Every human creature must have a God. He must have something outside of himself or he turns in and dies. If we, in our apathy and culture, lose sight of the true God we will settle for something less. The professed atheist worships himself, his own selfish interests, the fabric of life not the life itself.

So, in today's world, in the culture which we ourselves have created from the gifts which God has given us, we begin to see, if we will open our eyes to see, and if we then open our minds to truly understand that which we see, we begin to see certain danger signs. These danger signs have been in man's sight before. This is nothing new. Each civilization which has perished before this one has been preceded by these same signs. But, you say, we are smarter than they. We certainly should be. We can profit from their experience. We can use the knowledge which they have handed on to us.

This Nation, this world, has just witnessed a *supreme tragedy*. Not a "shot that was heard around the world," but a shot that was felt around the world. And just as death, when viewed from this side of the veil appears to be the end, and when viewed from the other side is seen to be a birth into a new life, so this tragedy must be turned into something more. We cannot sit idly by and permit this death to teach us nothing. We cannot sit idly by and permit death to continue a human feeling of hate. We have an obligation to ourselves, to the world, to the yet unborn and to God to see in this our means of salvation as a civilization. We must be eternally thankful that this man lived. We must be eternally thankful for the pure and noble witness made by a woman. A witness to the truth that strength can, and will come from faith in God. Today we must be thankful that our forefathers have handed us a government so strong, a government so right, that the loss of the chief of state need not, indeed cannot, foreshadow a complete overthrow of the system.

We must be thankful that we have been shown that party loyalties and differences can dissolve themselves in pure Americanism. That denominationalism cannot erect a barrier over which love and concern and prayer *cannot pass*. That our denominationalism is quickly dissolved in the strong light of God.

In these past few days where are the people who told us not to pray? Where are the ones that warned us of the terrible dangers in a wedding of church and state? The church is people. The state is people. And we are people.

People make the culture in which they live. We had created a culture which nourished bigotry, defiance against authority, hatred, malice. Nourished it and fed it. Words such as apathy, materialism, selfishness, unconcern, are the food which has the power to destroy us.

But this is a new day. The night has passed, and the day must dawn clear and bright in determination.

The day has passed when we can support the bigot, the segregationalist, the hater. The day is here when we must meet these problems person to person. Me to you. You to you.

All the tinsel must be torn away that we may be permitted to behold the tree. The clouds which have covered this land of ours must give way, that we may be permitted to see the endless sky with its bright sun of truth and morality which have the power to melt all the lesser gods.

We must, because Thanksgiving Day 1964, Thanksgiving Day 2064 depend on you and on me.

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

## ADJOURNMENT

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

**The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 9, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.**

## 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. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 9023. A bill to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1007). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8070. A bill for the establishment of a Public Land Law Review Commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to the administration of the public lands of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7967. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 1009). 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. LANGEN:

H.R. 9388. A bill to regulate agricultural and forestry imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Texas:

H.R. 9389. A bill to provide that the flag of the United States of America shall be flown for 24 hours of each day at the grave of the late President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.J. Res. 852. 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 evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.J. Res. 853. 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 evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

495. By Mr. MAILLIARD: Petition of the Reverend Lane W. Barton and 26 parishioners of St. Barnabas Episcopal Church in San Francisco for action on the civil rights bill during this session of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

496. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to Members of the Congress holding reserve commissions in the U.S. armed services; to the Committee on Rules.

# SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

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

Eternal Father, who art the light behind life's shadows, the love behind life's sorrows, shine, we pray, in morning splendor upon these darkened lives of ours, groping in a maze of uncertainty and perplexity.

We cannot lean upon our own unaided might—our flesh is too fragile, our hearts too evil, our wills too wayward.

At the beginning of another week of deliberation, coming for this noontide tryst to this altar of a nation under God, we would not catalog the sins and shortcomings of others. We come as those who have missed the mark of our high calling and who, standing in the white light of Thy searching, pray for Thy forgiveness and Thy cleansing. Then as we go forth to face tangled and unpredictable days that tax our human resources and understanding, we ask only for light enough for the next step, courage enough to face the present duty, and truth enough for today's decisions, as into Thy hands we commit the welfare of our Nation.

We make our prayer in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
*Washington, D.C., December 9, 1963.*

*To the Senate:*

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
*President pro tempore.*

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

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 6, 1963, was dispensed with.

## ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules and Administration were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

## ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 726, House bill 9140, the public works appropriation bill.

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

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON LOAN TO UNITED POWER ASSOCIATION, ELK RIVER, MINN.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on a loan to the United Power Association of Elk River, Minn., in the amount of $39,230,000 for financing certain transmission and generation facilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of October 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States for public assistance," for the fiscal year 1964, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO PROVIDE FOR RETROACTIVE QUALIFICATION OF CERTAIN PENSION FUNDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the retroactive qualication of certain union-negotiated multiemployer pension funds (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON UNECONOMICAL MANAGEMENT OF COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE ITEMS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the uneconomical management of commercially available items, Department of Defense, dated November 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO EXPLORATION PROGRAM FOR DISCOVERY OF NEW MINERALS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 700), relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CLARENCE L. AIU AND OTHERS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Clarence L. Aiu and others (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS RELATING TO THE DEATH OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate certain communications from foreign governments concerning the death of the late President John F. Kennedy, which will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## PETITIONS

A petition was laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter from Chesterfield Jackson, New York, N.Y., making certain comments relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy; ordered to lie on the table.

## PRESIDENT KENNEDY MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution unanimously adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on December 2, 1963. The resolution would establish a President Kennedy Memorial Day, and directs that a copy of the resolution be forwarded to, among others, the President pro tempore of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

The 22d day of November will go down in history as the anniversary of the day that the people of the world were thrown into deep sorrow upon hearing of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

It was a day of sadness for all and will linger in the minds of mankind for many years to come.

It would be most fitting for the Congress of the United States to set aside November 22 of each year as a day when the people of our Nation can rededicate themselves to the ideals which were set forth by our 35th President: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to declare November 22 as President Kennedy Memorial Day; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate in Washington, D.C., as well as each Member of the Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution Serial No. 9, introduced by Senators William J. Lane and James S. Berger on behalf of the entire membership of the senate and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 2d day of December 1963.

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
*Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 1233. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease numbered Sacramento 037552–C, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 751); and

H.R. 4479. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California (Rept. No. 752).

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 2064. A bill to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guaranty revolving fund (Rept. No. 754); and

H.R. 5691. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code (Rept. No. 755).

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

H.R. 221. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period (Rept. No. 753).

## REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated December 4, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 2371. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. HART:

S. 2372. A bill for the relief of Ramon Carlos Bayana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## RESOLUTION

### DESIGNATION OF SENATOR METCALF AS ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE DURING THE REMAINDER OF PRESENT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 232) to continue during the remainder of the present session of the Congress the designation of Senator METCALF as Acting President pro tempore of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR U.S. ALLIES WHO FOUGHT FOR FREEDOM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War II. This legislation would make hospital and medical care available to persons who have been lawful residents of the United States for at least 10 years and who served during World War II as members of the armed forces of Allied nations which actually participated in armed conflict against an enemy of the United States. Such a person would derive benefits—as hospital and domiciliary care and medical services—to the same extent as if his service had been performed in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Allied cause during the Second World War was a common effort of peoples of many nationalities. Many nations which succumbed to the barbarism of Hitler and the Axis Powers never ceased to aid the Allied coalition through their national armies in exile or through organized underground resistance. These brave men and women of partisan forces gave their lives and fortunes to rid, not only their homelands of the tyranny which had descended upon them, but for the restoration of freedom to the children of all mankind.

The gallant history of the Polish people during World War II serves to illustrate the fierce determination of a nation which, though shattered by overwhelming military force in the first days of the war, regrouped its men and resources to fight an underground resistance at home and an all-out effort on the long road back across the battlefields of Europe.

The people of Poland were firm in their resolve to reassert their position as a sovereign and Allied country that would continue the war in the ranks of the Western coalition. There were no quislings among the leaders of the Polish nation. Poland never ceased to be a fighting ally. She contributed to the common effort as a great country, and the efforts of her brave men played a decisive role in the success of the Allied cause.

The remnants of the Polish Army escaping across dangerous German- and Russian-held territory made their way first to France. There, under the leadership of General Sikorski, Prime Minister of Poland and commander in chief of the armed forces, four infantry divisions joined with the French Army. It is reported that "in the last period of the campaign in France, the Polish troops fought as if they were defending their own country." The heroic defense of the French airfields by the Polish Air Force is a stirring chapter in the records of the Battle of France.

When France capitulated, 24,000 members of the Polish armed forces were evacuated to Great Britain where 2,300 airmen and 1,400 sailors were already serving. Here, based in this island fortress which stood the "sole fury and might of the enemy" for 2 full years before the United States entered the war, the land, sea, and air forces of Poland played a gallant and efficient part in winning the Battle of Britain and extending the war to the German homeland. British Air Marshal Sir Sholto Douglas, in speaking of the participation of Polish air forces in the battle waged against the German Luftwaffe stated, "When Mr. Churchill spoke his famous words—'Never in the field of human conflict has so much been owed by so many to so few'—he spoke of the Polish fighters as much as of our own pilots."

In the House of Commons in 1945 Winston Churchill expressed the gratitude of the British nation to the Poles who had fought side by side with the English.

> His Majesty's government will never forget the debt they owe to the Polish troops who have served them so valiantly, and for all those who fought under our command, I earnestly hope it will be possible to offer the citizenship and freedom of the British Empire * * * we should think it an honour to have such faithful and valiant warriors dwelling among us as if they were men of our own blood.

As the Polish armed forces fought with the Allied armies on all European fronts to restore the freedom and independence of their country, the Polish home army, personally directed by General Sikorski, "maintained," in the words of Winston Churchill, "a ceaseless warfare against the German oppression in spite of as heavy sufferings as any nation has ever endured." The home army, the Armia Krajowa, was "unrivaled by any underground movement in any part of Europe."

The inscription on the monument in the cemetery of Polish soldiers at Monte Cassino serves best to exemplify the dedication of the Polish people throughout history to the cause of human freedom spurred on always by the deep love of their homeland:

> For your freedom and ours we gave our lives to the world, our souls to God, our hearts to Poland.

We as Americans know, better than any other nation, that the Polish willingness to fight for freedom has often extended beyond the boundaries of Poland. Sons of Poland served with our forebears as the midwives of America during the Revolutionary War. The names of Kosciuszko and Pulaski are nearly as familiar as the name of Washington. Upon Kosciuszko's death, Gen. William H. Harrison spoke of him as follows:

> His fame will last as long as liberty remains upon the earth * * * and if a temple shall be erected to those who have rendered most service to mankind, if the statue of our great countryman, Washington, shall occupy the place of the "most worthy," that of Kosciuszko will be found by his side.

Polish patriots served in American ranks during the War of 1812 as well as the Civil War. Poles also took part in the Texan revolt against Mexico in 1835 and in the war with Mexico between 1846 and 1848. To the Poles the struggle for freedom and independence is universal and Poles have fought for the sanctity of hearth and home far from their native soil and their own kith and kin. It is ironic, perhaps that a people so passionate in their love of freedom should have fought so hard against the Nazi tyranny only to have passed under a tyranny today which, in some ways, is far more sinister and protracted.

A glimmer of hope for the people of Poland is reflected in the words of Churchill:

> Poland is like a rock which the tides may submerge for a while, but nevertheless remains a rock.

Poland's historic example as a fighter for the freedom of others might well be said to have strengthened the commitment of the Allies in the face of the common enemy. It was Poland who at last accepted the German challenge and brought an end to the peaceful conquest of Europe. It was to Poland's defense that the British and the French rallied. The cause of each nation became intimately bound to the victory of all. An excerpt from a Churchill speech to Commons in 1944 pointed out the common effort which was being exerted:

> What an extraordinary army it is (8th Army in Italy). There has never been anything like it, and there is nothing which could so bring home to one how this is a war of the United Nations. You have the British and United States troops, the New Zealanders, the American-Japanese troops, who have fought with great vigor, the Greeks are coming—some are already there—a Brazilian force is already beginning to take its place upon the field; the French are there; the South Africans are there; the Poles have greatly distinguished themselves.

Every American who fought during World War II is, of course, an American veteran. But in a larger sense he is a

veteran of the Armed Forces of every nation which fought under the Allied banner. General Eisenhower was not only the Commander of the American forces, but the commander of all European Allied forces; the British, the French, the Danes, the Dutch, the Norwegians, the Poles, the Belgians, all who dedicated themselves to the Allied cause.

Those of our citizens who were members of the armed forces of governments allied with the United States and who participated in armed conflict with an enemy of the United States, should, it seems to me, be the recipients of some o. the benefits which are accorded veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States. Let me point out, that this would include those Americans who, recognizing the Nazi danger before December 7, 1941, joined the armed forces of a nation already engaged in war against the Axis Powers. The British and Canadian Royal Air Forces each had notable American contingents.

Mr. President, there is a pressing need to make the facilities of veterans hospitals available to the brave men of other national armies which served the cause of the free world and are now residents of the United States. Many of these hospitals are not used to their full capacity and could easily accommodate those who would benefit from this legislation.

This bill encompasses a small measure of our gratitude to those who fought with us, though in a different uniform, for the preservation of our ideals and institutions and who are now building their future in the United States. This legislation deserves the favorable consideration of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2371) to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War II, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. SCOTT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 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 section 109 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c)(1) Any person who served in the active service in the armed forces of any government allied with the United States in World War II who has been a lawful resident of the United States for at least 10 years, and who during such service was a member of forces which actually participated in armed conflict with an enemy of the United States shall, by virtue of such service, be entitled to hospital and domiciliary care and medical services under chapter 17 of this title, and to the benefits of chapters 31 and 37 of this title, to the same extent as if such service had been performed in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection, World War II shall be deemed to have begun on September 1, 1939."

## AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 193, 83d CONGRESS, RELATING TO CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION — AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 345)

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7044) to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

## REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments (Nos. 346, 347, and 348), intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BENNETT submitted an amendment (No. 350), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8363, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

## DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 349)

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS AND AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2345) to amend the Federal Firearms Act to further restrict the use of instrumentalities of interstate or foreign commerce for the acquisition of firearms for unlawful purposes, introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1975) to amend the Federal Firearms Act, introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment (No. 335), intended to be proposed by Mr. DODD to Senate bill 1975, to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

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

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolution:

Authority of November 26, 1963:

S. 2332. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, members of the Cabinet, and Members of the Congress, and for other purposes: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MECHEM, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

Authorities of November 26 and 27, 1963:

S. 2341. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WALTERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

Authority of December 3, 1963:

Senate Joint Resolution 136. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WALTERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article in the December 1963 issue of the Rotarian magazine, "Education: Answer to Unemployment," by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz.

## STATUS OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. There are on the calendar certain measures which—in view of the fact that the Senate adjourned on Friday, and did not take a recess at that time—should, I should think, in due course be called up.

I did not object to the request of the majority leader for a 3-minute rule; but I ask him whether he would now be willing to make whatever motion he has in mind with respect to the resolutions which I sponsor, and which are on the calendar, so that they may be disposed of in accordance with an informal agreement which he and I have reached.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania—and I should note, for the attention of the Senate, that he has been most cooperative—ask unanimous consent that the "Resolutions and Motions Over, Under the Rule," namely, Senate Resolution 209, Senate Resolution 226, and Senate Resolution 227—which are placed in that category, be transferred to page 12, under "Subjects on the Table."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—I wonder whether the majority leader will indulge me long enough to permit the clerk to read the title of each of the resolutions, in order, and so that I might have an opportunity to make a brief statement on them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. I ask that the clerk be instructed to read each of the resolutions sufficiently to identify it—perhaps by title; I refer to the resolutions which have been referred to by the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield, I shall be glad to read them.

The first is Senate Resolution 209, submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] authorizing Labor Subcommittee meetings during Senate sessions.

Mr. CLARK. That resolution was submitted on October 3. It called for action by the Senate on a motion, made under rule VII, to permit the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to meet during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the month of October and for all of November.

There was a parliamentary dispute as to the propriety of that motion. The then Vice President of the United States—now the President of the United States, who then was in the chair, ruled that it was improper, under parliamentary practice, to bring such a motion to a vote. What I shall describe as an "elementary school" filibuster—not a "senior high school" filibuster—was briefly engaged in, to prevent the taking of a vote on that motion and to sustain the ruling made by the Vice President.

Since that motion was made by me, and thanks to the cooperation of the majority leader and other Senators, the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment was able to meet on a number of days while the Senate was in session; and now it has completed its hearings, I am happy to say; that occurred last Friday. Therefore, the resolution is moot; and I join in the request of the majority leader that it be laid on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The next resolution is Senate Resolution 226, to discharge the Committee on Finance from the further consideration of House bill 8363, the so-called tax bill. That question was raised on November 21.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the President of the United States is reported in the newspapers—and, I have no doubt, correctly—to have entered with the chairman of the Finance Committee into an informal agreement that hearings on the tax bill will be concluded in the quite near future, on the condition that the chairman of the Finance Committee is afforded an opportunity to examine next year's budget, and since it now appears that a motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of that bill would not only be vigorously resisted by the leadership on both sides of the aisle, but also in all likelihood would accomplish no useful result, in view of the agreement made by the chairman of the Finance Committee and the President of the United States—which agreement will, I hope, result in bringing the tax bill to the floor some time in the barely discernible future—I have no objection to having this resolution also laid on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for purposes of the RECORD, I think the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania should be a little more precise in the language he uses. As I understand, there was no agreement. The distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee did have an informal session with the President of the United States. I, also, had an informal session with the President of the United States; and at the time, we discussed the same subject. I believe that, generally, if there is any agreement at all, it is an agreement to be diligent in pursuit of the tax bill. That, of course, the committee has done, because tomorrow it will have heard its last witness.

Incidentally, I may say that after tomorrow the Finance Committee will have heard 129 witnesses. Thirty witnesses finally agreed to submit their statements. In addition, 250 additional statements were submitted for the record. So the committee has fulfilled its promise to be diligent, and I am sure it will continue to be, but I can hardly call that an agreement. I wished to make sure that even though the chairman and the ranking minority committee member got a peek at the 1965 budget, that still does not constitute an agreement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I do not withdraw anything that I said. I take not the slightest objection to anything that my friend, the Senator from Illinois, has said. In view of the spirit of peace, good will, amity, and comity which hovers over the Senate today, I shall say no more.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table Senate Resolution 226? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the spirit of Christmas is hovering over the Chamber?

Mr. CLARK. So long as the Senate is determined to remain in session until Christmas Eve and pass the rest of the appropriation bills.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the next motion referred to by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has to do with Senate Resolution 277 to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from consideration of H.R. 7063, the so-called Departments of State, Justice, and judiciary appropriation bill, which will be called up on Thursday of this week. I ask unanimous consent that that resolution be laid on the table.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the bill has progressed so far and so expeditiously since I filed that motion, and will, as the majority leader says, be brought before the Senate on Thursday of this week, I am quite content to have that motion also laid on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, only to observe that patience is a virtue and time is a great healer.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

## THE CONGRESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, over the weekend there came to my attention two provocative articles. One is entitled "The Failure of Congress," written by Stewart Alsop and published in the Saturday Evening Post for December 7, 1963; the other is entitled "It Is the People Who Face the Test," which was published in yesterday's New York Times magazine section and written by Tom Wicker.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 7, 1963]

THE FAILURE OF CONGRESS

(By Stewart Alsop)

The Congress of the United States is in deep trouble. More than ever before, the

public attitude toward Congress is a mixture of indifference, amusement, and contempt. It is time to ask why this is so, and whether anything can be done about it. For when the citizens of a democracy begin to hold their legislature in contempt, democracy is itself in danger.

There is an obvious reason why the reputation of Congress is—to use a favorite phrase of a great Congressman, the late Sam Rayburn—"lower than a snake's belly." Never before in history has Congress talked so long to accomplish so little.

Only once before in peacetime—in Woodrow Wilson's first term—has Congress remained in session from opening day right around to the next December. That first Wilson Congress accomplished a great deal. Here is what the second Kennedy Congress has accomplished, as summed up by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut.

"Of our four major objectives of this session, a tax cut, a civil rights bill, a general aid-to-education bill, and a medicare bill, none has a real chance of enactment this year."

There is plenty of other evidence to support DODD's charge that this congressional session is a shambles. Appropriations are supposed to be approved by the end of July each year, to provide money for the next fiscal year. As of late fall, the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments are still living hand-to-mouth, because Congress has never got round to voting funds for them.

"The Hill has gone to hell," says an old hand on Capitol Hill, "since the Speaker died and Lyndon left." "The Speaker," of course, was Sam Rayburn, of Texas. "Rayburn's personal power and prestige," says Democratic Representative RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri, "made the institution appear to work. When Rayburn died, the thing just fell apart." Rayburn's successor, JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, an elderly, earnest man who looks like an axhausted monk, has little or none of Rayburn's power and prestige.

MCCORMACK's opposite number in the Senate, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, succeeded Lyndon Johnson as majority leader when Johnson became one of history's unhappiest vice presidents. MANSFIELD—who also looks like an exhausted monk—is universally liked in the Senate, something that could not be said of Johnson. But DODD tactlessly spoke what was in the minds of many of MANSFIELD's colleagues when he said, in effect, that MANSFIELD was not tough enough to be a good leader.

MANSFIELD himself, when asked by this reporter whether he thought this criticism of his leadership was justified, removed his pipe from his mouth, thought for a moment, and characteristically replied with a monosyllable: "Yes."

"The leadership," MANSFIELD says, 'has no special powers to lead." This theory of leadership is markedly at variance with the Johnson theory. The Johnson theory of leadership, in short, involved the lavish and even ruthless use of "special powers." Johnson's influence on key committee assignments was one of his most important special powers. MANSFIELD insists that committee assignments are no business of the leadership. In so doing, he has discarded the leadership's biggest stick and sweetest carrot.

The departure of Johnson and the death of Johnson's immensely rich and immensely powerful ally, Senator Robert Kerr of Oklahoma, has left a power vacuum in the Senate. MANSFIELD is like a King of France in the period when the King was merely primus interpares—and not all that primus either—among a fiercely competing throng of dukes and barons. MCCORMACK, because the House is so huge and so unmanageable, has even less real authority than MANSFIELD.

Fate and the accident of character have thus contributed to the decay of Congress. The same elements played a part in the fall of Bobby Baker, secretary to the Democratic majority. The downfall of poor Bobby—actually a likable country-slicker type—has contributed to the widespread notion that most Senators spend their time cavorting with call girls in luxury hotels and making big money on the side. This is not true, but it has hurt the reputation of Congress at least as much as its do-nothing record.

But the real trouble with Congress is deeper and more permanent than MIKE MANSFIELD's excessive amiability or Bobby Baker's slickness. Representative BOLLING, a Democrat and the foremost student of congressional history in the House, went to the heart of the matter in one sentence: "The trouble with Congress is not Congress but the Democratic Party in Congress."

The Democrats in the Senate have a crushing majority over the Republicans—67 to 33. There is also a big Democratic majority in the House. But these majorities are wholly deceptive, because the party nomenclature is deceptive.

There are two parties in Congress. But in reality they are not the Democratic and Republican parties. They are the generally liberal presidential party and the generally conservative party of the congressional establishment. On major issues—if the issue can be brought to a vote—the presidential party usually has the edge. There is no doubt, for example, that the President's tax cut and civil rights bills would be enacted if they could be brought intact to a vote in in both Houses. But the machinery of Congress is controlled by the establishment party. So bills the establishment party does not like either do not come to a vote at all, or come to a vote after endless delay and in emasculated form.

The establishment, which has also been called the club, the inner club, includes most of the southerners. It also includes most senior Republicans and a scattering of conservative Democrats from outside the South. But the southerners dominate it. Since the establishment controls the machinery, the southerners representing less than a sixth of the voting population dominate both Houses of Congress.

A neat trick. How do they do it?

To understand the answer to that question, you have to understand something about the atmosphere and something about the real power structure of Congress. The Congress—the Senate especially—has a curious atmosphere, at once cozy and awe-inspiring. The Capitol is the last place in Washington—except perhaps for the Treasury, and not excepting the gutted White House—with an authentic smell of the past.

The place is almost palpably populated with the ghosts of Clay and Calhoun and Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens and Vandenberg and Taft and Rayburn. At the same time, with its overstuffed leather chairs and its Brumidi frescoes and general aura of camaraderie, the place is also wonderfully cozy and clubbish.

This combination of history and coziness has its effect on men. Senators, especially, adore being Senators. "This is the most wonderful job in the world," says freshman Senator CLAIBORNE PELL. "Only 99 other people in the world have as good a job, and no one has a better one."

A Senator or Representative soon gets emotionally caught up in the wonderful world of Capitol Hill. He wants to shine in that world, as well as in the larger world outside. The way—almost the only way—to shine in both worlds is to get on good committees. The committees are where the work of Congress is done, and where reputations are made or unmade. There are 16 standing committees in the Senate, 20 in the House. Of the 36, about half are considered good. A man who wants to get on good committees had better not alienate the establishment.

One great key to the power of the establishment is the seniority system. Because of political longevity in the one-party South, this system gives the southerners a near monopoly of the most important committee chairmanships. The committee chairmen are the dukes and the barons of Congress—in the words of the first Robert La Follette, "they report, shape, or suppress legislation at will."

But that is not all. The establishment in both parties controls the party committees which meet once every 2 years to make new committee assignments. For example, the Demoratic steering committee in the Senate is solidly controlled by the establishment. As Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, has pointed out, 7 of the 15 members are from the South, and 9 of the 15 are stanch conservatives, whereas two-thirds of the Democrats in the Senate are nonsoutherners and Kennedy men.

This careful weighting of the steering committee—which most people outside Congress have never heard of—in turn makes it possible for the establishment to maintain numerical control of the really key committees, notably the purse-strings committees, Appropriations and Finance.

Nor is this all. To the establishment, the rule of seniority is sacred—when it suits the establishment. But when it does not suit, the sacred rule can be broken. For example, Senator CLARK, who is considered ungentlemanly and unclubbable for openly attacking the establishment, has been trying to get on the Foreign Relations Committee for years. He has repeatedly been passed over in favor of more clubbable types junior in service to him. For another example, in the current session, of 14 nonfreshman Senators who voted against the South on the filibuster issue, only 1 got his first choice committee assignment—and in several cases seniority was disregarded. Not wholly by chance, six out of eight of those who voted with the South on cloture got their first choice.

Bucking the establishment, in short, is what is known in the Pentagon as counterproductive. Moreover, it is one of those things that is, in the British phrase, "not done." The atmosphere of gentlemanly camaraderie is carefully nurtured by the establishment members, most of whom are men of considerable personal charm. When Senator DODD attacked the Senate leadership, he was made to feel, by his own account, like a skunk at a lawn party. A clubbable club member simply does not attack the people who run his club.

What is more, the southerners and their conservative allies are by and large a lot abler and smarter and more unified than the liberals.

