, sobering effects of 1939; World War II had begun. With the clandestine attack on Pearl Harbor 2 years later, the United States was in that war.

We Americans always have loved peace; in the midst of every war, the leaders of our country and all our people have dreamed, have worked, have planned for the day when the guns are again silent. In the midst of World War II, 20 years ago this month, I had the great privilege to join with 13 other business and civic leaders in my city of New Orleans in establishing an organization designed to foster peace and good will among all men, and to flourish in peacetime, and not in war.

The real driving force behind the founding of International House was the late Rudolf S. Hecht, then chairman of the board of the Mississippi Shipping Co. Early in 1943 I had the honor of working closely with Mr. Hecht to prepare a brochure that projected the idea of establishing this unique organization, the first of its kind in the United States, or anywhere in the world for that matter. We traveled to Washington several times to consult with Secretary of State Cordell Hull and his aids about this organization to promote international trade. Despite the press of his heavy wartime duties, Mr. Hull was most helpful, and was enthusiastic about the idea.

My wife, Lindy, really broke the logjam on finishing the brochure in time to launch our initial drive for support and funds for establishing International House. And it was Lindy who provided this great institution with its motto, "Dedicated to world peace, trade, and understanding," which is inscribed in large letters on the outside wall of International House's building on Gravier Street in New Orleans.

Some two dozen other cities in our country have followed the successful pattern of New Orleans' International House, and organized similar institutions themselves.

It was December 28, 1943, when the articles of incorporation for International House were signed in New Orleans, and a unique and farsighted plan for peacetime was born. The establishment of this progressive organization was a big factor in assuring there would be no return to "isolationism" in my part of the country. Its purpose was, and is, to develop and promote trade and commerce between the people of the whole Mississippi Valley and those of the nations of the world, particularly the countries in our own hemisphere. In the two decades since its founding, International House has served as the great catalyst for the benefit of the port of New Orleans, and business and industry throughout the Mississippi Valley. Its success has been phenomenal, and this success has been showered on all who have worked through International House.

Trade has always been the very life's blood of New Orleans, since its founding in 1718. The old saying that "the proof is in the pudding" was never more true when applied to International House's greatest contribution to my city—its efforts to provide the tremendous increase in the past two decades in the volume of imports and exports handled

by the port of New Orleans. In 1962, according to the U.S. Corps of Engineers, a total of 71,570,000 tons of foreign and domestic waterborne commerce passed through the port. In 1962 the dollar value of the foreign cargo alone was $1,667 million. Furthermore, since World War II, New Orleans reestablished itself as America's No. 1 grain port; last year, the port handled 189,049,000 bushels. All of these factor add up to explain why New Orleans is today, and has continued to be, in most postwar years the Nation's No. 2 port next to New York City. And the fine work of the officers and staff of International House has helped the port of New Orleans to enjoy this great development and prosperity.

I had the honor and privilege to be the first executive secretary of International House. In November 1943 the completed plans for establishing this now world-famous organization were announced, and the next month, its articles of incorporation were signed. The 13 distinguished citizens of New Orleans who joined in forming International House were: William G. Zetzmann, who served as its first president; Wilmer Hayward, George H. Terriberry, Leonard K. Nicholson, E. O. Jewell, Charles Denechaud, Sr., Salvador D'Antoni, A. B. Paterson, George E. Schneider, Eddie F. Lebreton, Theodore Brent, W. P. Flower, and Salon B. Turman. Unfortunately for my community, most of these men have gone to their reward, but their good works live after them and are a daily reminder of their vision and their dedication. Those of us founders who live on are devoted to their memory and their sacrifice, and we are proud to salute them on this memorable anniversary. The founders who are continuing today to serve International House and the city of New Orleans are Mr. Solon B. Turman, chairman of the board of Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.; Mr. E. O. Jewell, Mr. Eddie F. Lebreton, Mr. George E. Schneider, president, New Orleans Traffic Transportation Bureau, and myself.

International House first opened the doors of its present home on Gravier Street in June 1945, and today this splendid organization has almost 2,500 members from New Orleans, the Mississippi Valley, and around the world. In its *membership*, International House boasts the leading business, civic, and professional leaders of many communities, who represent all forms of transportation and every kind of business and industry engaged in trade and commerce.

International House is a nonprofit organization supported by its 2,500 members, and is a fine example of the fruits of energetic and imaginative men working together under our free enterprise system. It is literally an "international clubhouse" which, you might say, sells nothing itself. That is, it sells no physical products. But it does sell, or promote, friendship and good will, trade and commerce, throughout the world.