"The damn liberals," says Majority Whip HUBERT HUMPHREY, himself the Senate's leading liberal, "they just don't understand power—all they understand is sentiment. After all, politics is just the way you spell power, but the liberals think power is sinful."

Another liberal Senator agrees with HUMPHREY: "Power is like sex, if you think it's sinful, you don't enjoy it and you're not much good at it." Again and again the liberals of the Presidential party, mistaking sentiment for power, play straight into the hands of the establishment party.

The relentless verbosity of Senator WAYNE MORSE in the foreign aid debate, for example, dovetailed nicely with the anti-civil-rights strategy of the southerners. And the liberals on the House Judiciary Committee very nearly scuttled all chance for civil rights legislation by insisting on an ultraliberal bill which could not possibly pass.

There is another element in the equation, and that is the power of the Presidency. At the beginning of his first term President Kennedy had a key decision to make. Should he try to lick the establishment, or should

he try to "jine 'em"? He decided on the latter course. In terms of the political mathematics, this was a sensible strategy—the administration badly needed southern votes, especially in the House.

An essential if unspoken part of the strategy was to rise above the principles expressed in the Democratic platform and skirt the civil rights issue. Even before the Negro revolt last summer, the congressional machinery was slowing down. When the Negroes took to the streets, the President decided that their revolt could be contained only by giving the Negroes a strong civil rights bill. When the civil rights bill was accordingly introduced last summer, the southerners reacted like Samson in the temple. To defeat civil rights they risk bringing the whole structure of the congressional institution crashing about their ears.

No southerner will admit it for the record, but the southern strategy is to delay not only the civil rights bill itself but anything else that can be delayed. Since the South dominates the establishment, and the establishment controls the congressional machinery, the machinery has come almost to a dead stop.

The machinery cannot be absolutely halted. Larry O'Brien, the President's able chief of staff for Congress, is no doubt right when he predicts that Congress will eventually pass both the tax cut and civil rights legislation. But when? And what kind of legislation?

The President first proposed a tax cut in August 1962. No doubt he will get some sort of tax cut in 1964. But it will be short of virtually all the administration's proposals for closing tax loopholes, and in other ways it will bear only a distant family resemblance to the original Kennedy tax program. And something is obviously wrong with our system of Government when it takes the legislative branch 18 months or more to get around to voting on the basic program of the executive branch.

The power of the establishment is, in fact, an essentially negative power. Since World War II only a single piece of really major legislation—the Taft-Hartley law—has originated wholly in Congress. To be sure, when the President and the establishment agree, as in the case of the railroad crisis or the nuclear test ban, Congress can act expeditiously. When they do not agree, the establishment has the power to stage what Walter Lippmann has called a furtive and degenerate form of the filibuster. The establishment's power is the power to delay and emasculate.

The result is a catatonic Congress and a frustrated Executive. No doubt there are those who like it that way. They may even be a majority. "We're in the era of physiological politics," says HUBERT HUMPHREY. "Empty stomach, full head; full stomach, empty head." As long as most stomachs are full, people don't want to think about politics. "The country's fat, dumb, and happy," says another Senator. "Most people would just as soon we did nothing but talk."

Among those who see no need for any major change in the way Congress operates is Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, the most important establishment Republican. "The American Congress is like an old waterlogged scow," says DIRKSEN, paraphrasing Fisher Ames, a Congressman of an earlier era. "It doesn't go far. It doesn't go fast. But it doesn't sink."

Maybe so, but the feeling is beginning to be widespread in Congress that the old scow is getting altogether too waterlogged for comfort, and that something has got to be done to make sure it doesn't sink. There are more proposals for reforming Congress than there are Congressmen. Most of them originate with the liberals, and most are concerned with changing the rules in such a way as to break the grip of the establishment on the congressional machinery.

The more sensible liberals themselves agree that in the way Congress operates there is much that is either admirable or unavoidable. Most Senators see no practical substitute for the seniority system. There is even much to be said for the filibuster. And it is surely better to have the Senate operate like a club than like a snakepit. "One thing I didn't realize when I came here," says HUBERT HUMPHREY. "You have to have rules. You have to have tradition."

This is true. But rules and tradition should help Congress to function, not prevent it from functioning. MIKE MANSFIELD, in his mild-mannered way, states the heart of the matter. "A President has a right," says MANSFIELD rather plaintively, "to expect reasonably prompt consideration of any major proposal." In short, if the reputation of the Congress is to be restored, the power to delay and emasculate must be limited.

Obviously the southerners have every right to fight like tigers against the President's civil rights program. For that matter, Democratic Senators like GORE and PROXMIRE have every right to fight like tigers against his tax program, on the grounds that it is a "rich man's tax bill." But the duly elected representatives of the people, after due consideration, should also have a right to vote, one way or the other. What is needed is to find some way to make certain that Congress will vote within a reasonable time limit—60 days? Ninety days? Six months?—on major Presidential proposals.

The establishment will fight to the death any change in the rules which would limit its powers. But unless he is willing to accept frustration and deadlock for as long as he is President, Kennedy is going to have to rally the Presidential party and fight back. What is at stake is not only the power of the President to lead but the respect of the country for its Congress. That respect is being rapidly eroded, and for good reason. Like a nonfighting soldier, a nonlegislating legislature is inherently contemptible.

---

[From the New York Times Magazine, Dec. 8, 1963]

IT IS THE PEOPLE WHO FACE THE TEST

(By Tom Wicker)

"Before my term has ended," John Kennedy told Congress on January 30, 1961, "we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure. The outcome is by no means certain."

Mr. Kennedy could not know then how soon his term would end. But the test he foretold, the uncertainty he foresaw, may now be upon us. That is not just because an assassin's unspeakable deed has placed the Presidential Government of the United States in the hands of Lyndon Baines Johnson of Texas.

It is because the shots fired that day in Dallas have not altered by one iota the 20th-century alienation between Mr. Johnson's office and a Congress that has steadily lost its status as a coequal branch and become more nearly an opposition.

Can Lyndon Johnson make Presidential Government work in tandem with that opposition? Can any man? Will Government and opposition grind together in inevitable deadlock, as they seemed to be doing the last months of John Kennedy's Presidency?

To our grandfathers, in what the French called La Belle Epoque of 50 years ago, the question might have seemed absurd. In the 19th century upon which their lives and views were built, the President and Congress were roughly compatible partners in Government. Operating in constitutional equality and in a democracy that was raw, vigorous, expanding, and self-assertive, their problems produced at worst alternating periods of supremacy and balance.

When strong Executives like Jefferson and Jackson, or national emergencies, made the Presidency paramount for a time, the natural suspicions and asserted interests of the people forced Congress swiftly to reassert itself. If lackadaisical Presidents left the field to Congress and to colliding interests and parties in the melancholy twilight of the 1850's, national interest made it necessary for Abraham Lincoln to emerge in the 1860's as the strongest, most assertive President the Nation ever has had.

Overall, popular self-government through an elected Congress was not far from a fact. Landmarks of national policy—the Homestead Act, for instance, or the Sherman Antitrust Act or the Missouri Compromise—originated more often in Congress than in the White House. The great issues of that century—slavery, secession, the tariff, currency, industrial development, the westward expansion—were internal and personal. They immediately touched the people, who could respond vigorously and directly to a Congress capable of comprehending these problems.

But in the 20th century, matters largely have been taken out of the hands of the people and their Congress. Popular self-government is no longer a fact; it only remains a faith. Presidential government has taken its place.

No longer is this a country of isolated pockets of population, each reasonably self-sufficient, united only for external protection and internal convenience, sheltered behind its oceans. Giant industries and giant transportation have linked it into an economic whole and such giants require equitable control that only powerful national government can exert. The wealth and power of the Nation, of necessity, have had to be projected into a world made small by communications, and particularly into the power vacuum left by the decline of the old European empires.

Four massive crises in this century—two World Wars, the great depression, the cold war—have had to be met with national power. The colossal concerns of modern technology, from superhighways to space exploration, demand colossal government, both for financing and execution; what private interests are capable of developing, say, communications satellites or a supersonic passenger aircraft? A Military Establishment capable of exerting conventional and nuclear power in two hemispheres and across all oceans dwarfs the biggest of private combines.

Congress, hierarchically managed, responsible to hundreds of jealous constituencies, cumbersome in organization and procedure, heir to the conflicting claims and prejudices of numerous lesser interests, is not the body to manage such affairs. For these are matters of national power, and that is preeminently the President's to wield. He alone has the direct responsibility and the autonomy to view such problems in a national light. He alone has the ability to mobilize the national force, determine priorities, expend while preserving the national resources—all with a view to the national interest.

As a result the President has become Commander in Chief, the military director of foreign policy, chief legislator, chief appropriator (the national interest he defines determines whether the budget shall be $50 billion or $90 billion; it is left to Congress only to say whether it shall be $90 billion or $89 billion), strongest influence on revenue and taxes, most effective shaper of public opinion, chief architect of the practical forms of its expression, chief administrator, even, in a sense, chief justice. For as the President devises means to act as necessity requires him to, as he shapes a public climate that affects the judicial attitude, he gives the Constitution itself much of its contemporary meaning—and its contemporary meaning must change as the times change.

But what has this left for Congress? As the national power—the power of the Presidency—has increased, it has inevitably imposed itself upon the local powers, the local interests, the local beliefs and attitudes, of which the National Legislature is made up. And as those local interests and powers have resisted the growth of national power, their opposition has become centered in Congress.

Thus the great shift in American government that came to a climax in the 20th century can be stated with some precision. The proponent forces of all major governing steps are the President and the administration, with some impetus from the courts; the opponent force is Congress.

Since Congress retains its constitutional powers and has armed itself with formidable institutional weapons over the years, the contest is by no means one-sided. In Mr. Kennedy's years Congress thwarted him often—on farm policy, aid to education, and important phases of foreign aid, to mention a few. On tax reduction and civil rights, battles yet to be won or lost, Congress had become, at his death, a powerful, glacial resistance.

What basically has happened is a 20th-century magnification of the split personality of the American system, reflected in the dual roles of the American voter. He is a member of the President's national constituency, a citizen of the Nation. He is also one of the people, a resident along the Wabash, or the Columbia or the Suwannee, a member of one of the 535 local constituencies of Congress. There is in him an impulse to follow the President, the leader; there is in him also an equal and sometimes opposite impulse to assert the mystic power of the people to define their own immediate interests and guide their own destinies—to resist the creeping control of their lives and affairs that they sense the national power to be assuming.

It is easy to fix the blame for the resulting deadlock and delay upon Congress. It is speckled with men of irresponsible power, provincial ideas, baseless suspicions. Besides, the idea of national interest expressed by the President has the ring of patriotism and selflessness; the notion of local interest, so often acted upon by Congress, smacks of the pork barrel and the gravy train. So the case against Congress is being passionately made, these days, in something like the following overall terms:

Senescence: The deadly conjunction of the seniority system with the large number of one-party districts and States. Only about 125 congressional districts are truly competitive between the parties. In 1962 only 67 new Members were elected to any of the 435 seats in the House of Representatives. The retention of the same old faces, year after year, session after session, makes the seniority system a deadening institution, a guarantee that youth of the physical, mental, or spiritual varieties shall not often be served.

In 1961 President Kennedy, with his great charm, recalled amusingly his early indoctrination into the hierarchical life in Congress. At a banquet in Phoenix honoring the indomitable Senator CARL HAYDEN, who at 84, was getting ready to run again, Mr. Kennedy recalled his first talk with the Arizonian as follows:

"After I had been in the Senate about 2 months in 1953, I got up to take part in the debate as a new Member. And, after speaking for a few minutes, I sat down near Senator HAYDEN and said, 'Senator, what's the difference between the Senate as you knew it and now?'

"And the Senator said, 'New Members did not speak in those days.'

"So I went back to my seat."

Localism: The charge that Members are too bound to their own localities and its needs, too intent upon taking home a Federal grant or a new space center, too callous—as a result—of the national interest to recognize the President's greater ability to define that interest, and the necessity for him to act upon it.

Trickery: The charge that congressional rules of procedure (constitutionally sanctified only by the founders' laconic statement that each House may determine its own) are designed for more Machiavellian purposes than that of insuring order.

One is to permit delay of a piece of proposed legislation until it can be watered down, buried, torn to shreds or caused to lose its effectiveness. The other is to give single Members, or power blocs or coalitions of them a fighting chance to defeat it, even when there is majority sentiment for it.

These specific charges against Congress blend into one basic indictment—that it fiddles while Rome burns, that it is not responsive to the Nation's needs, that it prevents or harasses the passage of needed national legislation.

Congress undoubtedly is guilty on all counts. But the reason—perhaps as sweeping and as oversimplified as the charges—is not that Congress is a deliberate structure of ignoble congressional potentates, but that it is a natural outgrowth of a political system that rests on States and districts and their less-than-national interests, all clamoring to be heard, protected, advanced.

For instance, as huge urban areas in an increasing number of States come to dominate senatorial (statewide) elections as well as presidential elections, the Senate, like the giant of national power, increasingly is influenced by the same urban areas and their interests; in current political jargon, the Senate becomes more "liberal." And, as the Senate moves more nearly into line with the Presidential wish and the national power, the House, its local districts less reflective of urban growth and national trends, becomes the bulwark of congressional opposition to national power.

As if to multiply its resistance, the districts that make it up are turning more and more in upon themselves and sending the same old faces and attitudes to the House. An average of 96 new Members entered it after each election from 1940 through 1948, but in 1960 and 1962 an average of only 65 new Members was elected.

The night before President Kennedy died, he heard Democratic Representative ALBERT THOMAS go to the heart of the matter. At a dinner meeting of his Texas supporters, Mr. THOMAS, one of the most powerful men in the House, told them buntly, "You are my boss." Mr. Kennedy thereupon paid homage to Mr. THOMAS for his services to the Nation, but Mr. THOMAS had left no doubt where lay the real power over his actions and attitudes.

Representative HOWARD SMITH of Virginia expanded on the point in a House debate in 1961:

"When I am asked to pledge aid to the passage of any resolution or bill in this House that I am conscientiously opposed to, I would not yield my conscience and my right to vote in this House to any person or any Member or under any conditions. If there is any other Member here who thinks he ought to yield his conscience and the views of his constituency to the will of somebody, then he ought to vote the other way."

It is not only that the typical Member of Congress often feels impelled to reflect his constituency; it is more nearly that his own views, interests and prejudices are shaped largely by the nature and environment of that constituency.

Moreover, that constituency in modern times makes appalling demands upon him as its personal servant as well as its political representative. One example is the insistent demand that he produce the goods of prosperity—defense contracts, power projects, Government installations. Another is the astronomical volume of correspondence that spews daily upon his desk, dealing with everything from private immigration bills to his latest remarks on farm prices. These demands derive directly from the vast power and influence of the Federal Government upon private life in America. As a result, only the most able, conscientious Member can be an enlightened legislator after he has performed all his constituent services.

Thus, localism is built into Congress and is only exacerbated by the rapid growth of the giant of national power. Similarly, seniority (which, to give it its due, can produce committee chairmen of skill and effectiveness, like WILBUR MILLS and J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas) has its natural causes; even if there were in Congress no hard-and-fast seniority system, senior men, as they do in every organization, would arrogate leadership and privilege to themselves. And seniority can only become a powerful factor when one-party States and districts give it to their Representatives.

Granted that congressional rules give great power to minorities and individuals; so does the Constitution of the United States, which is built on the principle of limited powers. The less-than-national interests of a democracy surely should have means, at least a fighting chance, to make their case against a national interest that could swallow them. And if any man or section wants its interests protected in Congress, it must acquiesce in a system that will permit at one time or another, the protection of all members and sections. Big-city members who fume when, say, urban renewal is hamstrung, do not hesitate to fight farm subsidies, with any weapon at hand.

It is, finally, oversimplification to say that Congress prevents—irrelevantly, because callous Members want to do so—the passage of legislation demanded by the country. More often, that legislation is being demanded by the national interest, a palpably different thing.

The case of Federal aid to education is instructive. A recent poll showed that 59 percent of the population favored such aid, as a general proposition. When the proposition begins to be examined in Congress, however, that sufficient majority falls rapidly apart. Should the aid go to Catholic schools, too? Should it go to segregated schools, too? Should poor Mississippi or populous New York get more per child? Should the money go for teachers' salaries or just for buildings? Who controls it? Who, then, controls the schools?

In 1960 the House Committee on Rules killed an aid-to-education bill after differing versions of it had been passed in both House and Senate. Outrageous? Maybe—but there is no evidence that if the committee had stood aside, southern Senators would have accepted the House version, which would have prevented aid-to-segregated schools; or that the House would have dropped its insistence on that provision; and if either had happened, President Eisenhower might well have vetoed the bill, anyway.

In such complex situations, Congress—malapportioned as it is, burdened with seniority, bound by procedures and provincialism—may represent the divisions and hestitations of the people rather accurately. When the national power demands an action, a strong and vocal opposition almost always arises among varied less-than-national interests of the country and it is not always the same opposition. Today's proponent of one action often is tomorrow's dedicated opponent of another; one man's obstructionism is another's fearless stand for the right as he or his constituency sees it.

Congress, like the people, does learn and grow slowly. The social security bill was enacted in a terriffic struggle in 1935, to the accompaniment of cries of Socialist doom. In 1962 a far-reaching modernization of welfare state procedures attracted almost no attention as it whizzed through both Houses

When a Kennedy bill to permit voluntary limitation of feed-grain production reached Congress in 1961 it was damned as dictatorship; by 1962 when mandatory limitation was proposed the former critics of the voluntary plan rapidly discovered its considerable merit. The thalidomide scandal revived a drug control bill that had been bogged down. Even the southern Senators, in 1957 and 1960, found reason to compromise around the edges of the civil rights controversy; they may well do so again in early 1964. And the reluctance of Congress to act on that issue may well be reflective of the plain hesitation and fears of the people themselves.

It is true that some means ought to be found to lighten the deadening hand of seniority, and that the rules of procedure ought to be simplified. Apportionment of the House ought to be more equitable. But those are mere truths, not solutions.

For to reform the institutions of Congress, assuming that could be done, would be to change its way of functioning, but not the reasons it functions that way. If that happened, a Congress still based on States and districts and local interests, many of them one-party, would have to find means to function differently to the same end—the representation of the less-than-national interests of the country against the growth of national power.

After a jungle of outmoded committees was cleared away by the La Follette-Monroney Act of 1946, it was not long before a jungle of subcommittees arose. If unlimited debate were destroyed at a stroke, the necessity for State and local representatives to protect their own interests and that of their constituencies by allowing others the means to protect theirs would eventually result in a new usage or rule to replace the filibuster. The revolt against the dictatorship of Speaker Cannon in 1910 produced the autocracy of the House Committee on Rules. To improve apportionment would be to send to the House a somewhat altered set of local interests, only marginally more representative of the cut and shape of the whole people—and blending them not at all into some kind of national whole.

Thus the real test that approaches, which John Kennedy foresaw, is not a test of the Presidency. It is not a test of Congress. It is not Lyndon Johnson who is on trial, nor the men of the House and Senate. It is not only the executive and the legislative branches that are approaching deadlock.

It is the people of the United States who face the test. It is their ability to resolve, in a sprawling and immensely varied continent, in a system that was designed to limit all forms of power, the underlying clash of national interest and less-than-national interest—of national power and local resistance.

This does not mean that local interest or resistance to the national power should disappear; often that resistance is needed, and in any case local interest is inevitable. It means that if the American people are going to make their form of government work, in a land so full of conflicting interests and diverse beliefs, they will have to develop a sharper and surer sense of what is truly important in American life, of what the real national necessity is, of what is fundamental to their local interests and what is meretricious.

Certainly Presidential leadership, wise and articulate, will be vital to that task. Probably congressional reform would lessen the conflict. But if Americans would reach the "new American greatness" Lyndon Johnson has envisioned, they will have to begin at home—right where the trouble lies.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to several of the statements made by Mr. Wicker. The first statement is as follows:

Thus the great shift in American Government that came to a climax in the 20th century can be stated with some precision. The proponent forces of all major governing steps are the President and the administration, with some impetus from the court; the opponent force is Congress.

Mr. President, that statement has been my observation, which I have reiterated many times on the floor of the Senate. I hope that in the foreseeable future some progress will be made in changing the Congress from an opponent force of the President of the United States to a cooperative force.

The second statement to which I should like to call attention in Mr. Wicker's article is as follows:

Congress is speckled with men of irresponsible power, provincial ideas, baseless suspicions. Besides, the idea of national interest expressed by the President has the ring of patriotism and selflessness; the notion of local interest, so often acted upon by Congress, smacks of the pork barrel and the gravy train. So the case against Congress is being passionately made, these days——

Mr. Wicker continues with a series of reasons why he feels a case is being made against Congress, the first of which follows:

Senescence: The deadly conjunction of the seniority system with the large number of one-party districts and States. Only about 125 congressional districts are truly competitive between the parties.

In my judgment, there are only 77. I believe this is a very serious matter. Returning to the quotation:

The retention of the same old faces, year after year, session after session, makes the seniority system a deadening institution, a guarantee that youth of the physical, mental, or spiritual varieties shall not often be served.

There are other pertinent quotes in Mr. Wicker's stimulating article. I do not agree with all his comments, but I suggest that there is in them, meat for further study by all Members of both Houses. I urge all Senators to read the articles.

One more thought and I shall have concluded. I do hope that all who hear and read my words will take note of this fact: I love the Senate. I have been happier in this body than I have ever been in my life. I hope to stay for at least another 5 years—and, who can tell, perhaps more. My efforts to urge all Senators to take steps to reform the rules, practices and procedures of the Senate are being made, not because I wish to tear the Congress down, but because I wish to build it up. I love this body, and I wish to see it better than it is.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. I feel that we have reached a constitutional crisis. Each Senator has a responsibility to the institution of which he is a part. Senators exercise that responsibility in different ways, which is not only our right but our duty.

I close by reiterating the strong feeling that I love this body. Anything I say against it is merely a result of that love. I cannot say that I come like a parent for the parents were the Founding Fathers. But any criticism I make of this institution is made because I love it so much.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who is the Mr. Wicker to whom the Senator referred?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Wicker is a reporter on the New York Times. I am sure the Senator would recognize him if he saw him. He has been covering events in Congress for a good many years. In my opinion, he is quite an able man.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no quarrel with his competence or with his ability. His article stands as the opinion of one individual.

Mr. CLARK. It is an opinion which is shared by one Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. But insofar as I could determine, I do not share that viewpoint at all.

Mr. CLARK. I would not expect the Senator from Illinois to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do share with the Senator from Pennsylvania a deep affection for this body, and in the same proportion that he criticizes, I find myself impelled to defend the Senate. I shall do so on every possible occasion.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator does so with great eloquence, if not with complete conviction, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

---

## AUTHORITY TO COMPEL ATTENDANCE AND TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES BEFORE COMMISSION TO REPORT ON ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on page 12 of the calendar of business there is listed Senate Joint Resolution 137, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 137 be taken from the table and be laid before the Senate for immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 137) 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 evidence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it develops that the joint resolution is almost identical in verbiage with one introduced earlier by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. Therefore, I deem it appropriate, and I ask unanimous consent, that his name be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution.

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

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution having been read the third time the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 137) was passed, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) for the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "Commission" means the Commission appointed by the President by Executive Order 11130, dated November 29, 1963.

(b) The Commission, or any member of the Commission when so authorized by the Commission, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Commission. The Commission, or any member of the Commission or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purpose, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from anyplace within the United States at any designated place of hearing.

(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under subsection (b), any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

(d) Process and papers of the Commission, its members, agent, or agency, may be served either upon the witness in person or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, its members, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(e) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to a subpena, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture (except demotion or removal from office) for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

(f) All process of any court to which application may be made under this Act may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found.

---

## TRIBUTE TO HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday in the Temple Emanu-El, New York City, some 2,200 people mourned the death of Herbert H. Lehman, former Governor of New York, a former Member of this body, and an outstanding American.

But in a larger sense, the death of this man was mourned by thousands not only in the State he served so well but also throughout the country and the world. Herbert H. Lehman was many things—millionaire, banker, Governor, Senator, philanthropist, reformer, and religious leader. But most of all, he was a humanitarian in the best and most noble sense of this word.

He was a rich man who, throughout his political career, was the champion of those who had no money, no status, and virtually no chance of gaining either. He was the kind of man who could retire from an extremely vigorous and fruitful business career only to take up an extremely vigorous and fruitful career as Governor of his beloved State and finally, as a Member of this body. When he left the Senate, for a much-deserved rest, he proceeded to bring his many talents and his vigor to countless philanthropic and religious causes. In the intervening years, he guided United Nations relief efforts after World War II. In the last days of his life, he still found time and strength to undertake a crusade for reform of his own political party in New York.

These organizations and his fellow-reformers will miss him. We will all miss him, for a man like Herbert Lehman comes all too seldom to the center of the stage of the American life.

Mr. President, I believe it is fair to say that Governor and Senator Lehman earned the love, affection, respect, high distinction, and regard of the people of New York and the people of the United States through his long and fruitful life, and that this was shown in a most appropriate way yesterday in the solemn services conducted by Rabbi Julius Mark, at which the eulogy was delivered by U.S. District Court Judge Edward Weinfeld.

I believe all Senators will be interested in the events which took place, and the history of the life of Governor and Senator Lehman, who was extolled as a great humanitarian and public servant, quite properly, at the solemn services. I ask unanimous consent that various newspaper articles and editorials in tribute to Senator Lehman be 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. 6, 1963]

### HERBERT H. LEHMAN

A second riband of mourning now hangs on the American flag. For the death of Herbert H. Lehman closes the active career of an indomitable national and international servant. As Governor of New York, U.S. Senator and Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, his life and activities soared in example and significance far beyond the borders of this, his native city.

He lived a private and a public life that moved in a straight and true line. In the richest sense of the words, he was a liberal and humanitarian. Against the enemies of the Republic, he saw service in the U.S. Army in the First World War and resigned from the governorship in the Second World War to direct foreign relief operations for the State Department. Wherever human distress existed, all over the globe, there could be found Herbert Lehman, saving lives as a representative of the best instincts of the United States and the United Nations.

Reform, sound administration and courage marked his political career. He entered politics at the side of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, serving one as campaign chairman and the other as Lieutenant Governor. As Governor for 10 years from 1932 until America's entry into the war, he brought the State distinction and honor during difficult years for the people and Nation. All this time he was a stalwart New Deal Democrat, closely affiliated with the programs of President Roosevelt.

The refinements of the Fair Deal nationally saw him in the service of New York as U.S. Senator, often as a quiet but not small voice speaking for legislation favoring all Americans. In Washington, he became the conscience of the Senate. When others quavered before the onslaught of McCarthyism, it was Herbert Lehman who offered the resolution for the removal of the Wisconsin demagog from his committee chairmanships. On matters close to his heart—immigration to continue the American dream and civil rights to uphold the American Constitution—he battled relentlessly against the troops of evil.

Together with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman continued to stand for the reform movement in State and National Democratic politics. After he had passed his 80th birthday, he could be found in rain and cold carrying on his crusade for political decency in every section of the city. At the end of his life he was still standing in the forefront of many charitable, welfare and humanitarian causes. This great man of private heart and public courage was not just a symbol, but an activist of noble aims and accomplishments to his last moments. These live on.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HE SERVED THE PEOPLE WELL

The death of Herbert H. Lehman leaves all of us poorer. For in our time there have been few public servants so universally respected, admired and beloved.

The life of the former Governor and Senator was a long one. It is hard to remember now that he was first elected to office as long ago as 1928, as Franklin D. Roosevelt's Lieutenant Governor. But he was then already

50, a man of great wealth turning from private pursuits to new and broader arenas.

In this career Mr. Lehman was four times elected Governor of New York, and later twice chosen to the U.S. Senate. During the war he served as the first head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. And in recent years, when he was already in his eighties, Mr. Lehman led the reform storm in the local Democratic Party.

Thus he covered more than a third of a century in city, State, National and international performance, all of it done with courage and competence.

The strength of Herbert H. Lehman was in character. Few public figures were so consistently on the right side of the great issues. He was a social idealist, yet also an industrious man of action. He stirred few antagonisms, but in his undramatic way he got things done. This is perhaps why one hardly thinks of Mr. Lehman as a politician, although he was this State's prime vote getter.

There was about him the assurance of nonpartisanship, of quiet but determined conscience, that made for popularity. He knew what was right, and did it. That he did it so unspectacularly is probably the true mark of Lehman quality, although in later years he became increasingly a bold crusader.

But the important thing is that at all times Herbert H. Lehman served the public interest well. By spirit, integrity and efficiency, he inspired trust and devotion. And he gave of himself in many ways to the very end of his admirable life. This is an example to cherish.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

HERBERT LEHMAN, 85, DIES; EX-GOVERNOR AND SENATOR

(By Robert Alden)

Herbert H. Lehman, a towering figure in the liberal political movement in the United States and a noted philanthropist, died yesterday morning at his home after suffering a heart attack. He was 85 years old.

Mr. Lehman served as Governor of New York for 10 years and as a U.S. Senator for 8. President Franklin D. Roosevelt referred to him as "that good right arm of mine."

Mr. Lehman also was Director of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration after World War II. The organization aided more than 500 million war victims.

Governor Rockefeller proclaimed a 30-day period of mourning to mark the death of Mr. Lehman. Flags on all State buildings, already flying at halfstaff because of the death of President Kennedy, will remain at halfstaff until January 5.

Mr. Lehman was stricken as he was about to leave his apartment at 820 Park Avenue to go to Washington to receive the Nation's highest peacetime award to a civilian—the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

With 30 others, he had been chosen for this honor by President Kennedy. The award was to have been presented by President Johnson at a White House ceremony today.

Yesterday, President Johnson praised Mr. Lehman as a "distinguished leader who ably and effectively served his State and Nation."

He said that perhaps the best words that he could use to describe him were contained in the citation that was to have accompanied the award: "Citizen and statesman, he has used wisdom and compassion as the tools of the Government and has made politics the highest form of public service."

In preparing for the trip to Washington yesterday, Mr. Lehman, always an early riser, was dressed and packed and had finished breakfast when he was stricken in his bedroom at 9 a.m. He had had no history of heart disease.

Although he had suffered a broken hip in a fall last February, members of his family said that he had been recovering well from that accident and had appeared to be in generally good health.

President Johnson's tribute was one of the first of a multitude of tributes to Mr. Lehman—tributes that cut across partisan politics.

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon said:

"Senator Lehman was one of the kindest men I have ever known. I'm sure that one of many tributes members of the two parties can pay to him, is that he had the quality of never growing old."

Governor Rockefeller said: "He was truly a beloved figure in the affairs of our State and Nation, an outstanding Governor and U.S. Senator, a humanitarian whose works spanned oceans and continents to reach the hearts and raise the hopes of men and women throughout the world."

Mayor Wagner called Mr. Lehman "a father to our whole city and State."

"I have never known a better man, a kindlier man, or a more courageous man," the mayor said.

BODY TO BE AT CHAPEL

Mr. Lehman's body will lie at the Universal Funeral Chapel, Lexington Avenue and 52d Street, today and tomorrow. The public will be able to pay their last respects from 1 to 10 p.m. on Friday and from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. on Saturday.

A funeral service will be conducted at Temple Emanu-El, Fifth Avenue and 61st Street, on Sunday at 1 p.m. Burial will be private.

Mr. Lehman's family asked that floral tributes be omitted and donations made instead to charitable works.

Although best known because of his career in public service, Mr. Lehman was a philanthropist whose charitable activities encompassed a broad spectrum of human needs.

A cofounder in 1914 of what later became the American Joint Distribution Committee, Mr. Lehman gave generously and often anonymously to hundreds, perhaps thousands, of charities around the world.

The money involved probably ran into the millions, but even close members of the Lehman family would not venture a guess as to how much.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

EX-GOVERNOR ONE OF KEY FIGURES WHO SHAPED IMAGE OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN STATE—REFORM MARKED 35-YEAR CAREER—SPENT ACTIVE RETIREMENT LEADING FIGHT AGAINST ORGANIZATION IN CITY

(By Layhmond Robinson)

Herbert Henry Lehman was one of the master builders of the Democratic Party in the State.

After Franklin D. Roosevelt, he was one of three men who wielded the greatest influence in shaping the philosophy and course of action of State party affairs in this century.

The others were Alfred E. Smith and Senator Robert F. Wagner.

Though born to wealth, Mr. Lehman was a powerful instrument in creating the image of the Democratic Party as the champion of the little man.

His career was linked inseparably with that of Mr. Roosevelt. In 1928 he first won election to office as Lieutenant Governor on the ticket that put Mr. Roosevelt in the Governor's mansion.

In 1932 he was elected Governor at the same time his old friend, Mr. Roosevelt, was elected President. As Mr. Roosevelt ushered in the New Deal Governor Lehman ushered in the little New Deal in the State.

He remained in Albany for 14 years, 10 as Governor, during which he greatly expanded the role of the State government as Mr. Roosevelt had revolutionized it on the Federal level.

PRESSED SOCIAL REFORM

He pushed through the legislature a broad program of social reform, including measures creating unemployment insurance, old-age benefits, public housing, regulation of utilities, the State labor relations board, and laws to protect the workingman.

The Lehman political career is studded with paradoxes.

He entered politics as a wealthy man, yet his name became a synonym for the rights of the common man.

He was a dull, austere campaigner, yet he was elected to more high offices in the State than anyone else, serving two terms as Lieutenant Governor, four as Governor, and 8 years as U.S. Senator.

He came from a family with a southern background, yet he was a champion of Negro rights, and was the most persistent civil rights advocate in the Senate when he served there from 1949 to 1956.

He had the "handicap" of being a Jew when he ran for public office in his early career. Yet, in 1934, he piled up the greatest plurality—800,000—ever achieved by a victorious candidate for Governor in the State's history.

ACTIVE RETIREMENT

He "retired" from active politics at the end of his Senate term in 1956, but was in the thick of the State's political battles almost to the day of his death, as organizer and strategist of the citywide reform movement.

Two things explain Mr. Lehman's popularity with the voters over the last four decades. One was his link to Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal, which gave him an almost mystical voter appeal.

The other was what one of his political opponents once described as his absolute sincerity.

He was an unprepossessing man who spoke in a deliberate, unemotional voice. Yet he established instant communication with his audiences, a communication that caused him to win every office he ran for except one—his first bid for the Senate in 1946 against Irving M. Ives.

Such spectacular moves as appointing Thomas E. Dewey, a Republican, as special prosecutor in 1935 to clean up rackets in Democratic Manhattan, further marked Governor Lehman in the minds of the voters as a man sincerely devoted to the public interest. He later defeated Mr. Dewey in the gubernatorial race in 1938.

His background as a successful investment banker was no handicap during the depression.

Applying tough, business techniques to the management of State government, he converted a State budget deficit of $106 million which he found when he took office in 1932 into a surplus of $80 million when he left in 1942.

His stock as the principal liberal spokesman in the Senate went up each time he clashed with Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and other apostles of the right wing, and he often found himself a lonely crusader on the civil rights issue. In this period he was often called the conscience of the Senate.

His death casts a cloud over the future of the Democratic reform movement, whose guiding genius he had been. Even at the age of 83, his vigorous campaigning as reform chieftain played a major role in Mayor Wagner's upset victory 2 years ago over the regular Democratic organization. His influ-

ence in party affairs and his appeal to the voters never waned.

---

LEHMAN IS EXTOLLED AS HUMANITARIAN AND STATESMAN

(Following are tributes to former Gov. Herbert H. Lehman that were expressed yesterday:)

President Johnson: "Perhaps his best epitaph can be the citation on the Presidential Medal of Freedom which he was to receive here tomorrow: 'Citizen and statesman, he has used wisdom and compassion as the tools of government and has made politics the highest form of public service.' "

Governor Rockefeller: "He was truly a beloved figure in the affairs of our State and Nation, an outstanding Governor and U.S. Senator, an humanitarian whose works spanned oceans and continents to reach the hearts and raise the hopes of men and women throughout the world. Mrs. Rockefeller joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Lehman and the family. We hope the knowledge of Governor Lehman's extraordinary contributions to humanity in a long and fruitful life will bring consolation to all who loved him."

Mayor Wagner, who was attending the Conference on Automation, Education, and Collective Bargaining in San Juan, P.R.: "He was a father to our whole city and State. I have never known a better man, a kindlier man, or a more courageous man. The people have lost a dedicated and brilliant champion, a spokesman for all that is best in our Nation. His like will not come this way soon again. His figure will loom like a mountain in the history of our city—a landmark of greatness for the future to steer by."

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS: "I think it fair to say that Mr. Lehman, as Governor, Senator, and leading citizen of the State of New York, was one of the most distinguished New Yorkers, not only in his own time but in the history of our State."

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING: "He was really a towering figure in the life of our State and Nation, truly a spokesman for all people."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate majority leader: "We missed him when he left and we miss him even more now."

Richard M. Nixon: "Senator Lehman was one of the kindest men I have ever known. I knew him when I served in the Senate and later as Vice President. I'm sure that one of many tributes members of the two parties can pay to him is that he had the quality of never growing old."

Cardinal Spellman, upon being told of the news as he arrived at Idlewild Airport from Rome: "I am terribly sorry."

Rev. Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El: "Innumerable men, women and children of all faiths in many countries suffer the loss of a truly wonderful human being. He was one of the great men of our times because he was an innately good man. He walked with kings but never lost the common touch. He was confirmed in Temple Emanu-El with the class of 1892 and often referred to this experience as one of the high points of his life."

Paul R. Screvane, president of the city council: "As Governor, Senator, philanthropist, and humanitarian there was no task too lowly or too difficult for this kind and phenomenally energetic man. History will record him also as a friend of all people."

Stanley H. Lowell, chairman of the city commission on human rights: "The passing of Herbert H. Lehman, like the death of John F. Kennedy, has taken from each of us a bit of our collective conscience. Equality for all, regardless of race, color, or religion, was Herbert Lehman's lifelong passion."

Abraham D. Beame, city controller: "Our city, State, country, and the entire world have lost a great statesman, an outstanding humanitarian and one who fought until his last breath for good and humane government. Whatever is progressive in New York State government is due largely to the work and effort of Herbert Lehman."

Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair: "He set a standard to which the younger generation may repair and an example to people everywhere of the best in our Nation."

Timothy W. Costello, State chairman of the Liberal Party: "He was a tireless champion of humanitarian ideals. His courage and full measure of devotion to the public good will be solely missed by all Americans concerned with progressive government."

Rev. Dr. Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations: "Herbert Lehman was a giant of social justice. He was a humanitarian, an idealist and a champion of the noblest ideals of a free society."

William M. McKeon, State Democratic chairman: "The impact of this great man will be felt for generations to come, in the United States and in every part of the world where freedom is cherished and the betterment of the lot of peoples in every way is of deep and primary concern."

Joseph Zaretski, minority leader of the State senate: "Here was a humanitarian unselfishly devoting all of his energies to the welfare of the people. He sought nothing in return."

James R. Dumpson, city welfare commissioner: "The little people have lost another great leader."

Fred A. Young, Republican State chairman: He was one of the great public servants of our time and a powerful influence for good long after he lay down his burdens of office.

Edward N. Costikyan, Democratic leader of New York County: Governor Lehman lived a life of happy and devoted service to his community, his State, his country, and to the entire world. He was another of God's unique creatures whose place here on earth will never be filled.

Russell Hemenway, president of the Lexington Democratic Club: We deeply mourn the death of our trusted adviser and friend and our only honorary member.

Harry Van Arsdale, Jr., president of the New York Central Labor Council: We can ill afford the loss of another great humanitarian such as Herbert H. Lehman.

Charles Poletti, former Governor: Forgetful of self-interest, sincere in his modesty, he wished only to serve his fellow man. We are grateful that God blessed him with a long life of service.

Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University: He served both his Nation and the world with wisdom, compassion, and understanding. The Jewish community in particular has lost a great leader.

Edward M. M. Warburg, chairman of the Joint Distribution Committee: He was perhaps the only Jewish leader around whom all sections of the American Jewish community could rally. Many are the causes, both Jewish and nonsectarian, which he aided. The world has been greatly enriched by his presence.

The Reverend Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress: He was a great American and noble Jew who combined in his life and works the thunder for justice and the love of his people reminiscent of the prophets of Jewish history.

Arthur Levitt, State controller: Those of us fortunate enough to know him were inspired by his brilliant leadership, his incisive mind, and his abiding spirit.

Louis J. Lefkowitz, State attorney general: I have never known any man who gave so much of himself to the cause of peace, justice, and mercy.

Edward R. Dudley, Manhattan Borough president: Herbert Lehman has died only today. But his monument long since has been built. It was a monument of legislation he sponsored and encouraged for the benefit of the underprivileged and the oppressed.

Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League: We share with other citizens a deep sense of loss in the passing of a great humanitarian. By his untiring efforts in the cause of equal opportunity and better interracial understanding, he has performed a lasting service to the Nation.

Rabbi Uri Miller, president of the Synagogue Council of America: In his lifetime his record for unswerving devotion to Jewish causes made him the beloved of his people. His courage in battling for the rights of the disadvantaged and persecuted will ever serve as an eternal light for world democracy. Revered by all, his memory will live on to inspire us for generations to come.

A. M. Sonnabend, president of the American Jewish Committee: This giant of social and international justice enriched the entire human family by his presence among us. His public career and private life were supreme witnesses to his belief in the sacredness and divine worth of each human life and in the inalienable rights of every human being. Our most meaningful eulogy would be a rededication to those principles he held so dear.

Joseph F. Carlino, speaker of the State assembly: When Herbert Lehman became New York's 49th Governor he pledged to "give the best that is in me * * * to serve my State and its people well." Before he died, Herbert Lehman redeemed that pledge.

Rev. Dr. Abraham N. Avrutick, president of the Rabbinical Council of America: His passing leaves a void that cannot be filled.

Dore Schary, national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith: We can never forget his fight for civil liberties when he stood virtually alone in the Senate against the nightmare of McCarthyism, or his eloquent advocacy of human rights all the years of his life.

Abe Stark, Brooklyn Borough president: He could have lived a life of relative ease and comfort enjoying the admiration and respect of his fellow citizens in a successful business career. Instead he decided to dedicate his life to help the unfortunate among us.

John M. Bailey, Democratic national chairman: Senator Lehman worked all of his life to strengthen the fabric of American life.

Rabbi Mordecai Kirshblum, president of Religious Zionists of America: The American Jewish community joins with the entire Nation in mourning the passing of one of the greatest statesmen of our century, Senator Herbert Lehman. Senator Lehman was not only a great American citizen, but also an outstanding Jew, as he helped to establish the State of Israel.

Rabbi Israel Mowshowitz, president of the New York Board of Rabbis: The New York Board of Rabbis mourns Governor Lehman. America and the world mourn a great statesman, a wise leader, a man of the people, and devoted proponent of human rights. Governor Lehman gave added stature and new dimensions to the arena of politics. Through his many years of service, through his integrity and selflessness, through his profound humanitarian impulses he renewed our faith in the human potential for good. He was a loyal son of the Jewish faith whose philosophy of life was rooted in Hebraic soil and nurtured by prophetic tradition.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 9, 1963]

JOHNSON AT LEHMAN RITES; 2,000 GUARD HIM ON VISIT—SERVICE IS AT EMANU-EL

(By Robert Alden)

Final tribute was paid yesterday to Herbert H. Lehman at a funeral service attended by President Johnson and other high officials of the Federal, State and city governments.

As Mr. Lehman was being eulogized as a "kind and gentle man, fearless in meeting head-on the forces of hate and bigotry," Secret Service agents stood on the mezzanine level of Temple Emanu-El, their figures silhouetted against the towering stained glass windows of the largest Jewish house of worship in the world.

President Johnson and his wife, along with a large party of public officials from Washington, arrived at the temple, Fifth Avenue and 65th Street, just before 1 p.m., the hour at which the service was to begin.

NEARLY 2,200 IN TEMPLE

Fifteen hundred guests of the Lehman family and 700 members of the public were already seated when the President and Mrs. Johnson were escorted to their seats by David Sarnoff, chairman of the Radio Corporation of America and a trustee of the temple.

In the first pew, with President and Mrs. Johnson, sat Governor Rockefeller, Senator Jacob K. Javits, Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Mayor Wagner, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and Adlai E. Stevenson. Just behind President Johnson sat Chief Justice Earl Warren, Associate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman.

The copper coffin containing the body of Mr. Lehman, former Governor of New York State and former U.S. Senator, was in the sanctuary under a blanket of yellow roses. Sprays of pom-poms and chrysanthemums—yellow, orange and red—were placed to the side and below the coffin.

To the right of the coffin and behind it was an American flag, to the left the flag of the Governor of New York State. Behind each of the flags were the Menorahs, seven-branched candelabra symbolizing the creation of the world in 6 days and the 7th day, the Sabbath, on which the Lord rested.

Directly behind and above the coffin was the Ark containing the Torah, the scrolls of the five books of Moses. Above it burned a perpetual light, known as the Ner Tamid, a symbol of the traditional Jewish belief in the truths contained in the Torah.

Mr. Lehman's widow, Edith, sat in a pew to the left of the Presidential party. With her was her son, John Lehman; her daughter, Mrs. Hilda Jane Wise, and other members of the immediate family.

In addition to the 2,200 persons seated in the main temple and chapel, an overflow of about 1,500 heard the service over a loudspeaker in the Isaac Wise Hall directly below the temple floor.

DR. MARK PRESIDES

The Reverend Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El, entered the sanctuary from the right to preside over the services. He took his place in the pulpit and intoned the 15th Psalm:

"Lord, who shall abide in Thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in Thy holy hill?

"He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart.

"He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour * * *"

Rabbi Mark then turned to Mr. Lehman's favorite prayer and read it in a deep and sonorous voice to the hushed congregation:

"Grant us peace, Thy most precious gift, O Thou eternal source of peace, and enable Israel to be its messenger unto the peoples of the earth. Bless our country that it may ever be a stronghold of peace, and its advocate in the council of nations.

"May contentment reign within its borders, health and happiness within its homes. Strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellowship among the inhabitants of all lands. Plant virtue in every soul, and may the love of Thy name hallow every home and every heart.

"Praised be Thou, O Lord, Giver of peace."

TELLS OF LETTER

Dr. Mark then spoke of a letter Mr. Lehman had written to a boy who had asked whether being Jewish had been a handicap in public life.

"My answer," Mr. Lehman had written, "is that I think any man who is seeking public office and allows his ambition to affect his religious affiliation is not worthy of the confidence of his fellow citizens.

"* * * My advice in a word, is: Never be ashamed of being a Jew. Never try to hide it. Never try to compromise with your convictions because they may not agree with those of the group in which you find yourself."

Rabbi Mark next turned to a favorite poem of the late Governor, a poem titled "Some Time at Eve" and written by Elizabeth Clark:

"Some time at eve when the tide is low
I shall slip my moorings and sail away,
With no response to a friendly hail
Of kindred craft in the busy bay.
In the silent hush of the twilight pale,
When the night stoops down to embrace the day,
And the voices call in the waters' flow—

"Some time at eve when the tide is low,
I shall slip my mooring and sail away.
A few who watched me sail away
Will miss my craft from the busy bay;
Some friendly barks that were anchored near,
Some loving souls that my heart held dear,
In silent sorrow will drop a tear—
But I shall have peacefully furled my sail
In moorings sheltered from storm or gale,
And greeted the friends who have sailed before
O'er the Unknown Sea to the Unseen Shore.

After the reading of the poem, Judge Edward Weinfeld of the U.S. district court stepped to the pulpit to eulogize the late Governor. He said:

"Herbert Lehman had no doubt of the answer to the taunting biblical inquiry—Am I my brother's keeper?

"His life was a decisive affirmative response—man does have a responsibility to his fellow man. * * * The range of his interests in the cause of social justice and the betterment of mankind was without limit. His actions were rooted deeply in his belief in the worth of each individual.

"He knew of no distinction of race, color, or creed. A devoted son and leader of his own faith, he respected all faiths and religions."

Judge Weinfeld made a direct reference to Mr. Lehman's vigorous opposition to the tactics employed by the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy in his Senate investigations. Judge Weinfeld said:

"He deeply felt the responsibility for our freedoms—that whenever those freedoms are threatened, they can be preserved only by forthright and vigorous action, no matter what the personal or political consequences.

"In the dark, suspicious days of our Nation—well within the memory of us all—when fear seemed to have paralyzed most of our leadership, Herbert Lehman dared to stand alone, fighting those that would have destroyed the meaning of our democratic way of life.

"His courage inspired courage in others, and gradually America came back to her senses.

"In those years it was not easy to be a lonely fighter; yet this kind and gentle man was fearless in meeting head on the forces of hate and bigotry."

WIFE'S ROLE LAUDED

Judge Weinfeld told of how the close and loving relationship that Mr. Lehman enjoyed for 54 years with his wife had buoyed him up in time of trouble.

"The soul-trying experiences when he so often fought against ruthless opponents were made more bearable because of Edith's encouragement and support," he said. "This beautiful relationship not only meant everything to them, but was the joy of their friends.

"His works and deeds, the love and affection of a grateful people, remain his lasting tribute. Because of him and his achievements, the world is a better place in which to live.

"This shall be a comfort to his family and friends. Herbert Lehman is forever enshrined in our hearts."

Following the eulogy, Dr. Mark read Tennyson's poem "Crossing the Bar" and then his own prayer-eulogy.

In it he described Mr. Lehman as this "modest, courteous, gallant, dedicated public servant, whose great heart was on fire with a passion for human freedom and who could not countenance prejudice and injustice regardless of who might be the victim."

The rabbi also spoke of the Lehman family's association with the temple, an association of more than a century. Mr. Lehman was confirmed at Temple Emanu-El in 1892; he died last Thursday at the age of 85.

GOD IS ENTREATED

"May God's comfort bring healing," Dr. Mark said, "to his beloved Edith, a devoted companion and a wise counselor who was always at his side; his children, grandchildren and all others bound to him by the golden ties of blood and kinship and precious friendship."

The service ended with Dr. Mark's recitation of the 23d Psalm followed by four lines from "Hamlet":

"Now cracks a noble heart.
Good night, sweet prince, and
Flights of angels sing thee
To thy rest."

Mr. Lehman's coffin then was lifted out of the sanctuary and carried slowly down the long center aisle. Directly behind them walked the members of the immediate family and, behind them, President and Mrs. Johnson and the line of mourners.

In front of the temple, Mrs. Lehman paused and President Johnson joined her, the President embraced and kissed Mrs. Lehman as did Mrs. Johnson. President Johnson talked privately for several moments with Mrs. Lehman.

Then President and Mrs. Johnson walked from the Fifth Avenue entrance to 65th Street where they turned the corner and entered their car.

Mrs. Lehman and the immediate family followed the coffin to the family plot in Kensico Cemetery, Valhalla, N.Y., for the private burial, at which Dr. Mark presided.

---

[From the New York Tribune, Dec. 9, 1963]

LEHMAN MOURNERS LED BY PRESIDENT

(By Robert S. Bird)

Herbert H. Lehman was laid to rest yesterday after a funeral service at Temple Emanu-El which was distinguished by the presence of President and Mrs. Johnson and Attorney General Robert Kennedy, representing the family of the late President, and by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, Mayor Wagner, and a great throng of public figures and other

friends whose names are known to most Americans.

Despite an extraordinary security shield set up to protect President Johnson both inside the temple and all around its site at 5th Avenue and 65th Street, the service was one of impressive dignity and warmth for the former Governor's memory. There wasn't an intruding note to mar any part of it.

Mr. Lehman, four times Governor and for two terms U.S. Senator, died of a heart attack Thursday at his home, 820 Park Avenue, at the age of 85.

He was interred in Kensico Cemetery in Westchester after a private burial service.

More than 2,200 persons filled all pews in the temple except those of the side and rear balconies, left empty for security reasons. And another group of 1,500 persons overflowed into the downstairs Isaac M. Wise Hall, where they heard the service over a public address system.

Outside the temple the streets and sidewalks were cleared during the service on 5th Avenue from 64th to 66th Streets, and from East 65th Street from 5th to Madison Avenues, but a crowd of 2,000 people gathered behind the police barricades that blocked off those areas.

During the 32-minute service, Mr. Lehman lay on a catafalque in the sanctuary of the synagogue, and at the head of the casket, covered by a blanket of yellow roses, stood an American flag on one side and the Governor of New York's personal standard on the other. This last flag had been sent to the temple by Governor Rockefeller especially for the funeral service to honor the former Governor.

The immediate members of the Lehman family sat in the left front pew, with other relatives numbering 120 persons sitting behind them.

The President and Mrs. Johnson and other dignitaries of government sat in the center front pew.

These included Attorney General Kennedy, Governor Rockefeller, and State Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz; the two U.S. Senators from New York, Jacob K. Javits and Kenneth B. Keating; Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations; Chief Justice Earl Warren, who remained with the President throughout his entire trip yesterday; Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, and Senators Mike Mansfield, of Montana, and Carl Hayden, of Arizona.

NOTABLES

Behind them in a score of pews were an assortment of persons famous in affairs of the Nation, State and city.

These included such a diversity of persons as former Govs. Averell Harriman and Thomas E. Dewey, Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, Bernard Baruch, Representative John Lindsay, of New York, Roy Wilkins, executive director of the NAACP, along with numerous city officials, judges of many different benches, leaders of industry and finance, and the like.

On the right front section of the pews were a number of labor leaders, and Circuit Court Justice Thurgood Marshall and Mrs. Constance Motley, who was his associate in earlier legal battles waged by the NAACP, together with a large delegation of officials and legislators from the State capitol at Albany.

Except for members of the Presidential party, including those who came with the President from Washington and those who met him at the airport and rode with him in the motorcade to the temple, the synagogue was filled long before the service started.

UNOBTRUSIVE

Persons bearing the blue invitation card which was the necessary credential for admission to the temple were passed through the doors by dozens of security men who worked quietly, almost unobtrusively. Other security men, including Secret Service and police detectives in plain clothes, were all around the interior of the place but they, too, were almost undistinguishable from mourners.