What was it that prompted this group of leaders in New Orleans to envision such an organization and work toward its establishment during World War II? The most immediate reason was their determination to maintain New Orleans as the Nation's second port in the postwar era. The fact is that during the war our port was enjoying a great boom, as were so many other ports in America. Our businesses and industries, especially those geared to the war effort, also were thriving. In 1943 the port of New Orleans handled a total of $657 million in combined imports and exports. What would happen to this boom when the war ended? How could we maintain New Orleans position in trade and commerce in the competitive postwar years?

By the establishment of an organization like International House.

Through the spring and summer of 1943 our idea for an international clubhouse to foster trade and commerce between the Mississippi Valley and the nations of the world advanced toward reality. By the time the articles of incorporation were signed in December, a total of more than $500,000 had been raised to help establish International House. This institution has made New Orleans, more than it ever was before, a truly international, cosmopolitan city. Our port has continued to reign as America's second port. Scores of businesses and industries in Louisiana and other States drained by the waters of the Mississippi and its tributaries have realized the benefits of the constructive work of International House. All of this has been done through the basic concept, in the words of Paul Fabry, the managing director of International House, that "friends always do business easier than strangers, and strangers can, and do, become friends through understanding and trade."

The men who have served as president of International House since early 1944 comprise a "Who's Who" of the business, civic, and professional leaders of New Orleans. The first president of International House was, most fittingly, one of the founders—the late William G. Zetzmann, president of Zetz 7-Up Bottling Co., who served from early 1944 to June 1947.

In chronological order, the other presidents were: A. E. Hegewisch, president of the Hegewisch Corp., who served from June 1947 to June 1949; Lloyd J. Cobb, New Orleans attorney, June 1949 to May 1951; Robert E. Elliott, now senior vice president of the National American Bank, May 1951 to July 1953; C. C. (Bud) Walther, president of Walther Bros. Co., July 1953 to December 1954; Richard G. Jones, executive vice president and general manager of the Jackson Brewing Co., December 1954 to December 1956; Joseph M. Rault, New Orleans attorney, 1957; Richard W. Freeman, president, Louisiana Coca-Cola Bottling Co., 1958; George S. Dinwiddie, chairman of the board, New Orleans Public Service Inc., 1959; Capt. Neville Levy, president of Equitable Equipment Co., 1960; Maurice F. Barr, vice president, Gulf Paramount Theatres, Inc., 1961; Dr. Alton Ochsner, internationally famous surgeon and president of the Alton Ochsner Medical Foundation, 1962.

The president this year has been Lawrence A. Molony, a prominent New Orleans attorney. He is to be succeeded in 1964 by Henry Zac Carter, president of the Avondale Shipyards near New Orleans.

By their service in leading International House to ever greater success, these leaders have given the New Orleans area more than they can ever be repaid in dollars and cents.

In naming the presidents of International House, I cannot forget to pay tribute to the full-time managing directors who have served International House so well through the years. Mr. Stanton Robbins was the first managing director of the organization in 1945 and 1946. Then for 15 years, Charles Nutter, a noted reporter for the Associated Press for many, many years, served at the helm and was instrumental in building International House into the great organization it is today.

In the period 1946–61, Charlie Nutter made a magnificent contribution to the development and growth of International House and to the achievement of its goals not only in our community but also in other communities in the Mississippi Valley. Late in 1961 Charlie Nutter left International House, and today he publishes and directs the operations of several weekly newspapers in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

Early in 1962 Paul Fabry assumed the directorship of International House, and he is carrying on in the same fine manner as did Charlie Nutter.

A list of the many projects International House has executed successfully is innumerable, but I would like to cite the most prominent ones over the past 20 years.

Some of the leading projects of International House are:

First. The annual trade and cultural missions of International House members to nations all over the world.

Second. The annual Pan-American press seminars which bring together leading editors of America with those of all media in Latin America. This year the second such seminar brought to New Orleans 40 participants from 17 countries.

Third. Scholarships to deserving Latin American students for attendance at American colleges and universities: These are provided through the Cordell Hull Foundation.

Fourth. Two-way tourist promotion between New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley, and the nations of Latin America particularly, although travel to and from Europe and Asia also is promoted. International House members often guide VIP's through New Orleans and the Deep South.

Fifth. Special programs for foreign students who are attending universities in Louisiana and Mississippi.

Sixth. Periodic publications and directories to complement the cultural and trade works of the various Government departments and agencies.

Seventh. Special exhibits for foreign artists in this country and exhibits of our art abroad.

Eighth. Various educational television programs.