Uniformed police were guarding doors and entry passages but they were not visible to those inside the synagogue.

President Johnson was solemn-faced when the motorcade drove up to the temple and he stepped out to be greeted by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, and a trustee of the temple. General Sarnoff acted in behalf of Alfred R. Bachrach, president of the temple, who was ill and confined in a hospital.

There was some slight turning of heads when the President and his party came in, at 12:50 p.m., but otherwise hardly a ruffle. They were quietly escorted to the front section where Preisdent Johnson doffed his dark coat and put on his glasses and looked quickly around. Governor Rockefeller was already in his seat and the two men shook hands.

Mayor Wagner and the others who were to sit in the front pew with the President slid into their places and within moments everybody was seated, still and lost in contemplation in the majestic byzantine tile and marble decor of this sumptuous temple.

Attorney General Kennedy came in separately and alone after the Presidential party was seated. He walked down the center aisle and joined the others, apparently having come to the temple alone.

A few moments later Mrs. Lehman and the members of her immediate family entered from a side door and took their places in the front on the left. She was accompanied by her two adopted children, John Lehman and Mrs. Edward P. Wise, and her sister and brother-in-law, Mrs. Arthur Master and Dr. Master.

PSALM 15

At 1 p.m. the Rev. Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi, opened the service with the reading of Psalm 15, which tells of the man who "walks uprightly, works righteousness, and speaks truth in his heart."

Speaking from a pulpit on the President's right, Dr. Mark next read from the prayer book a favorite selection of Mr. Lehman which begins, "Grant us peace."

Then Dr. Mark touched arrestingly on a subject dear to the heart of Mr. Lehman—his stalwart and lifelong affirmation of his religion.

In 1961 a young boy who was not publicly identified wrote to Mr. Lehman, asking if he had ever been handicapped by his religion. The busy man took time out from his work to write the boy a thoughtful reply which summed up his conviction on this subject. Dr. Mark read the two-page letter in full as a part of the funeral service.

After this, Federal Judge Edward Weinfeld, a friend of Mr. Lehman for many years, took the pulpit to deliver a eulogy. Judge Weinfeld said at the outset that Mr. Lehman was "an exceedingly modern man and perhaps he would not quite approve of what we do here.

"One can almost hear him say, 'Dear family and friends, do not trouble yourselves,'" Judge Weinfeld said, "'I have had a full and rewarding life. I saw the fulfillment of many of the ideals and principles that I believed in and fought for. And when my time came, it came quickly. And even now I am with you in spirit.'"

The judge then traced Mr. Lehman's long and broad range of activities in the cause of social justice and the worth of the individual, and as one who respected all faiths and religions, and gave unstintingly in a career of service to the city, State, Nation, and the world.

The judge said that Mr. Lehman's career was "without parallel in our times for its duration, its dedication and devotion, and for its impact upon millions of people here and throughout the entire world.

"No one, and certainly no one in this assembly who has ever been aware of movements concerned with the dignity of man—the very essence of the democratic process—need be reminded of Herbert Lehman's passionate devotion to those movements," he continued.

"This was a man who outwardly appeared reserved, but who always left those who he had just seen feeling warmer than before. This was a man who was modest in bearing and who brought distinction to every venture he joined.

MAN OF PEACE

"This was a man of peace, yet he met every assault on democracy with an iron will and an inner fire that carried the day. This was a man who cared for and loved people, yet his capacity for righteous indignation was never dulled by the years."

The judge touched on Mr. Lehman's feeling of responsibilities for the Nation's freedoms and his lonely stand in fighting forces which would destroy democracy in this country. He mentioned his service as Director General of UNRRA—"the greatest relief organization the world has ever known."

Judge Weinfeld noted how the tributes to Mr. Lehman "cut across all political, religious, racial, and national lines," and he told of the former Governor's intense devotion to family and to friends.

He closed with a reference to the thoughts which animated Mr. Lehman on the last day of his life.

"On the final morning of his life," said the judge, "he looked forward so eagerly and enthusiastically to the trip he was about to make to the White House to receive the Medal of Freedom—the highest American civilian honor for service in peacetime, from the President of the United States, who is with us today in tribute to our friend.

"The now posthumous award reads:

"'Citizen and statesman, he used wisdom and compassion as the tools of government and has made politics the highest form of public service.'"

BETTER PLACE

In closing, the judge said:

"Because of him and his achievements, the world is a better place in which to live. This shall be a comfort to his family and friends. Herbert Lehman is forever enshrined in our hearts."

After the eulogy by Judge Weinfeld, Dr. Mark read another favorite selection of Mr. Lehman, Tennyson's "Crossing the Bar," and then he offered a prayer and eulogy in which he expressed gratitude to God for this "modest, courteous, gallant, dedicated public servant, whose wise and understanding heart was literally on fire with a passion for human freedom and whose soul revolted against everything of prejudice and injustice regardless of who might be the victim."

THE 23D PSALM

He recalled his love of country and pride of Jewish heritage and faith, and his long association with Temple Emanu-El, and the rabbi concluded the service with recitation of the 23d Psalm, followed by the quotation of Horatio from Shakespeare's "Hamlet":

"Now cracks a noble heart.
Good night, sweet prince, and
Flights of angels sing thee to thy rest."

During the service, Associate Rabbi Nathan A. Perilman sat in the sanctuary.

The impeccability of the security arrangements was never better demonstrated than in the emptying of the temple at the end of the service.

The bearers at a signal lifted the coffin and carried it slowly from the sanctuary and

the march began down the aisle to the front door on Fifth Avenue. Mrs. Lehman, heavily veiled, and her son, John, followed the casket, along with other members of the immediate family; and then the President and Mrs. Johnson, the President walking on the right of his wife and holding her right hand in his left.

The rest of the family and Presidential entourage party followed behind, while the other dignitaries and distinguished friends debouched out on side aisles minutes behind the President.

EMBRACES

On the sidewalk outside the temple President Johnson walked over to Mrs. Lehman and embraced her, kissing her on the cheek and cupping his hands as he spoke something into her ear. When he turned away Mrs. Johnson also embraced the widow and chatted for a moment with her.

Mr. JAVITS. Though I have not asked my colleague [Mr. KEATING] I know he would wish to join with me in this tribute. I should like the RECORD to show very clearly that both of us attended the services. It is an honor for us as Senators from New York to have the record spelled out so completely upon the life and achievements of this very great man.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the thoughtfulness of my colleague in allowing me to join in this tribute. The ceremony was moving and impressive. It struck one with a sense of the great loss New York and the Nation suffered on the death of Governor and Senator Lehman.

Last Friday I placed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post. I now ask unanimous consent to include today editorials from the New York Journal-American, the World-Telegram and Sun, and the New York Post.

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

[From the New York-Journal American, Dec. 6, 1963]

GOVERNOR LEHMAN

The Nation's public life has suffered an ill-afforded loss with the death of former U.S. Senator and New York Governor, Herbert H. Lehman.

He was a valued elder statesman of the Democratic Party, a grand old gentleman of American politics, a famed humanitarian and philanthropist.

Governor Lehman, it will be remembered, quit his large investment and banking interests more than 30 years ago to devote himself to public service. During the remainder of his 85 years he earned the esteem and friendship of all honorable men, regardless of their political persuasion.

He brought quiet dignity to his calling, yet fought wtih determination and effectiveness for his ideals. And shortly before his retirement in 1956, at the age of 78, he was accorded the following tribute:

"Few men in our history have had such a distinguished career."

The speaker was the then Senate majority leader, now President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Few indeed have served their country so honorably and well, and the loss suffered by his wife, son and daughter is shared by us all.

[From the New York World-Telegram and The Sun, Dec. 6, 1963]

LEGACY OF DECENCY

Herbert H. Lehman leaves a rich political legacy.

He was warm and human in a field where it is sometimes easy to become aloof and imperious.

Veteran reporters remember him for his availability, his constant willingness to talk, even when under attack. Voters remember his folksy approaches on streetcorners and sidewalk.

He was decent, a fine person, with honest instincts—and politics can so easily compromise such instincts. There was never a breath of scandal attached to him.

He was a humanitarian. This spirit was stamped on every piece of legislative progress he touched, particularly in his later years as a Senator in Washington.

He was very serious, especially about the various offices he held. Some said he was so serious he was stuffy and humorless. But that's overstating it.

He was unique. He succeeded Governor Roosevelt when the latter went to the White House. From then until December 1942, he was Governor. He resigned after such an unprecedented time in office to take a Federal position as director of relief for war-torn Europe.

He later continued such humanitarian work with the U.N. He returned to political office in 1949, when he was elected Senator.

He was a fighter. He fought Tammany Hall on the streets of New York and he won. He fought to keep Mayor Wagner in office and he won.

He fought in the U.S. Senate for the causes he believed in. These causes always had humanitarian overtones.

Yet he was not born to politics. He came from a wealthy background and enjoyed working for a Wall Street banking house. He shunned the kind of politicking he eventually grew accustomed to.

For a man who was such a reluctant politician, he succeeded marvelously.

---

[From the New York Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

HERBERT LEHMAN: A PROFILE IN COURAGE

John F. Kennedy, in July of this year, designated 31 recipients of the Presidential Medal of Freedom—the highest honor a President can bestow for peacetime service to the country. One of those selected for such distinguished recognition was Herbert H. Lehman; the awards were to be presented this weekend.

It is a cruel accident of history that neither Mr. Kennedy nor Mr. Lehman will be present when the ceremony is held.

Herbert Lehman will be remembered with affection and esteem for many things. What is perhaps most memorable is the extent to which his fighting spirit grew and his convictions deepened with the passage of time.

He was an able, enlightened Governor who carried forward the spirit of humane government—he called it "government with a heart"—that had pervaded the Smith and Roosevelt eras in Albany. A reserved man with no special gift of oratory and a congenital dislike for demagogy, he was nevertheless elected Governor four times—more often than any other man in the annals of the State. His quiet, sometimes hesitant voice communicated both a sense of compassion and integrity that confounded the political rabble-rousers. The son of a wealthy man, his concern for the dispossessed was never patronizing.

After Albany came his leadership of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—a post in which all the human debris of a war-ravaged world became his burden.

He was 71 when he was elected to the Senate in 1949; a record of large achievement was already written, and this seemed destined to be the serene twilight of a life of distinction. Instead it produced his finest hours and when, it might be said, he crossed the bridge from virtue to greatness. It was in those hours that he met the critical test that places him in the company of Norris, La Follette, and others in that small band of Senate figures who have dared to stand almost alone against the furies of the day.

The portent was there during his Senate campaign. In that interval Cardinal Spellman issued his lamentable assault on Mrs. Roosevelt over the aid-to-education bill. Most of the local politicos suffered acute political lockjaw; Herbert Lehman rose to Mrs. Roosevelt's defense in dignity and solitude. There were those who said he had committed political suicide, but the electorate had a larger wisdom.

In Washington, almost at the moment of Lehman's arrival, the age of McCarthy began. Cowardice and evasion dominated the Senate; Lehman refused to be intimidated. In the summer of 1953, many Senate liberals, in a dubious effort to affirm their own patriotism, sponsored a so-called anti-Communist bill more damaging to the Bill of Rights than any legislation McCarthy had proposed. Herbert Lehman, with Estes Kefauver, stood up defiantly, declaring:

"I will not betray the people of my State in order to cater to the mistaken impression some of them hold. My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult. I shall cast my vote for the liberties of our people."

Lehman's passion for freedom had been abundantly revealed in these trials; his dedication to equal rights was the other major preoccupation of his Senate career, and again he was ahead of his time. Long before the civil rights movement had won political allies in many high places, Lehman was fighting the battle for effective legislation to end the degradation of second-class citizenship and give American Negroes the equity and equality so many of them had so long been denied.

Finally, when he decided in 1956 that he could no longer meet the physical ordeal of conscientious Senate service, he returned to New York. Again it was assumed that his political lifetime was nearly over; instead he plunged with implausible fervor into the Democratic reform movement and became, with Mrs. Roosevelt, not merely its spiritual leader but a street-corner activist. Who will ever forget the pictures of him pounding the hot pavements of a sweltering summer for the Wagner reform ticket that eventually staged one of the unforgettable upsets in our political annals? Perhaps the reform crusade was the hardest effort of all; it required open conflict with machine men Lehman had long known, and he was a sentimental man. But he did not shrink from it, and his example stirred the conscience of a city.

And so, until the day he died, Herbert Lehman was fighting the good fight for the basic American decencies.

His voice and his name were identified with a thousand efforts to help those born less fortunate than himself, to safeguard our tradition of freedom, to fulfill the dream of the Emancipation Proclamation.

He was never a thunderer, but his voice was heard; he was a gracious man, even in dealing with his adversaries, but he could fight hard and resolutely for the things in which he deeply believed; he was blessed with humility, but he scorned obsequiousness; he knew there were times when compromises were inevitable, but his incorruptibility was always clear. He endured personal tragedy with gallantry and stoicism.

Above all, he imparted a quiet nobility to all the causes he espoused, and to the lives of all who knew him. For his wife and others close to him there can only be the

consolation that he lived long enough to become not merely a beloved resident of New York, but a revered citizen of the world.

---

## CAPITAL ISSUES COMMITTEE NEEDED—NOT THE INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times devotes considerable attention to a problem I have discussed on the floor of the Senate on several occasions; namely, the need for a capital issues committee to deal with the problem caused by large U.S. capital exports.

In my view, the interest equalization tax would not be an effective instrument in dealing with the problem of capital outflows. Its apparent success during the third quarter is clearly attributable to the uncertainty caused by the proposed measure while Congress debates over it rather than to the actual tax that is to be imposed. While foreign borrowing in the United States has dried up, partly as a result of this proposal, it also succeeded in shutting down the U.S. capital market as a center of world finance. I believe that is not in our interest. While I fully endorse the Treasury's efforts to urge the Europeans to develop their own narrow capital markets, it is rather doubtful that all the capital markets of Europe added together can supply within the foreseeable future even a part of the capital needed for a prosperous and viable free world, and which heretofore has been obtained in the United States.

As a far more effective alternative I have proposed that a capital issues committee be created, composed of representatives of the Government, Federal Reserve banks, commerce and industry and banking as well as of the public. Their job would be to approve or reject proposed capital issues on the basis of criteria laid down by the Federal Government.

The interest equalization tax is discriminatory as far as the countries affected, as well as the type of securities involved, are concerned. It is in no sense less of a "capital control"—which the Treasury ostensibly abhors—than the capital issues committee I propose, but with one major difference. The capital issues committee could be a truly temporary arrangement. It could be an instrument which is known to our European allies and is not new in our own history—the Voluntary Credit Restraint Committee of the Korean War has served our country effectively. Such a committee could determine between capital issues which would be beneficial to our balance of payments in the long run—that is, those which may produce U.S. exports, and those which are considered nonproductive. It is a proposal which is gaining strong support from the responsible press and among the financial community.

The New York Times in an editorial this morning endorses the creation of a capital issues committee. It has previously endorsed this idea in editorials on September 1 and November 18. I urge the Treasury to give this alternative its serious consideration.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from this morning's New York Times, a letter to the editor on the same subject, and an article entitled "Equalization Tax," both from the same newspaper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Is there objection to the request by the Senator from New York?

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

[From the New York Times, Dec. 9, 1963]

### CONTROLS OVER CAPITAL

The administration wants quick congressional approval of its request for taxing American purchases of foreign stocks and bonds because the proposal itself has caused a virtual embargo on foreign borrowing. This was not intended by the Treasury, which recognizes that Wall Street's capital market must be kept open to foreign borrowers. Now with the House Ways and Means Committee giving its blessing to the proposed tax, the prospects for speedy passage have been enhanced.

The Treasury should reconsider this dubious measure. Unquestionably, the outflow of long-term funds into foreign securities has been a serious drain. Yet there is real doubt that the Treasury's proposal, which the Investment Bankers Association aptly describes as not a tax at all but rather a new protective tariff discriminating against foreign securities and American investors, is the best way to deal with the problem. For once the tax is passed, the way will be open for a renewed dollar outflow as borrowers and lenders devise loopholes of varying size and extent to avoid paying the levy.

In a letter to the Times, a major underwriter of foreign issues suggests that a more effective solution for holding down the outflow would be the formation of a capital issues committee to pass on prospective borrowings. Mr. Walker thinks that a committee made up of investment bankers who handle most of the foreign borrowings, in cooperation with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, would work in the national interest to curb foreign borrowings without harming Wall Street's position as the leading international capital market.

A capital issues committee is a much more honest and direct form of control than the proposed tax. But an industry committee would be less effective than a Government committee, composed of Treasury and Federal Reserve representatives, who would be less subject to the accusation of favoring Wall Street's interest over the national interest. If temporary control over capital outflows is required, the Government itself must take the responsibility.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 9, 1963]

### MARKETING FOREIGN ISSUES—REMEDY FOR PRESENT STANDSTILL RESULTING FROM TAX PROPOSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I assume it is now generally known that the issuance of foreign securities in the United States has been brought to a complete standstill. This is the consequence of the Treasury Department's so-called interest equalization tax proposal. Insofar as foreign capital is concerned, we have completely disrupted the operation of the only important international market in the world; and there is no other market or combination of markets upon which the free world can depend.

The Treasury Department appears to have assumed that as we leave off supplying foreign capital, the capital markets of Europe will be able to fill the vacuum created by their tax proposals. This is not so.

The Swiss market, centered in Zurich, has been available and used right along, probably to its full potential, because Swiss rates are lower than ours in New York.

#### LIMITED MARKETS

Zurich, London, and Brussels are the only international markets in Europe and they are all small. The other markets are essentially local, even Paris, Amsterdam, and Frankfurt. All of the capital markets of Europe added together, both actual and potential, can supply no more than a mere fraction of the requirements of a viable and prosperous free world.

The administration of this proposed legislation would seem incredibly difficult. Consider the cases of Canada and Japan. Our trade with these two countries is the largest of any in the world; and we sell somewhat more to them than they sell to us.

The interdependence of Canada and the United States and the importance of Japanese solidarity with us in the Far East are obvious. Both countries have need of our financial markets. We have told Canada that she will be exempt from the provisions of the proposed legislation; we have told Japan that she will not be.

I believe that a better way to meet this problem can and must be found, and that there is a quite simple way. I propose that the Government make an arrangement whereby the investment banking community will consult a Government agency and together, on an ad hoc basis, informally but effectively conclude whether each proposed piece of foreign financing is or is not in our national interest at that time and under the then existing circumstances.

#### COOPERATIVE EFFORT

Apart from Canadian financing, practically all foreign financing in the United States, either publicly issued or privately placed, has been managed by a limited number of investment banking housing, all in the top flight of American issue houses. Thus a cooperative effort between the Government and the investment banking community would be a readily managed, concentrated operation.

In my opinion the consultative agency of the Government most effective in this situation would be the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. They obviously are fully informed of all problems relating to balance of payments.

If the Government will take the lead in bringing about a consultative arrangement with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York I am satisfied that the plan will be effective.

BURNETT WALKER.

NEW YORK, *December 4, 1963.*

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 9, 1963]

### EQUALIZATION TAX—WALL STREET CRITICISM EVOLVES ALTERNATE PLAN TO CONTROL STOCK BUYING OVERSEAS

(M. J. Rossant)

Few measures have been so roundly criticized as the administration's proposed tax on American purchases of foreign bonds and stocks; yet it had a relatively smooth passage in gaining the approval of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The administration is eager to get the measure on the books because it has proved overly effective in its present state as a mere proposal.

The suspense is killing Wall Street, which is condemning the proposal in unusually harsh language. It is convinced that the tax would damage Wall Street's preeminent position as a financial center quite aside from what it will mean to underwriting profits.

In fact, investment bankers have gone to the extent of contemplating an alternative form of controlling foreign issues. They

think the job could be accomplished through a committee especially selected to examine new foreign demands for funds.

SOME SUPPORT EVIDENT

The idea of a committee does not enjoy unanimous support, but many investment men think it is better than the administration's plan, particularly in the proposal's present uncertain form of being a tax that is not yet a tax.

Since the tax was first proposed, there has been a dearth of foreign borrowing in the United States. This is understandable. There is little interest in making deals as long as both prospective borrowers and lenders are uncertain about the provisions allowed under the proposed tax, which is to be retroactive.

This drying up of borrowing has helped the Nation's balance of payments, but it has embarrassed the Treasury. It does not want to see Wall Street shut down as an international capital market. Nor does it want to create economic anemia in foreign countries by cutting off access to American funds so drastically.

QUESTION OF LOOPHOLES

The Treasury is prepared to countenance a reasonable outflow of dollars. Whether passage of the proposal will keep the outflow reasonable is open to question, for loopholes are bound to be employed if and when the measure becomes law.

Evidently, Wall Street is willing to give up potential business for a while longer in its effort to defeat or water down the administration's proposal. The majority wants business as usual, while a minority is plugging for the idea of a committee.

At the annual meeting of the Investment Bankers Association last week, Andrew N. Overby, vice president of First Boston Corp. and a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, spoke for the majority in attacking the administration's proposal as discriminatory and administratively complex.

Mr. Overby observed that investment in foreign securities was an asset-creating expenditure, producing income in the form of interest, dividends and return of capital. In his view, limiting the sale of issues might bring a small reduction in the current outflow, but at the expense of future income.

OVERSEA SALES ARE CITED

Another argument made by Mr. Overby was that most of the dollars raised by foreign borrowers were spent in the United States. He implied that denying foreigners access to the market would disrupt traditional trading relations and hurt export sales.

Investment bankers at the IBA meeting who agreed with Mr. Overby also pointed out that the tax might lead to increased issues by riskier and less desirable foreign companies. They reason that most of the blue-chip firms will have comparatively little trouble in getting funds in the limited markets abroad, leaving the remainder to tap Wall Street.

While most investment bankers admit that they have a pocketbook interest in opposing the proposed tax, they insist that they are not motivated primarily by the loss of business that they may suffer.

In support of their position, the financial community is fond of quoting a recent speech by Allan Sproul, former head of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. He declared that "whatever success it has had in checking an outflow of capital, despite its many loopholes, and while favored by its uncertainty concerning its adoption by Congress, this is a form of tinkering with a problem which should be attacked in the total context of capital incentives in the United States and in foreign countries."

Mr. Sproul added, "We need to avoid experimenting with direct controls, whatever they may be called, which in times of strain may be interpreted as a forerunner of stronger controls of capital outflow, or even of all dealings in foreign exchange, which in turn would heighten the danger of anticipatory withdrawals of foreign funds from our markets."

Yet a growing minority within the investment banking fraternity is talking in terms of establishing a capital-issues committee, made up of Wall Street underwriters, with responsibility for approving or rejecting proposed issues.

This would be a form of direct control, but some underwriters consider it preferable to the two-price system for capital that the proposed tax would establish.

The advantage of a capital-issues committee is that it would avoid the creation of loopholes that are bound to accompany any new tax. Moreover, it could approve issues considered beneficial, meaning those of blue chip companies or others, which may produce a rise in exports, while turning thumbs down on high risks of nonproductive investments.

Proponents of this approach believe that Wall Street can act responsibly in policing issues. It would require the cooperation of a relatively small number of investment banking firms, which manage the bulk of foreign underwritings.

But there is considerable skepticism about the formation of a voluntary committee. According to one authority with extensive experience in the underwriting field, the notion of permitting a group of underwriters to pass on the propriety of issues is like "putting parolees on a parole board."

Others question whether voluntary cooperation would work. It could open the door to Wall Street firms that are not now competing for foreign business and who would not feel bound by any restraints imposed by the leading houses.

The only effective form of a capital-issues committee is one that is in the hands of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. However, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon has made clear that he does not want to take on the job of passing on issues.

But the Treasury, the Federal Reserve, and the Securities and Exchange Commission possess the expertise and the power to exercise effective control.

---

## THANKSGIVING—1621 AND 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the finest discussions of the meaning and message of Thanksgiving was recently penned by Henry W. Clune, the legendary columnist of the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle. Mr. Clune, who is known around the world for his novels, has been the beloved author of the "Seen and Heard" column in Rochester's morning newspaper for years.

As he has done so often on so many subjects, Mr. Clune's comments about Thanksgiving cut to the heart of the subject and say eloquently what is in the hearts and minds of millions of Americans. Because of the significance and beauty of his words, I commend them to the attention of all Members of this body, and ask unanimous consent that his column, from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of November 28, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Nov. 28, 1963]

WE SHOULD BE THANKFUL

(By Henry W. Clune)

Winter, creeping and encroaching, is upon us.

People emerge from their warm homes and look up at the gray sky and shudderingly anticipate the first blizzard. We climb into our heated cars and drive to our places of employment, inveighing against the climate and wishing that we might pass the next few months in some halcyon land of sunshine and blooming flowers.

We work for the most part in steam-heated factories, offices, and stores, but we long for spring and feel that our lot is a hard one in the inclemencies of the North Temperate Zone. We forget the things for which this day we might be thankful.

We might be thankful for the example of fortitude made by the common little men and women who left the Mayflower at Plymouth 343 years ago and a year later dedicated the Thanksgiving which we celebrate today, perhaps loosely, and with very little sense of the day's true meaning.

There was no steam heat in the Plymouth Colony, no motor cars, no gadgets of domestic convenience, and little food in the boiling pots. There was no roof to shelter the colonists until such was made by their own hands from logs cut, with great labor, from the primitive forest. But there was a dream, and surely a faith; and below these a tacit, earthy dictum: "Root, hog, or die." And many of the colonists did die in that first dreadful winter on the rugged coast of the New World.

Their bulwark and their pillar of wisdom was William Bradford. He said, "It is not with us as with men whom small things can discourage or small discontentments cause to wish themselves home."

So they hung on, their numbers diminishing, huddled in their small clearing, until reinforcements came; and perhaps in this desperate interlude they took strength from the words of the Psalm, "Be ye of good courage, and He shall strengthen your heart, all ye that hope in the Lord."

Historically, it may be that we have overstressed the significance of this small settlement of Pilgrims, for surely had they not reached the New England shore, other expeditions soon would have begun the settlement of that land.

Yet they, more than any of the other early American settlers, stirred our imagination, and they established themselves in our tradition as the first seekers of freedom in America, though their notion of freedom was considerably different than the interpretation we put upon that word today.

Inhibited by Old World restraints, narrow in vision, limited in learning, it was not the Pilgrim Fathers who envisaged the true American ideal, but men of greater stature who came into prominence in the latter years of the 18th century. And to these men, it seems to me, we should be particularly grateful today, for it was they who wrote these words into the newborn Constitution:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peacefully to assemble, and to petition the Government for redress of grievances."

And these:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures,

shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

And again, these:

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any Criminal Case to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

There are other amendments to the Constitution, and the first 10 are known as the Bill of Rights. At the time of their composition they guaranteed a freedom for men that no other men in the history of the world had previously enjoyed. They still stand as the hallmark of our liberties.

We may be thankful that we live in a land where the rap does not come to men's doors in the dark of night and men are led out peremptorily to the dungeon, the rack, or the block for failure to subscribe to a state religion or for a whispered criticism of a despot.

We may be thankful that the noble writ of habeas corpus, denied today to millions of the earth's population; for a land that abounds in natural resources; for the privilege of the referendum; for the constitutional decree that allows us life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The world is not in sound health in all its parts; there are vast areas of it where freedom is unknown. In our midst there are men who would abrogate our rights and jettison our Constitution. We should be thankful that they are a dissident minority, not a party of power. We should be thankful that our cities have not been destroyed by enemy bombs or our lands devastated by invading armies.

We should be thankful for our democracy, and at once keenly sensible of the fact that it is not a spontaneous gift; and that if we fail to hold it zealously, administer it wisely, and defend it stanchly, one day it may slip from our hands and chaos and darkness and suffering, and the dissipation of our freedom, will ensue.

The founders of our Nation came here to escape the social cruelties and political injustices of Europe and we, if we have real faith, and wisdom, will make very sure that these same evils shall not descend upon our land. It is well, it seems to me, this day of Thanksgiving, to take check of ourselves, to strengthen our faith, to straighten the disorders of our own house, and to prove that we deserve the great heritage that has been given us.

## HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, while we are very much concerned these days about civil rights, tax legislation, and the impending Federal budget, the other matters also lie ahead and cannot be avoided. One of the most urgent of these is the need to provide help to our aged in meeting the cost of health services. The fact that an adequate solution has not yet been enacted does not mean that we can continue to avoid meeting this challenge. I believe this Congress will do so in the next session, and those who would say that the late President Kennedy and President Johnson were not strongly committed to a program for the aged are totally wrong. They should examine the record. They could go back to August of 1960 when the then Senator Kennedy and the then Senator Johnson actively worked in this Chamber to secure hospital insurance for the aged under social security.

Last February 21, President Kennedy again submitted his proposal for a social security approach to this problem. In a nationally televised press conference later that day, the President said that—

Only 10 to 15 percent of health costs of senior citizens today are reimbursed by private insurance. Hospital costs have quadrupled since the war and now average more than $35 a day. And since a great many retired workers have little more than $70 a month on social security, prospects of the two or three bouts in the hospital after age 65 confront them with an impossible choice.

They have to either ask their children or grandchildren to undergo financial hardship or accept poverty and charity themselves, or suffer their illness in silence. I think this Nation can do better than that. Social security has shown for 28 years that it is a logical first line of defense in this field.

This summer the late President Kennedy addressed the Second Annual Conference of the National Council of Senior Citizens. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Secretary Celebrezze, Secretary Nestingen, Senator Bayh, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you very much for a warm welcome, and I want to express my appreciation to all of you for having come to Washington and having once again brought to the attention of the Congress and the Government and the people of the United States the necessity of passing in this 88th Congress this very vital piece of legislation for hospital insurance for our older citizens.

The distinguished doctor, Dr. Rusk, of New York, told me that in making an analysis of the health of people over 65, he found that people who were engaged in great activities, such as this, experienced better health than those over 65 who stayed home, and did not concern themselves with the public business. I would not like to think that your only reward for this effort has been the better health that you enjoy because you are part of it. I would like to think that your reward is not only the feeling of a job well done, but the well-being of millions of your fellow citizens who, in the years to come, will themselves move across the threshold of age 65 and will benefit because of the actions that you have taken.

I must say I do not know why it is necessary for Senator BAYH or for any of the rest of us who believe in this program to have to come and make speeches about it, because I do not know any problem or any remedy more obvious, which now faces the Congress of the United States. The average older person living alone has about $20 a week. There is no room in that budget for a serious illness. Yet 1 in 6 will require hospitalization every year. The hospitalization will average 2 weeks, and will cost over $900. A $20 a week income, $1,040 a year, is hardly enough to pay for a $900 illness.

The person who has no resources—he gets a kind of treatment. He indicates that he is needy and he gets some sort of help. But there is another person who I think is one that concerns us a good deal, and that is the person who may have $3,000 or $4,000 saved up, or who may own their own house with a mortgage, and may have two children who may be in their 40's. If that person gets sick, the husband or the wife, they are in the hospital for more than 2 weeks, maybe 2 or 3 months, and there isn't anyone in this room who has not had a member of his family in the hospital at one stage or another of his life for a long time, and who does not know how much it can cost. So it may run up to $1,000 or $2,000, or even higher.

And then he sells the home or he goes to his children, he exhausts his savings, he has nothing left.

Now, the program we suggested will provide that he will set aside during his working years an average of $13 a year, not a burden for anyone employed, $13 a year. And that man and woman will know when they are over 65 that they will never be a burden upon their children and never be a charity case upon the National Government because they will have earned their way, and that is what we want.

We are not asking for anybody to hand this out. We are asking for a chance to have the people who receive the benefit to earn their way, the same principle established under the social security system in the 1930's. You would not believe it necessary, 30 years later, after we have seen the extraordinary success of the social security system, even though it was passed over the most vigorous objections—you would not think it necessary to say that hospital insurance shall be covered in the same manner.

There isn't a country in Western Europe that didn't do what we are doing 50 years ago or 40 years ago, not a single country that is not way ahead of this rich, productive, progressive country of ours. We are not suggesting something radical and new or violent. We are not suggesting that the Government come between the doctor and his patient. We are suggesting what every other major, developed, intelligent country did for its people a generation ago. I think it is time the United States caught up.

I don't think we ought to be second any place. I think this bill will pass. We were defeated by 4 votes 3 years ago. We lost it by 2 votes in the Senate more than a year ago. My prediction certain is that if the Members of the Congress, House and Senate, have an opportunity to vote on this, that this bill will pass in the 88th Congress, and when it does, every man and woman in this room will know that it was not a victory merely by the Members of the Congress or the executive branch, but this was one piece of legislation that was carried on the backs of the elder citizens of this country.

Ladies and gentlemen, I congratulate you all, and after looking around the room, I look forward with some anticipation to being over 65.

Thank you.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, one of the highlights of the convention was an informal talk to members of the executive board of the national council by the then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Seated with the board around a large table in the Adams Room of the Willard Hotel, the then Vice President recalled

that a quarter century ago, as a young Congressman, he was embroiled in a fight for a minimum wage of only 25 cents an hour.

The then Vice President continued:

Such a small amount seems ridiculous now, and somehow I feel that we will have a similar reaction in the future to our present struggles for a hospital insurance program. Later on we are going to wonder why it took us so long to get so little. I know we are going to enact this vital and necessary program and thereafter we will continue to improve on it.

The Vice President said that in the 1960 campaign he made some 400 speeches in 43 States and that all of them were recorded. He said that in replaying many of those recordings it was abundantly clear that those which brought the greatest public interest and sympathetic response were those dealing with health care for older people through social security.

Admitting that there was powerful opposition to the suggested program from the American Medical Association, Vice President Johnson commented:

Why anyone would want to deny a person the opportunity of putting in a dollar a month, along with his employer, to insure himself through social security against the staggering costs of hospitalization, simply amazes me. We ought just to say "God forgive them for they know not what they do."

Mr. President, I believe that these remarks will serve to keep the record straight as to the position of the late President Kennedy and President Johnson on hospital insurance for the aged.

---

## CONSERVATION AND WISE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR UDALL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on October 28 Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, in an address to the Fifth American Forestry Association Congress held in Washington, D.C., announced a new program of interest to all those who are concerned with the conservation and wise use of our public lands.

The new program consists of a series of resource conservation areas—85 in number—to give practical demonstration of what can be done with public range and forest lands.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by Secretary Udall be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT THE FIFTH AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 28, 1963

At the end of his conservation trip last month, President Kennedy, in Las Vegas, summarized his impressions of the state of American resources and called for a "third wave of the conservation movement" to tackle the unsolved problems of the 1960's.

This conference is, I think, a fitting followup to the President's challenge, for if we can generate the insight and enthusiasm that will be needed to mount a fresh attack on the many pressing problems that confront us it will take strong leadership from such organizations as the American Forestry Association. It is fitting, too, that the AFA should step forward to provide such leadership as this organization almost singlehandedly held the torch of conservation aloft in the dark days when waste and plunder were our unspoken national policies and the forces were gathering that led to the first wave of the conservation movement under Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot.

Your association has stated that this conference will include a "double-barreled salute" to the Interior and Agriculture Departments for improved cooperation in conservation.

Let me look down the other end of one of these barrels and tell you that we in the Department of the Interior salute you in return for your continuous efforts on behalf of conservation. This return salute comes from all parts of our farflung Department.

The opportunity for many of our officials and employees to participate in this Congress and the events leading up to it is appreciated. We commit ourselves here and now to follow up on the conclusions and recommendations of the Congress as they affect our programs and work.

To begin with, let me say that the American Forestry Association is no stranger to me and I am not a stranger to it.

In 1961 I addressed your annual meeting at Santa Fe. I am glad to report that most of the conservation programs outlined at that time are under way.

A chapter from my book "The Quiet Crisis" appears in this month's issue of your magazine. It is a chapter on Carl Schurz and John Wesley Powell—part of my effort to place into perspective the conservation problems of today.

Schurz has been justified time and time again in his famous statement that "destruction of the forests of this country will be the murder of its future prosperity and progress."

We can well add many more items to the category of resources that we cannot afford to destroy.

Your editor in the May issue of American Forests said, "AFA believes that this decade's so-called 'quiet conservation crisis' has become all but inaudible. It needs an explosive booster shot."

As one who has popularized the term "quiet crisis of the 1960's," I hope that this "national town meeting" will touch off such shots as are needed now in the never-ending job of conservation.

I am glad that much of the time of the Congress is being given to Department of the Interior land management problems. I want to give most of my time today to a discussion of those problems. Specifically, I want to emphasize management of public lands under the Bureau of Land Management.

First, however, I think we should examine briefly progress or lack of it since the last forest congress.

The past decade has seen more progress in forest control than any previous period in history. We have made advances in equipment, tools, and chemicals.

Public education in fire prevention has been accelerated each year in an attempt to reduce the number of man-caused fires. The Department has developed coordinated fire prevention in cooperation with the Forest Service, the States, and the forest industry.

We have done much to reduce fire hazards in recent years.

Fire control facilities, especially detection facilities, have been improved and expanded from the Southwest to the Arctic. There are many more airplanes, more lookouts, more and better equipment of all kinds.

Training of fire control personnel has been increased fivefold in the past 4 years.

An almost direct product of the Fourth Forest Congress was Public Law 167, the 1955 Multiple Use Mining Act. Under this law, the Department has cleared surface rights on 7 million acres of unpatented mining claims.

The Fourth Forest Congress advocated broader application of multiple-use principles to land management. In practice, multiple use is an established policy in the Department. However, such a policy has not received full congressional recognition. This is one of many conservation issues, unresolved for decades, which we should highlight.

Some of us who grew up in the freedom of the "wide country" of the West have a special duty to take leadership in its conservation. The Bureau of Land Management lands are a strong factor in that effort, but they are not well appreciated or understood.

Few people other than those who enjoy grazing privileges, have mineral leases, operate mining claims, or have purchased timber know of the exact location and condition of these public lands. Few people outside of Government and the advisory board know or understand in any detail the many duties and responsibilities of public land management. Unlike national parks and national forests, these lands have no easily identified or well marked boundaries because of their intermingled nature.

Yet many other people are vitally affected by the condition and use of these lands and their resources. Public lands make up much of the watersheds of great rivers—the Missouri, Columbia, Yellowstone, Colorado, and thousands of tributaries—to mention only one consideration. The use of these lands for outdoor recreation is another. They have always offered substantial recreational opportunities—particularly for hunting and fishing.

We must not underestimate the interests of these other people when we take into account the interests of commercial users who are more directly concerned with certain public lands. Without general public awareness of these lands, however, the particular interests of the direct users are apt to be overpowering.

One would think that an agency like Interior, with respect to its 466 million acres of so-called "vacant" lands, would have a clear and current directive from Congress for their management.

It does not.

You would think that we operate under comprehensive up-to-date laws. We do not.

You would think that such a large and complex real estate operation would be organized under long-range projects with definite financial commitments for improvements over a period of years. It is not.

Our statutory setup for administering these lands reminds me of a ghost town that time has passed by. We are being forced to use horse-and-buggy statutes in a guided missile age.

One of the current notions leading to some friction is that there is extensive flexibility in administrative authority regarding public land. In other words, many assume that all deficiencies or hardships concerning public lands can be overcome in the Bureau or the Department. It is too great an administrative burden to absorb all the shock when the fault derives from the status of the legislation.

I am glad that some of the discussion being heard here will emphasize reform of the public land laws. My Department and other departments have endorsed the proposal to establish a land law review commission. I am sure that the recommendations of this Congress will be highly valuable to the work of the commission if it is established.

To their credit, many Members of Congress have acknowledged a long period of inaction in public land law reform. They have been relatively moderate in their criticism of executive action that had to be taken to fill in the breach. Let us hope that leadership will be exerted now to overcome these inadequacies.

Specific kinds of inadequacies in our public land laws have been well documented in our appearances before congressional committees.

The Homestead Act of 1862 is out of step with today's conditions. The mining law of 1872 needs supplementation in the interest of modern mining itself as well as some kind of adjustment in relation to other uses.

The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 is not necessarily immune from reform considerations.

The laws governing sales of public lands are as strikingly obsolete as any. It is ironic that the same Government officials who have sought permission for years to sell lands for use in rapidly growing western communities are charged with wanting to lock up these lands and throw away the key.

When the laws themselves are out of date and bring about unconscionable results, usually the Government employee close at hand is blamed.

Some of our citizens may ask, "Aren't these just wastelands? Can't they simply be turned over to the stockmen or the States? Why bother with them at all?"

These are questions that we are trying to answer. We believe that investments under appropriate circumstances, for example, for range rebuilding, are very much in order on a large scale.

In most cases the public lands I'm talking about are a residue. They are what was left after the homesteaders and the miners passed; after the national parks and national forests were carved out of them. But as I said earlier—times have changed. Our economy has changed. Our population and its patterns of settlement have changed. Our methods of transportation have changed. Where these lands were of little value yesterday, they are often of great value today.

In monetary terms these values have been apparent for years, but they have received very little public attention. Revenues from public lands have exceeded the costs of administration by a ratio of 8 to 1 during the past 150 years. Gross receipts for all years through 1961 totaled more than $2.5 billion; of that total, the receipts of the last 15 years accounted for $1.5 billion. The cost of managing the public domain during the same 15-year period was $185 million.

The memory of man is short. We tend to forget how generous the land has been to us, and what bountiful wealth it still has to offer, if treated decently in return. We forget that the public lands are a national treasure, one which belongs to future generations as much as it does to us.

On the other hand, much has been accomplished in some public land areas. Under the Taylor Grazing Act, many successful range conservation projects have been carried out in cooperation with local people. Several projects like the Vale project in Oregon have been placed on full schedule.

Projects under the Accelerated Public Works Act have been a recent means of speeding conservation work and at the same time relieving unemployment.

A major potential of public lands is timber. There are 155 million acres of public domain forests and woodlands under Bureau of Land Management management. This approaches the size of the national forest system.

In western Oregon there is another class of public forest land under BLM management. The O. & C. Sustained Yield Act of 1937 was the first Federal sustained yield law and in effect the first Federal multiple-use management law. Many public and private forest managers have adopted forestry techniques pioneeded on the O. & C. O. & C. revenues are shared with local counties and are an important source of funds for local governmental services.

The savvy of the Department of the Interior's foresters and the efficiency of the O. & C. operation are presently being illustrated in connection with the gigantic timber salvage operation resulting from the Columbus Day 1962, hurricane which swept through the Pacific Northwest. The point I want to make is that we have the forest management know-how and efficiency which could and should be extended to those vast public domain forests and woodlands—those 155 million acres capable of producing nearly 3 billion board feet of timber every year.

I am not going to say that there is a complete apathy toward Bureau of Land Management lands. Organizations such as yours have done too much too long for that to be said.

I will say that there is too much heat and too little light in public discussions on many of the problems. The hard crust of traditional thought and practice about these lands is almost impenetrable in some parts of the West.

This is not to say that we are not making much good progress under the handicap of delayed legislative action. Some outstanding advances have been made in Bureau of Land Management administration in a very short period of time.

To mention only a few things: We eliminated an entire echelon of administrative overhead bringing decisionmaking closer to the land and the people. The chaos of excessive land applications and appeals was brought under control. State and national advisory boards have broader representation. Forest administration was strengthened. Grazing users were assisted and protected in tenure privileges during difficult periods of adjustment to capacity. Wildlife management on public lands was strengthened. And a series of legislative drafts have been presented to Congress.

Recognizing a need for greater mutual understanding, we in the Department are launching today, through the Bureau of Land Management, a program of resource conservation areas. The individual areas—some 85 in number—will give practical demonstration of what can be done with our public range and forest lands. If you have not seen the striking result of range and forest land rehabilitation, you are in for a pleasant surprise.

The public lands within these areas will be developed and managed in cooperation with soil conservation districts, private landowners, State and county governments, local clubs and conservation groups, and youth organizations. The program will help perfect techniques. It will provide accurate, up-to-date information. It will give the public an accurate picture of the diversity of the lands and resources they own and the many benefits that can come from scientific management.

An exhibit featuring these demonstration projects is available to those participating in this Congress. Full details are available in the Bureau of Land Management. I know that you will work with us in making these demonstrations a success.

If enough of our people care enough about the natural resource values of our Nation to join in a fight to protect those values with a balanced conservation program, then this generation can proudly put its signature on the land for future generations to see and enjoy.

Through this Fifth Forest Congress, the knowledge of qualified persons will be brought to bear and the will of the general public will further come to light. It is for us who have positions of executive or legislative responsibility to heed and take notice. To the fulfillment of these obligations, let us all commit our imagination, skills, and talent.

---

## NO MEAN CITY—AN OBSERVATION BY DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, CHAPLAIN, U.S. SENATE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, our beloved Senate Chaplain, Dr. Harris, has added his profound insights to the growing ranks of Americans hastening to defend the good people of Dallas, Tex., from collective guilt in the assassination of President Kennedy.

Dr. Harris in his "Saturday sermon" carried in the Philadelphia Bulletin, December 7, also draws a clear distinction between the tragic happenings in Dallas November 22 and the race question and other issues which center in the South.

Let it be remembered that what happened there (Dallas) could happen in any city in America * * * surely in America the exhortation we are now hearing against bigotry, hatred, and violence we need to have preached. But the horrible deed of the alleged assassin is the wrong text for the sermon.

There is no evidence that he (Lee Oswald) was the product of any political agitation gripping the political life of America.

Dr. Harris also notes that Oswald had:

Immigrated to Russia * * * he had endeavored by way of Cuba to go back to Moscow.

Our Chaplain continues:

To make him the symbol of all that is wrong in America, is to blunt the preachments which need to be made.

The "real Dallas" is strongly defended by Dr. Harris, who recalls some of his own experiences in the Texas metropolis.

To me it is not a city of spites but a city of spires. * * * Dallas is justly proud of its great metropolis * * * but most of all Dallas glories in its churches * * * its citizens have reason enough to stand with Paul of Tarsus and say with him "we are citizens of no mean city."

Mr. President, I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to have this magnificently penned column by our Chaplain printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a fitting corollary to the Chaplain's eloquence on that unforgettable Friday last month, when he reminded:

God lives and the Government at Washington still stands.

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

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Dec. 7, 1963]

NO MEAN CITY

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

WASHINGTON.—Almost 2,000 years ago there lived and wrought a man whom the centuries have called St. Paul. His name is cut deeply on the record of the ages.

In defending himself from certain unfair charges, he declared "I am from Tarsus, Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city."

In this dread day that proud assertion might well be on the lips of those whose home city has had turned upon it the searchlight of the world scrutiny.

That city, of course, is Dallas, Tex. And since the dastardly act which set the world aghast, it has been the target of vituperation and blame.

There are those, examples of the very hate they verbally deplore, who assume this metropolis forevermore will be a byword for hissing. Such conclusions are of course not warranted. In the face of the fateful happenings, mourned nowhere with more poignancy than in Dallas, its citizens have reason enough to stand with Paul of Tarsus and say with him, "We are citizens of no mean city."

Let it be remembered that what happened there could happen in any city in America. The Secret Service corps would readily agree to that. Surely in America the exhortation we are now hearing against bigotry, hatred, and violence we need to have preached. But the horrible deed of the alleged assassin is the wrong text for these sermons. There is no evidence that he was the product of any present agitation gripping the political life of America.

This sinister person was so un-American that he emigrated to Russia before John F. Kennedy became President. He had endeavored, by way of Cuba, to go back to Moscow.

To make him the symbol of all that is wrong in America is to blunt the preachments which need to be made. To suggest that all Americans, in a sort of mass guilt complex, belong in the dock which awaited him is to arraign those who refuse to be stigmatized by what one Senator on the floor of the Senate called "wrongly placed recriminations."

Another Senator, on the other side of the aisle, commented, "It is an injustice to thousands of hospitable, cheering persons in Dallas, to charge them with murderous guilt. What happened was not America's fault. Only the sober realization of that can make our mourning meaningful and not tortured with a guilt that is undeserved."

FALSE ACCUSATIONS

Those who assumed that the heinous crime could be linked to the so-called race question found that they were grasping at something that was not there. Those who jumped to the conclusion that the murder was the bitter harvest of radical rightwingers were compelled to confess that the alleged perpetrator's leanings were in the opposite direction.

What happened in Dallas was not the result of any aspect of the moral malignancy from which America, in her grasping materialism, is suffering. Much could be said about that. What happened simply grew out of the twisted mind of one deluded young man.

There will never be a utopia where dangerous warped individuals, antisocial, will not be at large, ready to wrap their venom in a bullet. It may be from a window in Dallas, from a reception line in Buffalo, in a theater or a railroad station in Washington, or in like attempts in Milwaukee or Florida. Assassinations or foiled attempts do not damn the cities involved.

ALL-OUT EFFORT

In spite of sharp divisions in the minds of people as to any administration's policies—and that is a precious prerogative of U.S. citizens—Dallas has gone all out to put differences aside and to give the President an enthusiastic welcome.

The wounded Governor of Texas bears witness that Mr. Kennedy's last words expressed his gratitude and delight at the warmth of the reception the city was according him—magnificent was the word between the President and the Governor.

Then the unbelievable happened. The death weapon was held by one who had but recently come to the city and who, within minutes after the shots were fired, killed without hesitation a police defender of law and order.

TELEVISION PORTRAYALS

The cries rending the air against acts of violence involving gunplay ought in large degree to be aimed at the constant television portrayals before the sensitive eyes of young America, pictures involving guns with telescopic sights, and boisterous depictions where people are shot down in cold blood. This is a daily pictorial diet of millions of children and youth. What monstrous ideas vicious scenes can plant in young minds.

And what about the real Dallas? I know it well. To me it is not a city of spites but a city of spires. It has been my high privilege to join the outstanding church and civic leaders there on various occasions. The religious life of the city is an inspiration to those who have felt its uplift in the dedication of its laymen and the potency of its prophetic pulpits.

Nowhere in America have I experienced evidences of benevolence and care more closely binding all segments of a city's life; United Givers crusades there have the fervor of old-time revival meetings. In hospital projects, Catholics and Protestants work together in beautiful fraternity.

A PROUD CITY

Dallas is justly proud of its great metropolis rising on the plain, of its boulevards and parks, its office buildings and hotels, its cultural institutions, its newspapers, its palatial banks and world famous stores. But most of all Dallas glories in its churches, great and small, and Dallas has some of the largest in the land; and of its schools and colleges, including a famed theological seminary training prophets for the years that beckon.

One of the prized photographs among my own mementos is that of a young lad, dressed as Uncle Sam, presenting to me a certificate making me an honorary citizen of Dallas. Gazing at that certificate, even while writing this, I say with Paul, "I am a citizen of no mean city."

## JOE VALACHI TALKS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have just opened the drawer of my desk. Somewhat to my surprise, though no mice jumped out at me, I did find four documents which, quite a while ago, I had committed myself, by promises to friends, to insert in the RECORD. With all apology to them for the delay, I should like now to do so.

The first came to me from my good friend, and a friend of many Members of this body, the mayor of New York City, Robert Wagner, who requested me to insert in the RECORD a fine editorial. He asked it both in his capacity as mayor of New York City and as a member of the Democratic National Committee.

The editorial, which he correctly describes as being so meaningful today, appeared in the Sons of Italy Times on October 7, 1963. It is the official organ of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania Order, Sons of Italy in America. It is entitled "Joe Valachi Talks."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Sons of Italy Times, Oct. 7, 1963]

JOE VALACHI TALKS

A known murderer by the name of Joe Valachi has in recent days been testifying before an open session of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, better known as the McClellan committee, named after the Senator from Arkansas who heads it. It is a lurid tale that Valachi has been unfolding under questioning before the committee, and to many it is very sickening.

Joe Valachi, according to his own testimony, was a member of a vicious underworld organization in New York going back as far as 1930. It was and is common practice in this organization to commit murder, particularly when its secrets are exposed to outside parties by inside members of the organization.

The men who make up the organization to which Valachi belonged are Americans, going back a whole generation or more. They are not Italians, or more particularly, Sicilians, although to be sure they are of Italian and Sicilian descent. They have perpetuated certain practices which are old in Sicily, and have Americanized them, so to speak. They operate as Americans on American soil, and they have exploited conditions which are peculiar to life in our large metropolitan centers. They have made a prosperous business out of racketeering, and they do not shrink from extortion and even murder to gain their ends.

According to Valachi, an organization called Cosa Nostra does exist, and has existed for many years. In his testimony before the Senate subcommittee, Valachi declared his purpose was to destroy the Cosa Nostra bosses and leaders, because they have been very bad to the "soldiers," of whom Valachi was one for many years. Thus he has a motive of vengeance as one of his motives. But he may have other motives, too, good and bad, which will probably become clearer as the hearings proceed.

There is little or nothing new in Valachi's testimony, as far as our law enforcement agencies are concerned. Various details are perhaps new, but the general pattern, and indeed most, if not all the individuals in the picture have been well known to law enforcement agencies for decades. The question may well be asked what those agencies have been doing all these years. How has it been possible for all these criminal organizations and individuals to flourish in the face of our laws? We do know that connivance by law and police officers has been a very considerable factor in making it possible for them to carry on their nefarious business. And, of course, the apathy and the low moral tone of such a large segment of our metropolitan populations have enormously contributed to the success of those who make a business of crime.

We cannot morally condone the criminal activity of any organized criminal group, whether it be the so-called Cosa Nostra organization, or any other that carries an Italian, or any other kind of name. We absolutely condemn crime and criminals. As far as it is humanly possible they must be rooted out of our national life. That is a colossal job, which requires the help of all of us from the President down to local government heads. But where government officers themselves are corrupt, where then is our salvation? We have a national sin which is called getting something for nothing, and it reaches everywhere.

Cosa Nostra, which has had and still has many counterparts, represents an intolerable type of organized viciousness within our American society of law and order. It

should be stamped out, and any responsible official who aids it, or covers it up, should also be punished.

The Sons of Italy as an organization cannot and will not defend known criminals, no matter what their names are. At the same time we ask for the kind of fairness from the public which does not accuse Italian Americans of exercising a monopoly in crime in this country.