Probably the most publicized and most successful work that International House does to promote trade and commerce

through New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley is through its many trade and cultural missions to countries over the globe. Thus far, International House has sponsored 47 of these missions. Their purpose is to spread the name of New Orleans and its port, to cite the advantages of engaging in trade and commerce through the port and with the businesses and industries of my city and in the Mississippi Valley. Most of these missions have been to the nations of Central and South America, but there have been several to Western Europe, and one to the Soviet Union and the bloc countries and one to the Far East.

Among the mission trips this year, a very fruitful one was the jointly sponsored trip to the five countries of Central America and Panama. The medical school of Louisiana State University joined with International House in sponsoring a 13-day tour of Central America. The result was the establishment of another IH project to provide free medicines and drugs to charitable, nonprofit medical groups operating in the poverty stricken areas of Central America. The LSU Medical School is cooperating in this humanitarian project, and the major pharmaceutical companies are donating the drugs and medicines.

And this summer, 31 civic, business, and professional leaders from the New Orleans area participated in the organization's 47th mission, which took them to three Common Market countries and to member nations of the rival free trade asociation. In these countries of free Europe, the IH members met with representatives of the chambers of commerce, the various port authorities, export and other trade associations, and the officials of different cities and towns.

In the coming year, International House is planning five trade and cultural missions: A tour of Central America by Louisiana lawyers to meet attorneys in those countries; a tour of South America to foster further cultural exchange and trade relations between the New Orleans area and Colombia, Ecuador, Argentina, Peru, Brazil, and Venezuela; an around-the-world trip in 25 days to further the goals of IH throughout the globe; a mission to the Mediterranean area to expand cultural exchanges and promote business through New Orleans from rapidly developing countries in the Near East, and a small mission to several islands in the Caribbean to explore new opportunities for promoting trade and commerce.

Furthermore, a recent trip this year to San Salvador by IH's director of its international relations department resulted in a decision by the tourism ministers of five Central American nations to establish in America a joint tourist promotion department in 1964. The tourism ministers had invited the IH official to meet with them for their own discussions on forming a regional tourist promotion department; the outgrowth was the ministers' pledge to establish in our country a joint tourist department in addition to their own regional one in Central America.

One of the finest humanitarian projects which International House has engaged in all its years was the formation, with the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce, of an East Pakistan relief committee to raise money and clothing for the distressed people of that country who were victims of a severe cyclone. The committee sent $15,000 worth of clothing and other goods, plus a check for $7,000 to aid the citizens of East Pakistan.

A very worthy and continuing program sponsored by International House is the foreign language instruction it provides at very low cost to New Orleans citizens.

International House offers regular courses in Spanish, French, English, German, and also this year added two classes in Italian. More than 200 students have consistently attended these classes in recent years.

One of the splendid services which International House provides to American businessmen and those of other nations is through its Thomas F. Cunningham Reference Library. This specialized library on world trade matters was established with the founding of International House, and today its multilingual staff members answers questions of all kinds from all over the world. In effect, the Thomas F. Cunningham Library serves as an international information service on world trade and enjoys a worldwide reputation. Its shelves now hold more than 11,000 volumes; they include trade directories from all over the world; reference books from many, many nations; statistical sources such as publications from the United Nations, reports of central banks of various countries, the publications of foreign governments, particularly from Latin America, and others. The library's periodical files date back 20 years, and tdoay it subscribes to or receives some 450 current periodicals from all parts of the globe. Some of its old periodicals cannot be found in any other library in the New Orleans area, and thus the IH library is a well spring not only for the businessman, but also for the student and the scholar.

The cornerstone of the daily operations of International House is its world trade development department, whose principal job is to bring buyers and sellers together from the four corners of the earth. Over the years the world trade department has established over 350,000 contacts between U.S. businessmen and those of many other countries. The department has comprehensive records of these contacts in its files, and also has extensive files on trade information by country and by commodity. A twice-monthly bulletin relating new opportunities in importing and exporting all kinds of products is published by the department. The work of the world trade department is enhanced through its close contact with American and foreign chambers of commerce, U.S. Government Foreign Service posts, foreign government representatives living in the United States and trade promotional organizations around the world. The department also studies the results of other American city missions to foreign countries for the purpose of trade, travel, and cultural promotion, and participates in many annual international trade conferences.

This year the world trade department published the third edition of International House's "Directory of Importers in the Midcontinent Area of the United States." This directory is of great use to foreign trade commissions; U.S. commercial offices here and abroad; transportation lines and many other groups engaging in foreign trade.