## IS CONGRESS MEETING ITS SPACE-AGE TASKS?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, turning to another subject, more than a month ago—almost 2 months ago now—the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, sent to his constituents in Massachusetts a newsletter entitled "Is Congress Meeting Its Space-Age Tasks?" in which he strongly contends for a revision and updating, a modernization, of the rules of the Senate and of the Congress generally.

I ask unanimous consent that this splendid newsletter, which relates to matters which I have been urging on the Senate for a long time, be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

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

IS CONGRESS MEETING ITS SPACE-AGE TASKS?

Has Congress kept pace with the changing role of our Government in world and national affairs? Just as petitions are being circulated in Massachusetts to bring about much needed modernization of our State constitution, I believe that here in Washington the Congress organization and operation need an overhaul.

Congress last modernized its rules over 17 years ago when we passed the La Follette-Monroney Congressional Reorganization Act in 1946. Since that time our country has assumed the leadership of the free world and crossed new frontiers in science and military technology. New laws have greatly increased our Government's responsibility in domestic affairs. As a result, Members of Congress are receiving more and more requests for direct services to their constituents.

Mr. Roscoe Drummond, the noted columnist, has stated, "Congress is not handling its workload because it has not organized its time, its talents, and its resources to meet the space age tasks which today's world imposes upon it." To tackle this problem I have cosponsored legislation to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

This year Congress convened on January 9 and, by law, was supposed to have completed its work and adjourned by August 1. However, we have not met that date since 1956. The Senate was not even organized until the end of February, and today, in early October, we have passed just a few bills, mostly of a minor character. To date Congress has completed action on only 4 of the 11 regular appropriations bills, all of which are supposed to be passed before July 1.

This delay in authorizing Federal programs and passing appropriations to run the Government makes it extremely difficult for the various Government agencies to plan their programs efficiently. For example, construction projects are delayed into the winter months. I receive inquiries in August from students who have applied for National Defense Education Act scholarships who do not know whether money will be available by September.

The major work of a Member of Congress is supposed to be directed to legislative tasks. Yet today with the increasing centralization of Government programs, we find ourselves spending more and more time responding to problems of a nonlegislative nature. My mail averages 300 letters a day through the congressional session. Only about one-half the letters relate to legislation; the others request services ranging from Agriculture Department pamphlets to assistance on difficult immigration or military service cases. I must meet frequently with numerous Federal and State officials on problems of concern to Massachusetts. Then there are the numerous outside activities, both during the day and in the evenings, such as the recent luncheon for the Emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie. My trip to Moscow is another example. Also I receive many requests for speaking engagements and only wish I had time to accept more of them. All of these other activities must be fitted into a busy congressional day.

I think Congress must find ways to speed up its committee work and accelerate debate in the Senate. When legislation reaches the Senate floor, final action is often delayed while Senators speak on a variety of matters not germane to the pending business. This does not happen in the House of Representatives because of strongly controlled time limitations and a germaneness rule. The Senate Rules Committee has reported a proposal which I cosponsored providing that 3 hours a day be devoted strictly to consideration of the pending legislation. The Rules Committee has also recommended that the Senate committees be permitted to meet while the Senate is in its morning hour. Today, without special permission, committees cannot meet after the Senate meets.

Congress conducts about 90 percent of its legislative work in its committees. There, members study legislative proposals and make recommendations for action, so it is most important that the committees be organized to work effectively. The 1946 Reorganization Act reduced the number of standing committees to prevent overlap and duplication of function and control. But by 1962, Congress had a total of 303 committee units, including 36 standing committees, 3 special and select committees, 11 joint committees, and 253 subcommittees. The columnist Henry J. Taylor has suggested, "In the New England vernacular, the * * * committees gum up the sap works."

Each of the 535 Members of Congress is certainly entitled to a committee assignment. In the House of Representatives, each Member is entitled to one, but in practice about one-third of the Members serve on two committees. In the Senate, a Member gets two major committee assignments and usually one or two minor ones. For instance, I am a member of the Senate Armed Services, Appropriations, and Small Business Committees. Within the Appropriations Committee, I am a member of six subcommittees. I recall one day when I had six of my committees all meeting at the same time.

Also, there still tends to be duplication of work between similar committees of the House and Senate, and between committees within each body. Often officials from the executive departments have to justify the same program before four separate Congressional committees. Only under exceptional circumstances, such as in the recent nuclear test ban treaty hearings, do several committees sit jointly to take testimony on a pending proposal.

I have heard the seniority method of selecting the chairman and members of committees questioned, too. Should committee members be selected for knowledge of a particular subject rather than just seniority?

I have found the longer a Member stays in Congress, the more he becomes wedded to the seniority system. Personally, I have tried many times to think of a way to improve on the seniority system, but so far neither I nor any other Member has come up with a wiser method. The seniority system avoids jealousies, eliminates personal controversies as to merit, and permits Members to gain valuable experience and wisdom in their specialties.

Should chairmen have exclusive authority to schedule subjects for consideration? Under committee rules, a majority can always override the chairman to bring up a matter for consideration but in practice, Members hesitate to take this step. Good committee chairmen will always provide an opportunity for consideration of an important problem.

The resolution which I have cosponsored to establish a joint House-Senate committee to study the congressional machinery was reported recently to the Senate for action. In reporting this bill, the Senate Rules Committee specifically excluded any review of the rules and floor procedures of the two Houses of Congress. This, of course, excludes consideration of the controversial House Rules Committee or any change in Senate rule 22 relating to cloture (the means of cutting off filibuster). I agree with this action because I believe that to include the cloture rule in a general study would certainly jeopardize the chance of obtaining much-needed reform in other important areas. The cloture rule is a highly emotional issue because of its use in civil rights legislation. I have personally worked to improve rule 22 since 1947, and support the use of cloture after sufficient debate so that Members can have the opportunity to vote on the pending measure. But I believe that any cloture rule change should be considered by itself.

I do not agree with those who contend that Congress has abdicated its constitutional and historical responsibility of conducting the public business to the executive and judicial branches of the Government. Congress has a coequal responsibility with the executive and judiciary to make our system of Government function. Congress must be sure that it is meeting this responsibility.

LEVERETT H. SALTONSTALL.

## THE NATION'S PRIORITIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on October 27 an excellent editorial appeared in the New York Times entitled "The Nation's Priorities," commending the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for an address he had made on the space program, pointing out that what is needed is an overhaul of the manner in which Congress makes decisions. I could not agree more thoroughly with the editorial, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 27, 1963]

THE NATION'S PRIORITIES

Senator FULBRIGHT's recent address on the space program went far beyond the issue of whether the United States should devote an inordinate amount of resources to a "crash" effort to land a man on the moon before the Russians do.

"The real question before Congress," he said, "is one of priorities, of how we are to allocate our great but not unlimited resources among many important national programs." Is the Federal Government spending too much on space or armaments

or payments to farmers or veterans benefits and too little on education, on medical care, or on housing? More generally, does the entire Nation's spending pattern really reflect a rational allocation of resources? Are we, as a people, spending too much, say, on cosmetics, cigarettes, or liquor and too little on capital investment, education, the prevention of juvenile delinquency, or cleaning up slums?

The available national mechanisms for considering such questions are inadequate. The executive branch of the Federal Government has, in the Bureau of the Budget, perhaps the nearest approach to an organization for rational consideration of priorities, and its conclusions are embodied in the President's budget message annually. But even the Bureau of the Budget finds itself hemmed in by encrusted legal provisions and by political considerations which are often inconsonant with decisionmaking on the basis of true national interest.

In Congress the situation is much worse. Except in an occasional speech like Senator FULBRIGHT'S, it is difficult to see an approach based on a concept of priorities and of the intelligent weighing of alternatives. Instead, the various appropriation bills tend to be considered in isolation from each other, and decisions on quite important individual items often reflect the predilections or prejudices of particularly influential individuals or small groups.

What is needed is an overhaul of the manner in which Congress makes decisions. New organizations and new modes of procedure are required to guide the country into an intelligent scale of priorities and to make sure that we are weighing the competing demands of alternative needs.

## A CALL FOR STUDENT ACTION

Mr. CLARK. Finally, Mr. President, I committed myself, on October 10, to ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a "Call for Student Action," which was published by the U.S. National Student Association, a Philadelphia-based national student union, which deals with the subject of civil rights.

Signatures to this call have come in from all over the world. Guatemala, New Zealand, Basutoland, Malaya, Australia, Mexico, Morocco, and Lebanon are all well represented in this petition. I do not ask that all these names be printed, and I trust that the signatories will understand the practical considerations which compel that. But I would like to venture this observation: These petitions are concrete evidence that the eyes of the world are on the Congress of the United States as it comes to grips with the civil rights problem, and the image of America will be either brightened or tarnished by what we do here.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the call be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A CALL FOR STUDENT ACTION

We, the following students, desiring a world where there are differences without hate and where each man has the freedom to struggle for freedom, urge the people of the United States and their Congress to fulfill their historic promise of full rights for all men. We join the U.S. National Student Association in petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass into law the notable proposals for human rights currently before Congress.

## CONTINUATION OF APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR METCALF AS ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 232), as follows:

*Resolved*, That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 3 of rule I, the designation of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] today as Acting President pro tempore shall continue in effect during the remainder of the present session of the Congress, unless otherwise ordered.

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

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

## GIUSEPPE MAIDA AND OTHERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 729, House bill 6975.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6975) for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Giuseppe, Antonio, and Vittoria Maida.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## ENCOURAGEMENT TO CERTAIN PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS TO SERVE IN AREAS HAVING A SHORTAGE OF THEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, several weeks ago, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] made known his views on S. 2220, a bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists.

Because of the understanding of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the Senate was able to pass the bill which was then under consideration.

In view of the fact that he was so deeply interested in this matter—and legitimately so, because his reasons were all sound and good—the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], kept their pledge. Hearings have been held. The bill has now been reported.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 728; that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2220) to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment on page 1, line 3, after the word "section", to strike out "740" and insert "741"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "health", to strike out "authority" and insert "authority, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary,", and in line 17, after the word "interest", to strike out "thereon" and insert "thereon, except that regulations prescribed pursuant to clause (1) may also provide for a minimum period of service as a condition to application of this subsection"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That section 741 of the Public Health Service Act is amended (1) by redesignating subsections "(f)", "(g)", and "(h)" thereof as subsections "(g)", "(h)", and "(i)", respectively, and (2) by adding immediately after subsection (e) thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Where any person who obtained one or more loans from a loan fund established under this part—

"(1) engages in the practice of medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy, in an area in a State determined by the appropriate State health authority, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to have a shortage of and need for physicians or dentists; and

"(2) the appropriate State health authority certifies to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in such form and at such times at the Secretary may prescribe that such practice helps to meet the shortage of and need for physicians or dentists in the area where the practice occurs; then 10 per centum of the total of such loans, plus accrued interest on such amount, which are unpaid as of the date of such practice begins, shall be canceled thereafter for each year of such practice, up to a total of 50 per centum of such total, plus accrued interest thereon, except that regulations prescribed pursuant to clause (1) may also provide for a minimum period of service as a condition to application of this subsection."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have learned from long years of practicing law never to make a speech when the court is with an advocate, and always to stop when one is ahead. Therefore, I shall not discuss this bill, but I do not want to let this opportunity pass without expressing my appreciation first to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the committee, who expedited the consideration of the bill in the committee, in accordance with his promise or pledge to me at the time I offered the provisions of the bill in the

form of an amendment to the scholarship bill; to the members of the committee; to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; and to the many other Senators, some of whom felt compelled to oppose this measure when it necessitated returning the scholarship bill to the House, but who at the same time believed, as I believe, that this provision is highly essential to many rural communities, for their assistance in expediting the passage of the bill.

I wish to express my appreciation and the appreciation of my people back home, to whom this subject is exceedingly important.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the amendment which the Senator from New Hampshire has proposed to the bill, H.R. 12, which was passed several weeks ago, to provide assistance to medical, dental, and osteopathic students, would have been adopted by the Senate at the time the amendment was before it except that it was felt to be the better course of wisdom and prudence to pass the bill as the House had passed it, thus obviating the necessity for a conference, and avoiding further delay in the enactment of that meritorious bill.

I commend the Senator from New Hampshire for offering the amendment and for his diligent and devoted interest in behalf of writing the amendment into law.

The committee unanimously reported the bill. I hope very much that the Senate will now confirm the wisdom of our friend from New Hampshire and pass the bill without further delay.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what the Senate does today will be a monument to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, who is entirely responsible for this action. He has performed a worthy service in behalf of areas which all too often are forgotten.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this will not only be a monument to the Senator from New Hampshire in his own State, but it will be something of a monument in all the 50 States of the Union. I can hardly think of one State where there does not exist a situation comparable to that which was so eloquently and dramatically placed before the Senate when the earlier bill was before it.

We can readily understand the difficulty of a student, after having completed a medical education, facing the problem of establishing an urban practice.

What the Senate is doing today will go a long way toward directing medical talent into areas where it is so badly needed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, having heard the testimony before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I agree wholeheartedly with all that the distinguished Senator from Montana and the distinguished Senator from Illinois have said. This legislation will indeed be a monument to the diligence, the work, and the dedication of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. It will be a monument in all the 50 States, because there is a compelling need in all the States.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join in erecting a monument to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire while he is still with us to enjoy it in full strength and vigor. That is the time to erect a monument to an outstanding statesman like the Senator from New Hampshire. I am happy to be a part of this endeavor.

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

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

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

---

## PROPOSED APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (AMENDMENT NO. 349)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as so often happens when any matter relating to civil rights is before the Senate, it is opposed by those who say, "We have enough laws on the books now. We do not need any more laws. All we have to do is to enforce the laws that are on the books."

There will be coming before the Senate this week the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice.

As so often happens, it requires a considerable amount of digging to find out what the Committee on Appropriations has done in connection with a particular bill. However, as far as I have been able to determine in the limited time available, it appears as of now that the committee has completely eliminated the budget request for additional staff lawyers for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. The committee has recommended an appropriation of $18,657,000 under the item, "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities," which is $84,000 above the House allowance, but $516,000 under the budget request.

The Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, which has been very active, and which, from all indications, will experience no letup in its activities—indeed, its activities will probably increase—had in 1963 only 81 lawyers to carry on its program both here in Washington and throughout the United States in enforcing civil rights legislation which is on the books.

In the current budget, the President requested funds for 38 additional lawyers to handle an immense caseload of civil rights and race relations litigation.

The House allowed funds for the employment of less than half of the additional lawyers requested. It was the hope of the Department of Justice that the Senate, as so often is the case, would be somewhat more generous than the House, and would allow all or nearly all of the additional lawyers requested.

This time, after consideration in the Senate committee, as far as can now be determined, the committee disallowed the employment of any additional lawyers by the Civil Rights Division, and has hampered in a very effective manner—perhaps more effective than by defeating some minor measure—the administration of laws relating to civil rights.

At page 17 of the bill the committee makes provision for an appropriation of $6,600,000 for expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws. I have no quarrel with that. I assume that amount is needed. However, this amount is made specifically applicable only to the Antitrust Division; therefore it will not be available for use in any other division of the Department.

It will be my intention, when the bill is called up for consideration in the Senate, to offer an amendment to add to the appropriate item in the bill whatever sums may be necessary for the employment of additional lawyers in the Civil Rights Division, which are said by the Attorney General to be indispensable for the proper enforcement of the civil rights laws.

Those who oppose civil rights legislation certainly should not be allowed by the Senate to have it both ways, so to speak. There are those who continue in their opposition to civil rights legislation—and indeed such opposition comes not only from the diehard opponents of civil rights, but sometimes also from those who are less interested in this problem for a variety of reasons—and say, "Why do we need any more laws? We have enough laws now. All we need is to enforce the laws now on the statute books." Senators who take that position will be given an opportunity to provide sufficient funds for the enforcement of the laws now on the books.

I am perfectly willing to be convinced that there is not a need for all the additional lawyers requested, if that be a fact, but so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, it has stated that need. It seems to me that the request is relatively modest. I know something about the workload of that office, headed by Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall. It has performed outstandingly in this field, and is deserving of our full support.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which would make appropriate provision for the salaries and expenses necessary for the enforcement of the civil rights laws of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I would deeply appreciate it if the Senator would agree to my name appearing on the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy to include the distinguished Senator from

New York as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Like my colleague from New York, I was impressed with the facts as they came to my attention through an article published in the New York Times this morning under the byline of Anthony Lewis, a Times reporter who is quite knowledgeable on civil rights questions. I feel, with the Senator, that the situation must be corrected.

I should like to point out to my colleague from New York and to the Senate as a whole that at one time we settled, in my opinion, for an emasculated bill, a civil rights bill which included the establishment of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, which was established by law. When that was done, it was clearly contemplated that the Division would not be starved; that, on the contrary, it would be fortified and enabled to do its work.

It is by now almost a cliche in civil rights matters that all we are fighting for—people like my distinguished colleague from New York, typically, who has seized upon this issue, as he should, and others of us in the civil rights field—is the assertion of the right of law; and if the public interest cannot be protected by an adequate staff of lawyers, then, truly, it will fail.

We have made a solemn commitment that this division shall not starve. We knew very well, when we examined the bill, that it would die for lack of adequate provision. It is especially important for the Senate to be vigilant that this does not happen at a time when we may not have our gaze fixed upon this particular agency, assuming that it is doing the job it must do for civil rights.

I appreciate the remarks of my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the statement of my distinguished colleague from New York. This situation was called to my attention by the excellent article written by Mr. Anthony Lewis and published in the New York Times today. When I read it, I could hardly believe it. It did not seem possible that this could have slipped by the Committee on Appropriations. So far as I can now determine, the article is entirely accurate.

The same problem arose previously with respect to the Civil Rights Commission. An effort was made to cut off the funds of the Commission. If we intend to make the civil rights laws effective, we must not allow this additional appropriation to be eliminated.

I sincerely hope that the President, who has indicated a deep interest in this problem, will use his extremely persuasive and influential efforts with members of the Committee on Appropriations, to the end that they will be willing to accept an amendment to make adequate provision for the additional lawyers needed by the Department of Justice.

## CLASSIC NIXON STATEMENT ON PRINCIPLES OF U.S. GOVERNMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Richard Nixon, a former Vice President of the United States, was recently required to explain what he thought the principles underlying the form of Government of the United States to be, before he could win admission to the New York State bar. His concise 500-word answer is a classic description of our governmental principles.

Mr. Lowell C. Wadmond, chairman of the New York appellate court's committee on character and fitness, told the court that the former Vice President's statement was the finest he had seen in 28 years as a member of the committee.

Mr. President, Congress has been under heavy attack for impeding the executive; for general foot dragging. The dignity and integrity of the legislative branch has been sadly misunderstood.

Because Mr. Nixon's statement represents the conception of our Government that is held by millions of Democrats as well as Republicans, and especially because it provides an assertion of the coequal power of Congress with the executive and the judiciary at a time when this coequal status is under heavy assault, and because it is a model of concise exposition of the principles on which our Government is founded, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The principles underlying the Government of the United States are decentralization of power, separation of power and maintaining a balance between freedom and order.

Above all else, the framers of the Constitution were fearful of the concentration of power in either individuals or government. The genius of their solution in this respect is that they were able to maintain a very definite but delicate balance between the Federal Government and the State government, on the one hand, and between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, on the other hand.

By contrast, in the British system, the Parliament is supreme. In the present French system the primary power resides in the executive, and in some older civilizations the judges were predominant. Throughout American history there have been times when one or the other branches of Government would seem to have gained a dominant position, but the pendulum has always swung back and the balance over the long haul maintained.

The concept of decentralization of power is maintained by what we call the Federal system. But the principle is much broader in practice. Putting it most simply, the American ideal is that private or industrial enterprise should be allowed and encouraged to undertake all functions which it is capable to perform. Only when private enterprise cannot or will not do what needs to be done should government step in. When Government action is required, it should be undertaken if possible by that unit of government closest to the people. For example, the progression should be from local, to State, to Federal Government in that order. In other words, the Federal Government should step in only when the function to be performed is too big for the State or local government to undertake.

## RUSSIA'S DESPERATE NEED FOR U.S. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have consistently argued that no wheat or other grain transactions should be made with the Soviet Union unless substantial concessions are obtained in return from the Soviet Union.

On Sunday, December 8, the Washington Post carried an excellent analysis of the problems which face the Soviet Union in its agricultural sector. I ask unanimous consent that this article, written by Stephen S. Rosenfeld and entitled "A Red Crisis In Topsoil," be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this article points out repeatedly that the Soviet problem in agriculture is essentially one of scarce economic resources. They have not allocated enough chemical fertilizers, enough machinery and equipment or even enough manpower. Rather, the allocation of resources has been in the direction of armaments and heavy industry.

The effect of this malallocation of resources has been to accentuate a shortage of agricultural products, products which the nation must have in adequate supply in order to live and prosper.

The result of this malallocation of resources is that the Soviet Union is now in a position where it must either divert resources back to agriculture or obtain these vital commodities from outside sources. As I have said before, under these conditions, I believe that we should extract substantial concessions from the Soviet Union before any grain is delivered to Russia in addition to that which may be shipped under any agreement to sell.

Instead, however, we seem to be providing the concessions ourselves in the form of waivers of shipping contracts, subsidized prices and so on.

EXHIBIT 1

A RED CRISIS IN TOPSOIL

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

The wheat disaster which errant nature and human error inflicted upon the Soviet Union this year also brought a harsh policy dilemma to the surface.

The day of reckoning is Monday, when the Soviet Communist Party's elite central committee will open a plenum—a session of all its 320 members—in Moscow.

The target of its deliberation and hoopla will be chemicals used in agriculture. The bull's eye in that target is fertilizer.

Fertilizer may seem a strange concern for the full array of a country's policymakers. In the United States, it could hardly evoke such official fervor. Obviously, the Soviet Union is a different land.

The heart of the matter is the fact that the Soviet Union's and Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's abilities and appetites are out of whack. He wants, in his terms, prosperity, but he lacks the resources to attain it now.

It is not that, as in the United States, the resources available to the Government are limited. The Soviet Government commands all Soviet resources and they are simply not up to the tasks imposed upon them.

The customary Soviet reaction to this bind is to set priorities; to feed the top (armaments, heavy industry) and starve the bottom (agriculture, consumer goods).

But, to right this imbalance, the Soviets cannot simply switch off resources from a high pocket of the economy to a low. Reality is too complex to permit an easy and automatic move from guns to butter.

Over the long run such an exchange might be made possible by disarmament or true peace or by completion of the country's heavy industry plant facilities.

But in the short run of current policy, swaps are more likely to be made inside priorities, not between them. Hence the alternative to a missile is a space capsule; to a cannon, a machine tool.

Changes in these upper reaches don't much help farmers or the consumers, who vie not with marshals or space scientists but with each other for investment funds, building materials, skilled personnel and the like.

Like his czarist and Soviet predecessors, Khrushchev has tried to get farm progress on the cheap and to siphon money, men and materials from the farms to other parts of the population and economy.

Here is another fundamental squeeze. Collectivization was undertaken as a solution to the political problem of bringing the spread-out ornery peasantry under central control.

This solution created an economic problem since collectivized peasants simply have not produced. Proof lies in the fact that on their own uncollectivized garden plots, the peasants produce like mad.

Khrushchev might solve the economic problem by decollectivizing. But this is unthinkable; it would recreate the original political problem of an uncontrolled peasantry.

Enter fertilizer.

In recent years the Kremlin has sought to improve agriculture without spending money. It has concentrated on administrative manipulation and exhortation, as though the right organization or slogan would unlock the door to bounty.

This worked well enough for Khrushchev until this year's wheat catastrophe, only now being seen in all of its awesome scope.

Authoritative American estimates of the wheat crop run as low as 40 million tons, down from a 1958 peak of 62 million.

In the key new lands of Khrushchev's personal pride and favor, Soviet sources put some yields as small as three bushels per acre, barely enough to cover next year's seed requirements. The American average in 1961 was 24.

This was the plight that cornered Khrushchev and forced him to offer more than a billion dollars for foreign wheat and to consider spending substantial sums on his farms.

To a man who 2 years ago told his people that "the Soviet Union will soon occupy a position on the international grain market which will demonstrate to the gentlemen imperialists how our agriculture is growing" [Stormy applause], the grain purchases must have hurt pride as much as pocketbook.

But, a victim of the rising consumer expectations which he himself has cultivated, Khrushchev went ahead and shopped. He had promised too much to the Russian people to pull in their belts in Stalin's old style.

The grain purchases, he realized, were only an expedient designed for an emergency. To spare Russia the need to dip wheat from foreign wells in future seasons of cruel weather, he undertook to increase the fertilizer supply. Weed and pest killers are also on his list.

Last year the Soviets produced 17 million tons of fertilizer; for fewer acres in a kinder climate, the United States produced 35 million.

Khrushchev said 35 million tons would be produced in 1965 (last year a Soviet expert said 45–47 million tons would be needed then) and for 1970 he set a target of 100 million tons with a price tag of 20 billion rubles. That is more than 20 billion dollars, a colossal sum.

Specialists feel that Russia's fertilizer situation is worse than the figures imply. Soviet writers continually tell inspirational horror stories about fertilizer lost through faulty production, slipshod distribution, or misuse. Khrushchev recently noted a typical atrocity: children were tobogganing on hills of unused fertilizer.

Nor is the panacea tone of preplenum Soviet discourse on fertilizer shared by the specialists here. Even if the immense amounts of money and materials for building fertilizer plants, bags, spreaders, and the like are found, other hurdles remain.

Incentives may be the highest. The record is plain that peasants won't work for nothing. Incentives don't mean just more rubles in the peasant's pocket. They mean goods to spend those rubles on.

These are consumer goods and if the Kremlin is to supply them in the quantities and qualities demanded, great expenditures are required.

Russia's farmers have been called "Soviet Negroes." Their purchasing power, social benefits, and individual opportunities are—by official policy—below those of the favored urban workers. The cost of changing this policy, in a country where six or seven times as many people work on farms as in the United States, is staggering to contemplate.

There is the problem of "cadres," the noncoms and officers of Soviet agriculture. They are often the country's least able personnel. If they were good, they would not be sent to the low-priority countryside.

It is hard to keep the farmers down on the farm. They want the relative comfort, culture, and pride of city living. Older people and women make up a disproportionate share of the rural population. The young, the able, and the ambitious flee to the cities, and no number of Hero of Labor Awards can hold them back.

Monday's plenum, it is clear, has its work cut out for it.

---

## ECONOMIC ANALYSIS SERIOUSLY QUESTIONS TAX CUT AS UNEMPLOYMENT SOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a casual look at the general economic indicators would suggest that the economy is booming along at an adequate rate. Improvement seems, in general, across the board. However, this is a strange type of economic recovery. One economic indicator, namely, the level of unemployment after remaining at unfortunately high levels significantly deteriorated last month while the rest of the economy is booming. I think this strange circumstance requires much more examination that we have given it to date. It represents a serious social and economic dilemma.

Let us take a look at some figures. In the third quarter of 1963 gross national product was at a level of $588.7 billion, up some $9 billion, a 1½ percent increase in one quarter. If this continues, the annual increase would be 6 percent.