Another vital department of IH is the international relations department, which serves as guide and host to both government officials and private citizens from around the world when they visit New Orleans. This department also directs International House's student exchange program, through which hundreds of students have received scholarships and other forms of financial assistance. International House administers the Cordell Hull Foundation, which is a nonprofit corporation to aid needy and worthy students from Central and South America to obtain a college education in America through special loans. The foreign language program is operated by the international relations department, as is the planning for the various trade and cultural missions taken by IH members each year.

The publicity department of International House, in addition to originating articles and information relating to international affairs, trade, shipping, and the advantages of the port of New Orleans, also publishes Noticias, a weekly Spanish newsletter for Latin American newspapers, and Trade Winds, IH's official log.

International House also has a monthly half-hour television show entitled "VIP" which is telecast over WYES-TV, the educational TV station in New Orleans. IH has helped to make several documentary movies on the Alliance for Progress program too.

With the great emphasis now placed on the vital Alliance for Progress program, which was initiated and pushed by the late President John Kennedy, it is most fitting that International House celebrate its 20th anniversary by hearing from the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso, the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress. Mr. Moscoso is to be the principal speaker at the anniversary celebration in New Orleans December 12, and I know he will give a most interesting and important address on his program and its progress. We have seen some positive results from this great program, but we all know that we are late in Latin America, and that the road of obstacles there will be long and difficult. Our country must contend with the unceasing efforts of Communist agents, from Castro's Cuba and elsewhere, to overthrow existing governments. The problems in Latin America are still very acute and are a long way from being solved, and the Alliance for Progress has been launched by our country to give the less fortunate citizens of our hemisphere an opportunity to better their standard of living and to enjoy the fruits of a democratic system of government.

For so many reasons, the success of the Alliance for Progress is vital to the

future growth and development of my city of New Orleans, its port, its businesses and industries, and to the whole economy of the Mississippi Valley. As I have pointed out, International House has been a great catalyst in this growth, and the future of IH is intertwined with that of New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley.

On this 20th anniversary of the founding of International House, in which I am proud to have played a small part, I am pleased to salute the new officers of IH and its dedicated staff members, and to congratulate them and wish for them and for International House 20 times 20 more years of increasing success and prosperity.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance.*

O God of grace and mercy, the sudden passing of John F. Kennedy, after a brief life among us of less than half a century, and a tenure of office of only a little less than 3 years, has given clear and glorious contemporary witness and meaning to these words of sacred Scripture.

Today the Members of the House of Representatives have assembled to render tributes of praise and love to the memory of Thy servant, our President, whose mortal body has been laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery, but whose spirit dwells in the Father's house of many mansions, leaving us to dream how wonderfully beautiful that heavenly home must be since he is there. We believe that at this very hour he is laboring and serving with all his strength and enthusiasm in the spacious and limitless fields of eternity.

As we go up and down the courts of memory and think of that brilliant and dedicated young man, whom millions in this and many other countries so dearly loved and admired, we are calling to mind especially the creative and significant part he had in history's greatest cause and challenge, the establishment of peace on earth and good will among men.

There was enshrined in his soul a deep passion for the welfare of mankind and for all the members of the human family, who are finding the struggle of life so difficult and its burdens so heavy.

By spoken and written word, by arduous toil and travel, he continually bore testimony that this was the vision which stirred his imagination and for whose fulfillment he longed and labored.

The contribution that he has made toward attaining that goal of universal peace and brotherhood will perhaps never be rightly and fully appraised by this and future generations for now we see through a glass darkly and know only in part, but someday we shall see and know the good that passed on from his life into the life of multitudes of others and how much more beautiful the world was made by his presence.

Grant unto the members of his bereaved family who were bound to him by the ties of faith and love, the consolations of Thy grace and the assurance that Thou hast crowned his life with the diadem of Thy praise and bestowed upon him Thy benediction, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter unto the joy of thy Lord."

In the name of the Christ, our Saviour and the Prince of Peace, we pray. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 82. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On November 20, 1963:

H.R. 2073. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain submerged lands to the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes;

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

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

On November 26, 1963:

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

On November 29, 1963:

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

On December 2, 1963:

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

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1111. An act to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; and

S. 2275. An act 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.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1703. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1, Public Law 88–138, approved October 16, 1963, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LONG] was appointed as a member of the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island.

The message also announced that pursuant to title 44, United States Code, section 393A, Mr. SALTONSTALL was reappointed, for a term of 4 years, as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission.

THE JOURNAL

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

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H.R. 8747, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1964, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6518, THE CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 6518, the Clean Air Act.

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

There was no objection.

SENDING TO CONFERENCE H.R. 8667, RIVER BASINS ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, with Senate