Industrial production was at a high rate of 126.6 in October, using the 1957–59 figure as a base of 100. This represents a half of 1 percent increase in 1 month since September.

National income in the third quarter was at a rate of $481.9 billion, an increase of 1½ percent since the second quarter. Consumer expenditures were $374.9 billion in the third quarter, up roughly 1½ percent since the second quarter.

The Consumer Price Index is already beginning to move up. In October the Consumer Price Index was at 107.2, using the 1957–59 period as a base. This represented an increase of one-tenth of 1 percent in 1 month from September.

Certainly this prosperity has extended to the business sector. Corporate profits after tax in the third quarter were $27.4 billion, up some $600 million since the second quarter. This represented an increase of almost 3 percent. Investment was at an annual rate of $3.7 billion in the third quarter, up $3 billion or nearly 3 percent since the second quarter of this year.

Yet look at the employment figures. The number of unemployed rose between October and November by half a million to 3.9 million in November. This is close to the level of a year ago. Seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment was 5.9 percent in November, up from 5.5 percent in October. The rate in November was larger than it was in November a year ago.

Mr. President, we will shortly be considering the vocational education bill.

The bill is in conference. I hope and pray that it will be reported this year, because it could make a positive, direct contribution to the kind of bottleneck unemployment we are suffering in our economy.

Listen to some of these recent figures on unemployment. November the job rise was somewhat more than in recent years, both for teenagers and for adult men. Much of the increase in unemployment came from an increase in the number of teenagers looking for part-time work. The teenage unemployment rate rose in November to 17.2 percent, close to the record May 1963, figure. Among these young workers, unemployment has continued substantially higher than a year earlier throughout 1963. Mr. President, these statements are based upon the most recent news issuance dated Friday, December 6, from the U.S. Department of Labor. Mr. President, a more complete breakdown of the unemployment figures for November is not yet available. However, a more finite breakdown is available for October of 1963. In that month unemployment of boys between 14 and 19 was at a rate of 12 percent. This group alone, Mr. President, accounted for a larger number of the total unemployed, 408,000 people, than any other component age group in the economy.

The same thing can be said with respect to girls. In October the unemployment rate of girls under 20 was 14.4 percent. They accounted for 378,000 people more than any other component group of women in our economy.

Vocational education can also be used for groups against whom economic discrimination is practiced. Again, referring to the October unemployment figures we see that while whites had an unemployment rate of 4.1 percent, nonwhites had an unemployment rate which was more than double, namely 9.2 percent Where white males had an unemployment rate of 3.5 percent, nonwhite males had an unemployment rate of 8.1 percent.

The importance of such policies as vocational education can also be seen in

terms of the duration of unemployment. Twelve and eight-tenths percent of the total unemployed have been unemployed between 15 and 26 weeks. An even larger number, 13.8 percent, have been unemployed for 27 weeks or more. These figures, incidentally, are larger than they were in October of 1962.

Mr. President, a number of economists throughout the country are becoming increasingly concerned about the nature of this general structural unemployment problem. I have mentioned the work done by Prof. Charles C. Killingsworth, of the University of Michigan. Others, such as Prof. William Felner, of Yale, and Prof. Rendigs Fels, of Virginia, have in recent weeks also commented on this same phenomena.

I also wish to refer to the recent work of Mr. Michael E. Levy, staff economist of the National Industrial Conference Board. Mr. Levy, writing in the Business Management Record, a publication issued by the NICB in November 1963, provides an excellent assessment of the retarded growth hypothesis and the policy implication which stems from that hypothesis.

Mr. President, the philosophy that a tax cut is the real answer is based upon what I believe is a mistaken notion which overlooks the nature of our unemployment problem.

Mr. Levy points out that there is considerable doubt that the economy has actually tapered off in its general economic growth. At the same time he well recognizes that the unemployment situation is not improving, and perhaps is actually getting worse. As he then indicates:

> These conclusions certainly do not follow from any simple gap analysis. Part of the gap may reflect an overestimate of potential supply within the current institutional framework, rather than real deficiencies in demand. Clearly this problem would call for more complex remedies than monetary or fiscal demand reflation.

Of course, the tax cut is the model for that.

Mr. Levy then points out that the Council of Economic Advisers has supported the growth hypothesis by comparing the period of 1947 to 1957 with the period of 1957 to 1962. This comparison indicates that growth rates change from 3.8 to 2.9 percent in the latter period. However, as Mr. Levy points out, a simple change in the base period gives far different conclusions. Thus, if the comparison is made between 1948 to 1958 and 1958 to 1962, the corresponding growth rates are 3.2 and 4.1 percent. In other words, the economy has been growing much faster in the past 4 years than during the previous period.

Mr. Levy's own conclusion is:

> The record shows unusually high growth during the early fifties, followed by very slow growth during the midfifties, and a steady acceleration during the late fifties and early sixties to date.

What does all this mean from the standpoint of policy? Mr. Levy concludes:

> Expansionary fiscal policies, in particular, carefully timed and structured tax reductions, may succeed in eliminating the remaining pockets of purely cyclical slack and unemployment. But—

He continues—

> the evidence of the past decade, as I see it, adds up to more than mere cyclical slack caused or aggravated by restrictive policies.

He emphasizes that our unemployment rates are a result in major part of resources not readily employable because of sectoral, institutional, and other so-called structural imbalances and rigidities that may be deeply embedded in our present markets, costs, and price structures. Until recently, Government policy emphasized mainly the former problem, which is more readily amenable to solution; but the structural problem, which may be more deep seated and intractable, is likely to demand increasing attention of policymakers in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time granted the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my own conclusion is that instead of placing so much faith and hope in the effectiveness of a general aggregative approach, such as the present tax bill in the Senate Finance Committee, we should concentrate much more attention upon specific policies designed to meet particular types of unemployment. A classic example of such a specific policy is the vocational education bill. I think this bill should be enacted, and it may well be that we shall have to look at this legislation again and consider a substantial expansion in the program in the future.

I believe this is necessary in view of the nature of our unemployment problem—the fact that it is concentrated among the unskilled and the young, those who desperately need to have vocational education before they can qualify for jobs in our booming economy. I believe this is the heart and soul of our problem. Therefore, although a tax cut may increase profits and personal income, and has great popular appeal—for everyone like to have his taxes cut—in my opinion a tax cut is not a sensible way for Congress to act in view of the nature of our economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Mr. Levy printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

### U.S. GROWTH RATES: THE KINK IN THE CURVE

(By Michael E. Levy)

(NOTE.—A slightly abridged and edited version of an address by Michael E. Levy, the conference board's specialist in public finance, at the annual meeting of the American Statistical Association, Cleveland, Ohio, September 5, 1963.)

During the end of the 1950's and early in 1960 business leaders and economists alike shared great expectations for the next decade, which was commonly referred to, at the time, as the "soaring sixties." Of the many projections of real economic growth for this decade, virtually none assumed an overall growth rate of less than 3.5 percent, and estimates ranging as high as 4.2 percent or even 4.7 percent were by no means uncommon.[1]

#### FROM "SOARING SIXTIES" TO "NEW STAGNATION"

By the end of 1960, the outlook among economists had changed drastically. At congressional hearings in December 1960, Joseph Pechman voiced considerable concern over the slow rates of growth of the economy during the business cycles of 1953–57 and 1957–60, and Charles Schultze diagnosed the recent economic performance as "high-level creeping stagnation."[2]

Early in 1961, the new Council of Economic Advisers presented for the first time a coherent and integrated analysis of what Arthur Burns, in his critical review, subsequently termed the "new stagnation theory."[3] Since that time, phrases such as "stagnation," "economic slowdown," and "deficient economic performance" have become part of the standard vocabulary used by economists, business leaders, and politicians alike, in describing the performance of the U.S. economy during recent years.

#### NEW STAGNATION: THE BUILDING BLOCKS

This new stagnation analysis may be viewed as consisting of three major building blocks. The first of these consists of a set of four aggregate statistical measures designed to substantiate the nature and timing of the economic slowdown. These are: (1) The actual rate of growth of real GNP, (2) the comparison of this growth rate with long-term historical norms, (3) data on excess capacity and unemployment, and (4) the GNP gap, that is, the difference between potential and actual GNP, where "potential GNP" is defined as total output that could be produced at "full employment" with reasonably stable prices.[4]

A second building block is more detailed and specific information bearing on the probable causes of our present economic deficiencies. This type of information stresses two major recent developments: (1) a slowdown in the rate of capital formation and

---

[1] E.g., see National Planning Association, "Long-Range Projections for Economic Growth: The American Economy in 1970," a staff report (Washington 1959); Gerhard Colm and Manuel Helzner, "Financial Needs and Resources Over the Next Decade: At All Levels of Government," and Dick Netzer, "Financial Needs and Resources Over the Next Decade: State and Local Governments," in "Public Finances: Needs, Sources and Utilization," published for the National Bureau of Economic Research (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1961); also Martin R. Gainsbrugh, editor, "American Enterprise: The Next 10 Years" (the Macmillan Co., New York, 1961), esp. pp. 145, 179, 198, 208, 309, 354–55, and 395.

[2] U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, "Current Economic Situation and Short-Run Outlook," hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, Dec. 7–8, 1960, 86th Cong., 2d sess., January 1961.

[3] U.S. Council of Economic Advisers, "The American Economy in 1961: Problems and Policies," in U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, January 1961 Economic Report of the President and the Economic Situation and Outlook, hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 1961; Arthur F. Burns, "Examining the New Stagnation Theory," the Morgan Guarantee survey, May 1961.

[4] Most estimates of potential GNP have taken a 4-percent unemployment rate to represent full employment. For a detailed discussion of the conceptual and measurement problems of "potential GNP" and for alternative estimates, see Michael E. Levy, "Fiscal Policy, Cycles and Growth" (National Industrial Conference Board, New York, 1963), ch. 5, pp. 59–81.

consumer demand, or a decline in the ratio of investment and consumer demand to GNP, and (2) an increase in, and an unusually high level of, the full employment budget surplus.

The following set of inferences and prescriptions derived from the preceding body of information completes the structure of the new stagnation analysis: (1) the deficient economic performance of recent years was the result of insufficient aggregate demand in general, and of low levels of investment in particular; (2) this lack of adequate demand was either caused or aggravated by excessively restrictive high-saving budget structures; and (3) greater fiscal incentives to private investment and consumption are, therefore, appropriate and effective remedies.

The following analysis focuses mainly on the first of these three building blocks, the evidence of recent stagnation. This so-called stagnation, which reflects a flattening of the U.S. growth curve, on the one hand, and a deterioration in the rate of utilization of economic resources, on the other, will be termed hereafter—somewhat inaccurately—the kink in the growth curve.

The second set of data, those reflecting on the causes of stagnation, will be scrutinized briefly, and I shall conclude with a few comments concerning current inferences and prescriptions.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE KINK

Four statistical measures have been used to substantiate the economic deficiencies of recent years. Two of these measures are growth rate comparisons; the other two are measures of unused productive capacity or loss of potential output. These two pairs address themselves to two distinct questions that have frequently been fused, or even confused.

Actual observed growth rates are the direct result of the interaction between aggregate demand and potential supply. Thus, a slowdown in the observed growth rate may reflect any one of three possible developments: (a) a balanced slowdown in the growth of both aggregate full employment demand and supply, (b) slackening growth of aggregate demand, or (c) slower growth of potential supply due to smaller increases in labor force, capital, or productivity. Without additional independent information, a comparison of actual growth rates cannot reveal whether the observed slowdown is due mainly to lackluster demand for goods and services, or to sluggish increases in labor, capital, and productivity.

This does not imply that the comparison of observed growth rates is trivial. It is of considerable interest whether real total, or per capita, GNP is rising less rapidly at present than during some previous period. But such information is informative rather than diagnostic in character.

One must turn to data on productive capacity and potential supply in order to determine whether a slowdown is caused mainly by limitations of "potential" supply or by lack of effective demand. Abnormally low unemployment rates and negative GNP gaps—that is, an excess of actual over "potential" GNP—combined with price pressures are indicative of limitations on the supply side. High unemployment rates and large and increasing positive GNP gaps apparently point to limitations on the demand side.

In fact, some economists have interpreted high unemployment rates and large positive GNP gaps as "proof" of "lack of effective demand" in the traditional Keynesian sense of the term. Hence they have prescribed the expansion of demand for goods and service by means of easy monetary and fiscal policies—as described in any standard principles textbook—as the effective cure against these ills.

These conclusions certainly do not follow from any simple "gap" analysis. Our current measurements of unemployment and "potential GNP" cannot properly differentiate between that part of unused resources or lost potential output which is due to plain "lack of demand" and that part which, though "revealed" by our measures, is not readily available to the economy because of sectoral demand-supply imbalances, rigidities in the institutional setting or in cost-price relations.[5] In other words, part of the "gap" may reflect an overestimate of "potential supply" within the current institutional framework, rather than real deficiencies in demand. Clearly, this problem would call for more complex remedies than monetary or fiscal demand reflation.

MEASURING THE KINK

In measuring the kink in the growth curve, I shall focus first on growth rate comparisons, and then on measures of resource utilization and potential supply.

*Comparison of short-term growth rates*

By far the most popular comparisons in recent discussions have been those of short-term growth rates. Such comparisons, however, pose several serious problems that arise from the uneven pace of economic growth during the business cycle: an initial decline is usually followed by a rapid recovery and an expansion which tends to slow down as the cyclical peak is approached. Hence, any arbitrary selection of starting and terminal points—or slight shifts in the time periods selected—may have a spectacular effect on the observed short-term growth rates. For example, if the recent 1947–57 and 1957–62 comparison of the CEA is replaced by one of 1948–58 with 1958–62, the corresponding growth rates change from 3.8 percent and 2.9 percent, respectively,[6] to 3.2 percent and 4.1 percent.

Clearly, peak-to-peak measurements should be used for the computations of reasonably useful short-term growth rates.[7] Moreover, computations based on quarterly peaks—as used here—seem far superior to those based on peak years that may already contain a significant part of the following recession.

The comparison of quarterly peak-to-peak growth rates reveals a very different picture from that of the widely advertised "economic slowdown." An unusually high growth rate of 5.2 percent during the 1948–53 cycle was followed by a disappointing growth rate of 2.3 percent during the 1953–57 cycle. Since then, however, the growth rate has improved significantly. It amounted to 2.7 percent during the 1957–60 cycle and rose to 3.4 percent during the interval from the 1960 peak to the second quarter of 1963, the latest available date. (See table 1.) Granted that the peak of the present cycle has not yet been reached and that the ultimate peak-to-peak growth rate may dip below 3.4 percent, it is nonetheless very likely to remain well above the 2.7 percent rate of the last cycle.

The industrial production index tells a similar story. After growing by an impressive 7 percent during the 1948–53 cycle, it edged up by merely 2.2 percent during 1953–57. The corresponding growth rates for the 1957–60 cycle and the most recent period were 2.8 percent and 4.1 percent; the average growth for the entire 1948–63 period amounted to 4.2 percent.

In conclusion, the record shows unusually rapid growth during the early 1950's followed by very slow growth during the mid-1950's and a steady acceleration during the late 1950's and early 1960's to date.

*Short-term rates and historical norms*

How do these postwar intracyclical growth rates compare with the long-term historical growth record of the U.S. economy? The long-term real growth rate of gross national product for 1889–1957 was 3.5 percent.[8] More rapid growth during the early decades of this period was offset by somewhat slower growth during most of this century. Real GNP grew by only 2.9 percent from 1909 to 1957, or by 3.1 percent from 1919 to 1957.[9]

[5] For an elaboration of this point and a discussion of "direct" attempts to separate these two elements, see Levy, op. cit., esp. pp. 42–45, 60–61.

[6] Council of Economic Advisers, Annual Report, 1963, printed together with the Economic Report of the President (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1963), table 4. The figures shown there are 3.9 percent and 3.0 percent. For consistency, I have substituted the figures from table 2 of William B. Franklin's "The Postwar Cycles" (National Industrial Conference Board, New York; 1963).

[7] 1948 and 1957 (but neither 1947 nor 1958) were peak years.

[8] E.g., see John W. Kendrick, "Productivity Trends in the United States," published for the National Bureau of Economic Research (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1961), p. 62, table 2.

[9] Edward F. Denison, "The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States and the Alternatives Before Us" (Committee for Economic Development, 1962), pp. 17–19; Kendrick, op. cit., p. 60, table 1.

TABLE 1.—*Peak-to-peak real growth rates of actual GNP, industrial production and potential GNP during the postwar cycles, 1948–63*

[In percent]

| | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1953 (1st cycle) | 2d quarter, 1953 to 3d quarter, 1957 (2d cycle) | 3d quarter, 1957 to 2d quarter, 1960 (3d cycle) | 2d quarter, 1960 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4th cycle) | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4 postwar cycles) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Actual GNP | 5.2 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 3.5 |
| Industrial production | 7.0 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 4.1 | 4.2 |
| Potential GNP: | | | | | |
| Knowles [1] | 4.1 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.1 |
| Okun I [1] | 4.3 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Okun II [2] | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.7 |

[1] For sources, discussion of estimating methods, and listing of quarterly data, see Levy, op. cit. For Knowles estimates, 1st 2 quarters of 1963 were derived from preliminary extrapolations. Okun data from 1960 to present were revised to take account of the July 1963 GNP revisions of the Department of Commerce.

[2] Okun II is the same as Okun I, except that growth rates were derived from semilogarithmic least-squares regressions rather than from peak-to-peak compound-interest formula. (The striking differences between Okun I and II are a result of the fairly irregular growth rates o. the Okun estimate.)

NOTE.—All GNP computations are based on constant (1954) dollar series. 1963 2d quarter is the latest quarter for which data are available but is not an established cyclical peak.

Sources: Federal Reserve Board; James W. Knowles; Arthur M. Okun; U.S. Department of Commerce; U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE 2.—*Unemployment rates and real relative GNP gaps during the postwar cycles, 1948–63*

[In percent]

| | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1953 (1st cycle) | 2d quarter, 1953 to 3d quarter, 1957 (2d cycle) | 3d quarter, 1957 to 2d quarter, 1960 (3d cycle) | 2d quarter, 1960 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4th cycle) | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4 postwar cycles) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Quarterly unemployment rate: | | | | | |
| At initial peak | 3.7 | 2.6 | 4.3 | 5.2 | ---------- |
| At trough | 6.8 | 6.0 | 7.4 | 6.8 | ---------- |
| At terminal peak | 2.6 | 4.3 | 5.2 | 5.8 | ---------- |
| Cycle average | 4.2 | 4.4 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 5.0 |
| Relative GNP gap: | | | | | |
| Knowles estimate: [1] | | | | | |
| At initial peak | −1.0 | −5.8 | 3.4 | 6.1 | ---------- |
| At trough | 4.7 | 2.4 | 9.3 | 9.9 | ---------- |
| At terminal peak | −5.8 | 3.4 | 6.1 | 7.0 | ---------- |
| Cycle average [2] | −2.2 | .4 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 2.9 |
| Okun estimate: [1] | | | | | |
| At initial peak | −1.0 | −4.7 | 1.0 | 3.7 | ---------- |
| At trough | 8.2 | 6.0 | 9.8 | 8.2 | ---------- |
| At terminal peak | −4.7 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 5.4 | ---------- |
| Cycle average [2] | .4 | 1.3 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 3.2 |

[1] For sources, discussion of estimating method, and listing of quarterly data, see Levy, op. cit. For Knowles estimates, 1st 2 quarters of 1963 were derived from preliminary extrapolations. Okun data from 1960 to present were revised to take account of the July 1963 GNP revisions of the Department of Commerce.

[2] Cycle averages were computed by dividing cumulative quarterly GNP gaps for each cycle by cumulative quarterly potential GNP. The initial peak was excluded; the terminal peak, included.

NOTE.—*Relative GNP gap* equals actual GNP gap (i.e., potential minus actual GNP) divided by potential GNP. All GNP gap computations are based on constant (1954) dollar series. 1963 2d quarter is the latest quarter for which data were available but is not an established cyclical peak. All peak and trough values refer to the quarterly dates established by the National Bureau of Economic Research.

Sources: James W. Knowles; Arthur M. Okun; U.S. Department of Commerce; U.S. Department of Labor.

The 5.2-percent growth rate during the 1948–53 cycle was thus well above the historical norm. It was supported first by high liquidity and a backlog of demand for durable goods inherited from World War II, and subsequently by the Korean boom. Most economists believe that this abnormally high growth rate could not have been sustained.[10] In fact, it may well have included some "borrowing of growth" from the 1953–57 cycle. The intracyclical growth rates of both the 1953–57 and the 1957–60 cycles were clearly below the historical norm. But the performance of the latest cycle to date leads one to believe that its growth rate may well remain above the 1919–1957 norm.

To conclude, economic growth during the 1960's to date, when compared with the historical growth record, does not give rise to any undue alarm over stagnation.

At this point, a word of caution is in order. The comparison of short-term with long-term historical growth rates does not provide any information as to the level of gross national product. The short-term rate may fall short of, or exceed, the long-term rate while GNP is either below or above its long-term growth path.

Independent evidence suggests that in 1957 actual GNP fell approximately on its long-term growth path.[11] The fact that the real growth rate from the 1957 peak to the present has averaged 3.1 percent suggests that the economy has continued to grow more or less along its historical growth path, falling below it in 1957–60, but recovering during the early 1960's.

*Excess capacity—Unemployment rates*

The discussion so far has focused on comparisons over time of the interaction between aggregate demand and supply. We now turn to measures of unused capacity and potential supply in order to determine to what extent our productive potential has been utilized. When viewed from this angle, the recent economic performance leaves no room for complacency. During the present cycle, the unemployment rate has averaged 6.1 percent; it averaged 5.9 percent during the 1957–60 cycle. These figures are disturbingly high in absolute terms as well as in comparison with a 4.4 and 4.2 percent averages for 1953–57 and 1948–53. (See table 2.) Comparison of the latest quarterly unemployment rate with those of the preceding cyclical peaks is equally discouraging: 2.6 percent (1st cycle), 4.3 percent (2d cycle), 5.2 percent (3d cycle), 5.8 percent (current cycle).

Further insight may be gained by comparing the growth rate of the civilian labor force with that of civilian employment for successive cycles (see table 3). During the 1948–53 cycle, employment grew more rapidly than the civilian labor force, resulting in the unusually low unemployment rate of 2.6 percent at the end of the economic expansion. Since the 1953 peak, the labor force has grown faster than civilian employment, but the gap between these two growth rates has narrowed considerably during recent years. Specifically, after a sharp acceleration in the rate of growth of the labor force during 1953–57, accompanied by a much more modest rise in the growth rate of employment, both rates have declined during 1957–60 and 1960–63, the former more rapidly than the latter.

In conclusion, unemployment statistics point to a steady deterioration of resource utilization ever since the 1953 peak. The initial deterioration during 1953–57 received little attention and was of no great concern because it started from an exceedingly high—perhaps excessively high—basis. Recently this deterioration has been almost arrested, but public concern has been greater than before, because even slight additional slippage is very painful at present, when increased resource-utilization is so clearly desirable.

*Lost output—the GNP gap*

In addition to the unemployment statistics, estimates of potential GNP and of the GNP gap have frequently been used to measure the magnitude of unused economic resources and lost output. The use of these measures poses many intricate conceptual and estimating problems, which were analyzed in a recent study.[12] This analysis reveals that alternative estimates of potential GNP yield sizable variations in short-term potential growth rates and are, therefore, of only limited usefulness for growth-rate comparisons. Nonetheless it is of some interest to note that—according to most existing estimates—potential GNP grew at a slower rate than actual GNP during 1948–53, but has grown at a faster rate ever since the 1953 peak (see table 1).

More useful and reliable is the pattern of change in GNP gaps. During most of the expansion phase of the 1948–53 cycle, the quarterly GNP gaps were negative, that is, actual GNP exceeded potential GNP. (This implies overutilization of resources at that time.) Since the 1953 peak, however, the quarterly GNP gaps have been positive most of the time, indicating an output loss that has steadily increased at successive cyclical peaks as well as over each successive cycle as a whole (see table 2). The cycle average of the relative GNP gap, that is, the cumulative (quarterly) real GNP gaps divided by cumulative (quarterly) potential GNP, may serve as a crude but convenient summary measure of the average loss of output during the business cycle. These cycle averages (computed from James Knowles' estimates of potential GNP) deteriorated from a 2.2 percent excess of actual over potential GNP during the 1948–53 cycle to a 0.4-percent deficiency during the 1953–57 cycle, a 6.8-percent deficiency during the 1957–60 cycle, and a 7.4-percent deficiency for the period from the 1960 peak to the present. Cycle averages of the relative GNP gap computed from Arthur Okun's estimates of potential GNP differ somewhat in magnitude but yield the same overall pattern of increases over successive cycles. (See table 2.)

[10] E.g., Pechman, loc. cit., p. 113.

[11] See Denison, op. cit., pp. 18–21; also Levy, op. cit., pp. 61–64.

[12] Levy, op. cit., ch. 5, pp. 59–81.

TABLE 3.—*Peak-to-peak growth rates of civilian labor force, employment, and unemployment during the postwar cycles, 1948–63*

[In percent]

| | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1953 (1st cycle) | 2d quarter, 1953 to 3d quarter, 1957 (2d cycle) | 3d quarter, 1957 to 2d quarter, 1960 (3d cycle) | 2d quarter, 1960 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4th cycle) | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4 postwar cycles) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Civilian labor force | 0.8 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| Employment, all industries | .9 | 1.1 | 1.0 | .9 | 1.0 |
| Unemployment | −4.2 | 13.6 | 9.5 | 3.9 | 5.1 |

NOTE.—1963 2d quarter is the latest quarter for which data were available but is not an established cyclical peak.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

Thus, the GNP gap analysis leads to the same conclusion as the analysis of unemployment data. A significant and persistent decline of resource utilization has taken place since the 1953 peak. This decline, which was most severe during the 1957–60 cycle, has been almost arrested recently. But it has left the economy with a large backlog of unused resources.

CAUSES OF "STAGNATION"

Insufficient private demand, and in particular insufficient private investment, has been considered the primary cause, not only of the slowdown of our economic growth, but also of the underutilization of resources. Excessively restrictive economic policies have been termed the "ultimate cause," because of their drag on private investment and consumption.

The scope of this paper rules out a full consideration of "causes." It may be worthwhile, however, to examine briefly some of the more relevant facts and figures.

First, let us compare the percentage distribution of the major GNP components at the postwar business cycle peaks and at the second quarter of 1963, the latest data for which this information is available. The share of personal consumption expenditure, at 66.8 percent of GNP, is slightly below the levels of the 1960 and 1948 peaks and slightly above the 1957 peak; it is well above the low 63.3 percent of the 1953 peak. (See table 4.) Apparently, the share of personal consumption has not varied systematically with either the rate of economic growth or the degree of resource utilization.

The share of gross private domestic investment declined sharply from 16.6 percent at the 1948 peak to 14.2 percent at the 1953 peak, held its own at the 1957 peak, and has since declined, falling to 13.6 percent in the second quarter of 1963. This pattern—clearly dominated by parallel changes of investment in producers' durables—may lend some support to the lack-of-investment theory. Yet the sharpest peak-to-peak decline, from 1948 to 1953, occurred at the time of the most rapid postwar growth of the U.S. economy and its highest rate of resource utilization. The more recent declines need not necessarily have been the cause of our stagnation; they may as readily have been one of its results. This view receives some support from the observed changes in the share of gross private demand: a decline from about 85 percent of real GNP at the 1948 peak to around 77 percent at the 1953 peak, a rise to 82 percent at the 1957 and 1960 peaks, and a subsequent decline to around 81 percent at present. Thus, the share of private demand declined during postwar cycles of good growth and rose to higher levels during cycles of sluggish growth.

TABLE 4.—*GNP and its major components at the postwar peaks, measured as a percent of actual and of potential GNP*

| | IVQ 1948 | | IIQ 1953 | | IIIQ 1957 | | IIQ 1960 | | IIQ 1963 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent of actual GNP | Percent of potential GNP | Percent of actual GNP | Percent of potential GNP | Percent of actual GNP | Percent of potential GNP | Percent of actual GNP | Percent of potential GNP | Percent of actual GNP | Percent of potential GNP |
| Actual GNP | 100.0 | 101.0 | 100.0 | 105.8 | 100.0 | 96.6 | 100.0 | 93.9 | 100.0 | 93.2 |
| Gross private demand [1] | 84.8 | 85.6 | 77.2 | 81.7 | 81.8 | 79.0 | 81.9 | 76.9 | 81.0 | 75.4 |
| Personal consumption expenditures | 67.5 | 68.1 | 63.3 | 67.0 | 66.5 | 64.2 | 67.7 | 63.6 | 66.8 | 62.3 |
| Gross private investment [1] | 17.3 | 17.5 | 13.9 | 14.7 | 15.3 | 14.7 | 14.2 | 13.3 | 14.1 | 13.2 |
| Gross private domestic investment | 16.6 | 16.8 | 14.2 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 13.8 | 13.9 | 13.1 | 13.6 | 12.6 |
| New construction | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 7.1 |
| Producers' durables | 7.8 | 7.9 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 5.2 | 4.8 |
| Government purchases | 15.2 | 15.4 | 22.8 | 24.1 | 18.2 | 17.6 | 18.1 | 17.0 | 19.0 | 17.7 |
| Federal | 8.6 | 8.7 | 16.1 | 17.0 | 10.4 | 10.1 | 9.6 | 9.1 | 10.4 | 9.7 |
| State and local | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 8.4 | 7.9 | 8.6 | 8.0 |

[1] Includes net exports.

NOTE.—All computations are based on constant (1954) dollar series. 1963 2d quarter is the latest quarter for which all the required data were available but is not an established cyclical peak. All cyclical peaks as established by the quarterly business-cycle dating of the National Bureau of Economic Research. Potential GNP as estimated by James W. Knowles (see Levy, op. cit., pp. 124–125, table A-2); 1963 2d quarter potential GNP based on preliminary extrapolation.

Sources: James W. Knowles; U.S. Department of Commerce.

The interpretation of this evidence is problematic in view of the rapidly changing postwar environment. The Korean boom with its large defense outlays and inflationary pressures and the post-Korean cutback in defense spending have deeply affected the evidence during the first two postwar business cycles that are considered here. Thus, they differ in some important respects from the subsequent cycles. But when these two special cycles are linked with the more recent ones, the resulting changes in GNP shares of investment and private demand do not generally support the lack-of-investment thesis of the stagnationists.

This conclusion is not merely the result of the method of GNP-share analysis. A comparison of peak-to-peak rates of growth (chart 3 not printed in the RECORD) yields similarly inconclusive patterns of investment and private demand.[13] Yet one component, personal consumption expenditure, has displayed a significant systematic pattern; its growth has slowed down continuously during successive postwar cycles. This slowdown is apparently related to the decline, until recently, in the rate of growth of real disposable personal income. Conceivably, an income tax reduction may reverse this trend by increasing the level and the growth rate of both disposable personal income and consumption expenditure.

What can be said concerning the stagnationists' final proposition? Does the evidence support the contention that an excessively restrictive Federal budget structure, as reflected in high full employment budget surpluses, has been a drag on our economy? This question has been considered at length in a recent study.[14] The two major relevant conclusions can be summarized briefly here.

The full employment budget surpluses since the mid or late 1950's do not appear excessively large when compared with those of 1947–48, 1950, or the first half of 1951. But their restrictive impact looms much larger in view of the more restrictive monetary policy of the late 1950's and the less vigorous private demand during much of the last decade.[15]

"During the second half of the 1950's the structural relationship among gross private investment, gross private saving, and Federal Government saving appears not to have been inconsistent with full employment equilibrium, in contrast to 1960–61, when a higher saving Federal budget structure resulted in a pronounced excess of full employment saving over full employment investment. In 1962 the budget structure apparently reverted to its previous lower saving level." [16]

REEVALUATING THE KINK

By now it has become clear that the landmarks of our "new stagnation" are varied and complex. But the main contours have—I believe—become discernible.

An unsustainably fast pace of early postwar growth was followed by an unsatisfactory, sluggish pace during the mid- and late-1950's. Slow growth, substantially below historical norms, and a steady deterioration in resource utilization appear to have originated after the 1953 peak. This conclusion seems generally valid, but the poor 1953–57 performance should probably be viewed, in part, as the result of a "borrowing of growth" by the preceding cycle.

The 1960's, so far, have brought an increase of the rate of economic growth to its long-term level and the near cessation of the earlier progressive deterioration of resource utilization. But the large gaps between economic potential and economic achievement that developed during the 1950's have not been closed, nor even narrowed.

The diagnosis of the causes of our current economic ills—as put forth by adherents of the "new stagnation thesis"—is not readily supportable from the statistical evidence on shares of GNP components or their growth rates. Variations in the rate of Federal expenditures for goods and services, associated with the Korean war, post-Korean disarmament, and the growing demands of the cold war, have deeply affected the evidence, both directly and through feedbacks to the private economy.

Restrictive budgetary policies may explain, in part, the mildness and short duration of the 1958–60 expansion, but they cannot readily account for either the earlier or the most recent deficiencies. Expansionary fiscal policies, in particular carefully timed and structured tax reductions, may succeed in eliminating the remaining pockets of purely cyclical slack and unemployment. But the evidence of the past decade, as I see it, adds up to more than mere cyclical slack caused, or aggravated, by restrictive policies.[17] As indicated earlier, our unemployment rates and our GNP gaps measure a mixture both

[13] In contrast, the share of government purchases of goods and services, and their rate of growth have risen and fallen together with the overall growth rate during the past postwar cycles.

This convariation—partly the result of special circumstances mentioned in the text—should, of course, not be mechanically extrapolated into the future.

[14] Levy, op. cit., esp. pp. 23–27, 32–45.

[15] Ibid., pp. 25–27.

[16] Ibid., p. 42.

[17] See also op. cit., ch. 3, esp. pp. 42–45.

of resources unemployed because of insufficient effective demand, and resources not readily employable because of sectoral, institutional, and other so-called "structural" imbalances and rigidities that may be deeply embedded in our present markets, costs and price structure. Until recently, Government policy emphasized mainly the former problem, which is more readily amenable to solution; but the "structural" problem, which may be more deep seated and intractable, is likely to demand increasing attention of policymakers in the future.

## FREELOADERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, last October, we celebrated the 18th birthday of the United Nations. At that time, I recall many Members of this body recounted the achievements of the world organization. During its 18 years of service to the world, the United Nations has grown from a handful of hopeful nations working with an untried charter and untested organization to a body of 111 members—virtually all the nations in the civilized world—exercising proven authority and responsibility in the interest of peace and progress.

In a short period of time, we have watched with satisfaction and pride as the United Nations Security Council resisted the paralysis-causing perpetual Soviet veto. We have seen the General Assembly override the proposed "troika" and turn a deaf ear to the pugnacious pounding of Mr. Khrushchev's shoe, and we have seen peacekeeping and peacemaking action bear fruit in the Congo, and elsewhere.

Satisfaction with the many successes of the United Nations is clouded, however, by the not-so-bright financial future which looms for the world organization. The United Nations is in dire financial straits, and is facing *imminent bankruptcy*. This is in large part due to the failure of many member nations to meet their financial obligations to the organization.

The United States has paid in full its official assessment of 32 percent of the total United Nations budget. In addition, the United States has purchased $72 million worth of United Nations bonds, to help the organization treasury. I supported the purchase of these bonds, because of our vital interest in the continuing success of the world organization. Unlike the United States, most other members have a poor record. The Soviet Union, quick to exercise its rights in the world forum with its frequently used veto power, has been slow to exercise its responsibilities. At present, the Russians owe $71 million. In addition, our close ally, France, owes $16 million. Smaller nations, such as some of the newer African states, are similarly in debt. Yet all take full advantage of the organization at every opportunity. Actually—and this is a startling figure—only 45 of 111 member nations are paid up.

Mr. President, we all recognize the tremendous achievements of the United Nations and its contribution to peace and security. We recognize that it is the best hope for lasting peace and self-determination in this world. However, the United States alone should not bear the entire burden or continue adding money to make up deficits due to the failure of other nations to meet their obligations. If the United Nations is to survive, it is time for freeloaders who freely use the facilities and forum provided by the United Nations to pay up or shut up.

On December 17, President Johnson will address the United Nations in New York. I am confident he will again renew the commitment of this Nation to that organization, as he did in his inspiring message to the joint session of Congress. I am hopeful that our renewed commitment will bring forth a similar response from all other member nations. This response should include not only words indicating hope for the success of the United Nations, but also deeds indicating responsibility for its solvency and recognition that each nation should, from now on, pay its indebtedness and continue to meet obligations previously acknowledged as being fair.

## NATIONAL WATER POLICY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when the Senate passed S. 1111 last Wednesday, it completed the enactment of legislation by this body to implement all of the major recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. The select committee was created by the 86th Congress, reported to the 87th and—hopefully—will have had its policy recommendations adopted by the 88th.

We have provided for a State planning aid program, nationwide river basin planning, research, a biennial report on water supply and demand by regions, and every sort of encouragement of improved water management practices.

One of these days, students of political science will be studying and writing papers about the evolution of national water policy in the 86th, 87th, and 88th Congresses. In order to assist them, and to be sure that the history they write is reasonably accurate, I want to take the time to dictate a memorandum to the files—and the file in this instance is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—about some of the unrecorded history of this water policy evolution, and those who have particitpated.

It has been said that when someone claims sole responsibility for accomplishing something in Washington, you can put him down for exaggeration, if not something worse. Many people are invariably involved in policy and decision-making in our democratic process. This is certainly true in regard to the water policies and programs which have been approved by the Senate and are now being considered in the House.

Shortly after the 86th Congress convened in 1959, Western Democratic Senators met in the office of the late Senator James E. Murray of Montana to canvass the problems of the Western States. During that meeting, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, now our majority leader, suggested that we could render a great service to the West, and to the whole country, by initiating a review of the national situation in regard to water resources.

In his terse way, the Senator from Montana reminded us that New York City as well as Los Angeles has serious water supply problems. He pointed out that the much-publicized pollution of the Potomac here in the National Capital was a manifestation of a growing nationwide problem. He suggested that as westerners long concerned with water problems, we might well take the lead in stimulating action in this increasingly crucial resource field.

There was unanimous agreement to Senator MANSFIELD's suggestion. He prepared and introduced a resolution which several of us cosponsored. It was promptly reported and adopted. It created a Committee on National Water Problems which included Senators from the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Public Works Committee, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Commerce Committee, the policy committees which are concerned with various aspects of our water problems.

The Senator from Montana was on the floor last Wednesday as action on S. 1111 was completed. He congratulated Senator GORDON ALLOTT and me on the explanation and discussion of the measure, giving no hint that its passage represented the fruition of a farsighted and constructive suggestion he made 4½ years ago.

The Senator from Montana is entitled to as much or more credit than any one of us for what is being done to meet the Nation's water problems. But he would be the last to claim such credit, and his role ought to be in the record.

We have been nearly 5 years translating Senator MANSFIELD's proposal to focus attention on water problems into Senate-approved legislation. But in the process we have involved officials and citizens the length and breadth of the land in the decisionmaking process. There has been created widespread recognition that the old phrase "free as water" is now a misconception. There are officials all across the land who have a new appreciation of the critical nature of water problems.

It might have been possible to get some water programs started by the process of what Mr. MANSFIELD has called wheeling and dealing among Washington leadership. Instead, water bills have been developed in the democratic way our majority leader advocates. The water resources research program has been fashioned in collaboration with water research agencies in all of the States in the Nation. The Interstate Conference on Water Problems, representing all 50 States, has participated in developing S. 1111, and officials of more than 40 States have commented on it directly in the hearing record. The participation has been exceptionally widespread.

This is the essence of democratic Government—widespread participation in policymaking. The hearings and debates which precede the enactment of legislation are an educational process which improve the quality of our legislation and bring agreement and understanding which make the laws effective after they are adopted. Tens of thousands of citizens who had an uneasiness about water

problems 5 years ago now have a clearer understanding of the nature of water problems, of their urgency and of the necessity of Federal and State programs in the field.

The late Senator Robert S. Kerr is entitled to a great deal of the credit for the breadth of participation. As chairman of the select committee, he conducted hearings from coast to coast, assembling a firsthand record of water problems in every area.

The vice chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Problems was the minority whip, Mr. KUCHEL, who has become an authority not only on his own State of California's water problems, but the whole Nation's. He was Senator Kerr's strong right arm, as he has become mine in advancing water legislation.

The minority members of the committee—Senator Milton Young of North Dakota, Senator Thomas E. Martin of Iowa, Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania and the late Senators Andrew Schoeppel of Kansas and Francis Case of South Dakota—all made an effective contribution to the committee's work.

Partisanship was forgotten in a constructive effort to diagnose and prescribe remedies for the Nation's water ills.

The chairmen of the four committees involved brought many years of experience to bear on the problems involved—Senator James E. Murray as an ex officio member, the late Senator Dennis Chavez by virtue of his chairmanship of the Public Works Committee, Senator Allen Ellender as chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and Senator Warren Magnuson as chairman of the Commerce Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this point does the Senator from New Mexico desire to request more time?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. In addition to the chairmen, we had four Democratic members serving their first terms in this body who were among the select committee's most diligent and valuable members.

Senator CLAIR ENGLE, of California, brought to the committee his years of experience as a member and chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Senator PHIL HART, of Michigan, surprised those of us from the West with his appreciation of the subject with which we were concerned. It was largely through his insistence that the select committee conducted as many hearings as it did in the Eastern States and found—as the report and studies made by the committee indicate—that the problems of usable water supply in the great industrial area stretching from Boston to Norfolk on the East, and then sweeping in a band west to St. Louis, Kansas City, Omaha, and Sioux Falls, is going to be just as acute, and probably more expensive to meet, than the absolute shortages of water in the West.

As a westerner who has of necessity been concerned with resources development throughout all of my public life, my hat is off to Senator PHIL HART, of Michigan, an already heavily industrialized State, for his unusual understanding of the key role of resources development—minerals, forests, water, and recreational opportunities—in the economic welfare of the Nation and of his own State.

The now senior Senator from Wyoming, GALE MCGEE, was our economics department. He gave constant emphasis to the importance of water resources development not only to the economic development of his own State, but to the economic development of the Nation and the maintenance of this country's world leadership. We were not allowed to forget that the 7 percent of land in Carbon County, Wyo., which is irrigated, pays nearly 50 percent of the taxes, and that growth in Carbon County, multiplied by the growth of other counties throughout the land, is what makes national growth and keeps this country foremost among the nations of the world.

Wyoming need have no fear that her welfare will be neglected so long as GALE MCGEE is in the U.S. Senate. He can prove irrefutably in 5 minutes, to the satisfaction of any openminded audience, that America's world leadership depends on the prosperity of Wyoming.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to mention two members of the Select Committee on National Water Resources who have succeeded to tasks which were once mine, and who have made magnificent records in the present Congress—the junior Senator from Washington, HENRY M. JACKSON, now chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and the Senator from Utah, FRANK MOSS, chairman of the Irrigation Subcommittee of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Both of these men served on the Select Committee on National Water Resources. Both of them have followed through to see that the work and the recommendations of the select committee was not forgotten and the effort wasted.

As chairman of the full Interior Committee, Senator JACKSON directed hearings on the water resources research bill, S. 2, got the measure to the floor early in the present session of the Congress and made it possible for a companion bill to be well advanced in the House of Representatives at the present time.

Under Senator JACKSON's chairmanship, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has reported more major policy legislation in 1963 than in any year in my experience. During 1963, the committee has reported one major measure after another, starting early in the spring when S. 4, the Wilderness Preservation Act, and S. 20, the Organic Act for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, were reported and passed overwhelmingly by the full Senate.

The Senate has approved the recommendation of Mr. JACKSON's committee for an Indian heirship bill, the great Garrison irrigation project, a new Canyonlands National Park, a vast national recreation area at Lake Mead, the Ozark National Rivers, the water resources research program, S. 1111, implementing the select committee recommendations on river basin planning, State aid, biennial water resources inventories, and a great many lesser measures. The record of the committee for the 1st session of the 88th Congress will be an outstanding one.

Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, who relieved me as chairman of the Irrigation Subcommittee, conducted the hearings on S. 1111 and steered it through the subcommittee, the full committee and to the floor.

One day not only the citizens of the State of Utah, but citizens throughout the Nation are going to have an appreciation of Senator FRANK MOSS that he is not now fully accorded. When the Canyonlands National Park is finally established, developed, and opened to the public, it is going to be one of the great attractions of the West. It is a geological fantasyland, strewn with petrified wood, petrified dinosaur bone, Indian ruins, natural arches, unbelievable and brightly colored rock formations, canyons and cliffs which defy description. No member of the Senate Interior Committee who has seen it, if only from the air, has failed to exclaim at its grandeur and its unquestionable worthiness for national park development.

The Senator from Utah has persisted in his determination to bring about the creation of the Canyonlands National Park in face of many difficulties. I am personally grateful to him for it, as well as for his constructive service on the Select Committee on Water Resources, his coauthorship of the implementing legislation, and his competent management of legislation for me when I was away.

The implementation of the Water Resources Committee's report is not yet complete. The House has yet to act on the Senate measures. When that has been done, we actually will have only made a start on the solution of water problems. They will have to be met by each succeeding generation of Americans as long as this planet persists.

Mr. President, one of the very gratifying experiences I have had in the U.S. Senate, has been working on this task which the Senator from Montana made the order of business for some of us back in 1959, before he became majority leader.

In the course of the hearings, the executive sessions, and the subsequent development and Senate passage of legislation in the water resources field, I have had an opportunity to be closely associated with fellow Senators of great ability in a constructive, democratic undertaking.

I have especially valued the encouragement and support which the majority leader has provided, and the energetic and intelligent participation of those younger Senators like HENRY JACKSON, PHIL HART, GALE MCGEE, and FRANK MOSS.

I have a great deal of confidence in the democratic system of government which brings the ability of many to bear on the Nation's problems and will work

better than any other form of government as long as there are leaders like MIKE MANSFIELD who have the understanding and the patience to make it work.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the senior Senator from New Mexico for his generous comments.

Whatever record the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been able to make this year in respect to overall resources development stems from the able leadership of the former chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico. Senator ANDERSON has long been identified not only with development of water resources, but also with the broad area of natural resources development.

I had the privilege of serving with the Senator in the House of Representatives. The distinguished majority leader had a similar experience. In that body, Senator ANDERSON served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. During all his service in the House of Representatives he was one of the most able and effective advocates in the field of water resources development and in respect to all matters relating to the sound development of the resources of this country.

Later, as Secretary of Agriculture, he provided outstanding leadership, especially for the Forest Service, in guaranteeing that the various important resources programs within that agency and the Department of Agriculture were accomplished.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, he made an outstanding record. We would not have been able to move the bills this year if it had not been for the groundwork previously laid by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate what the Senator has said. My purpose today was to compliment and to commend the Senators who did the work, not to receive compliments myself.

Mr. JACKSON. I appreciate that. In all humility, the progress cannot be separated from the previous efforts of the senior Senator from New Mexico.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico and other Senators who care to participate in this colloquy are granted adequate time.

Mr. MOSS. The senior Senator from New Mexico has shown the greatest of consideration in singling out Senators who have worked with him in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the water resources problems. I am grateful indeed to have had the things said which have been said about me.

The leadership, the driving force, the preparation behind the bills which have been discussed by the senior Senator from New Mexico really have come from his efforts, his knowledge, and his background. Senators who have had the opportunity to serve with him have the greatest of appreciation for his leadership and help.

I could not let this opportunity pass without pointing that out. I share the pride of the senior Senator from New Mexico in the many accomplishments which have been made in this field in the present session of Congress. I agree with the Senator that this is one of the greatest records ever made. It has been made in large measure as the result of the leadership of the senior Senator from New Mexico. Tribute should be paid to him today.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. As the Senator from New Mexico suspects—and no doubt wishes he did not have to suspect—I, too, would like to add a little correction for the record to the memorandum he put in.

It is true that the Senator from New Mexico is the recognized leader across the Nation in these efforts, and all of us are in his debt for the ability and steadfastness which he brings to the task.

I am grateful for the kind words the Senator spoke about me and about the efforts I have made in behalf of water resources as well as conservation in the Great Lakes region and the eastern section of the country. Again, his has been the leadership—his and that of the late distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr, and our own kind and effective majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The remarks of the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] occur at a time when we have received word from the Bureau of the Budget that at last it has released the planning money for the Midwest Water Pollution Control laboratory at Ann Arbor. I very much hope that construction can proceed next year. This is an example of the kind of reaction which occurs as a result of the findings of the select committee and the leadership given by the senior Senator from New Mexico.

I believe it will be interesting to all Senators to know that since the years 1959 and 1960, when we traveled throughout the country, the people in the Great Lakes Basin have become quite water conscious. They know that their jobs and environment—whether life is worth living, even if one has a job—are dependent importantly on usable water. The people of the West have long been concerned about changing sand to green stuff, but we have begun to realize that the green stuff can turn into sand and that we should be as concerned and busy as those people in the West who, understandably, have long had a concern about water.

The Senator from New Mexico has properly said that the select committee never permitted partisanship or preconceived notions about the proper function of the Federal Government to affect its considerations and ultimately it conclusions.

I thank the Senator for his kind words about me—and I mean every one I said about him.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I recall that when I first came to the House of Representatives 21 years ago the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico was also a Member, as was the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I recall further that there were 16 Members from the Rocky Mountain States at that time, and the recognized leader of that group was the man who later became Secretary of Agriculture—one of the best this country has ever had. At that time he was serving as a Representative from the State of New Mexico.

I must say, in all honesty, that the inspiration for the committee to organize a group to look into water problems was furnished by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico himself. He may not recall it, but many years ago we were discussing water and its importance in relation to oil. At that time he told me the day was not far distant when—because of our increased population, the upsurge in industry, and other factors, all of which cause an increase in the use of water; plus the fact that our water table was declining—the people of the country would begin to recognize the importance of this problem not only in our part of the country, where the problem is endemic, but also in other parts of the country which had given little consideration to problems of water through the decades and centuries.

So it is my pleasure, and it is a personal pleasure, at this time to salute the leader from the Rocky Mountain States who has given us such sound advice over the years in both Houses of Congress and as Secretary of Agriculture, and who has joined in paying tribute and in giving due credit to the Senators he mentioned—the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], who has performed outstandingly in this body in the field of western resources; the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who took upon himself leadership in this most important problem in the Great Lakes area; the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] who faces the same problems we have in Montana, and who has worked long and hard to try to bring about a rectification of differences in that area; the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is now chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who has followed in the footsteps of the Senator from New Mexico, as he himself has said, and who, like the Senator from New Mexico, during the second year of the 88th Congress is performing outstandingly as chairman of the committee.

The amount of good legislation coming out of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, having to do with the resources of this Nation, for the benefit of our own people, is, I think, unrecog-

nized in the country today; but all one has to do is look at the record of the 87th Congress, under the chairmanship in the committee of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is now the ranking Democrat of that committee, and the record this year of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who has kept alive the traditions and policies laid down by his predecessor, and who has added his own individual touches as well.

May I say also that what the distinguished Senator has said about the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and other Senators, is well said, because all these Senators from the West have worked together as a unit in this particular problem. In this area there has been little activity in the field of partisanship, because what happens there happens to the whole region. What benefits that region benefits us all and the people who live there.

I again commend the Senator from New Mexico, who is now chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, for the unflagging efforts he has made over the years and the many contributions he has made toward making that area and the country a better place in which to live, and making the Rocky Mountain region a better place to raise families, to live, and to prosper.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

## POLITICAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 661, H.R. 5945.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5945) to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 19, after "Puerto Rico", to insert "unless prohibited by other law"; on page 3, after line 21, to strike out:

(c) The Commission, acting through the President, is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency, to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions, and the heads of such departments and agencies are authroized and directed to furnish such information and assistance without reimbursement.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(c) The Commission is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions, and the heads of such departments and agencies are authorized and directed to furnish such assistance and information, unless prohibited under other law, without reimbursement.

And, on page 4, line 18, after "Puerto Rico", to strike out "at" and insert "no later than".

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the pending bill, as proposed to be amended, is to establish a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the status of Puerto Rico to study all factors which may have a bearing on the present and future relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico.

For many years considerable doubt has been expressed about the status of Puerto Rico. Various proposals have been made to change, modify, or clarify the relationship between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The burden of the effort here is to appoint a Commission which will report its findings to the Congress, the President, the legislature of Puerto Rico, and the Governor, without any binding obligation on the part of the executive branch or the Congress to carry out such recommendations.

I believe it is a sensible and reasonable proposal. The bill was reported unanimously from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I urge its approval.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I rise in support of the proposed legislation. It is a very desirable bill. It is purely an investigatory bill. Its aim is to straighten out some of the confusion which exists as a result of previous legislation giving the island of Puerto Rico a special political status.

There is a good deal of controversy on the island as to just what the status means. In English the status of Puerto Rico is described as a commonwealth. That is not an exact translation of the Spanish equivalent, in which it is described as an associated free state.

A great many people in the island feel that this status is highly desirable. Others feel it is enshrouded with much doubt.

The proposed Commission would be properly constituted, with representatives of both the Senate and the House, to be appointed by the respective authorities in those two bodies, with three Presidential appointees. In the future there will be some representatives from Puerto Rico according to a method of selection which the Puerto Ricans will approve. That is proper. The legislation would not commit Congress to accept the findings, but it would be in a better position to take appropriate action after the Commission had reported.

Puerto Rico has made gratifying gains—economic, cultural, spiritual—in the last quarter of a century. Every effort should be made to see that that progress is facilitated and not impaired. This legislation aims to help resolve questions which believers in democracy should desire to resolve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the committee amendments en bloc? If not, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to establish a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico."

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## HATE IMAGE IS BLACKENING THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at a time of national crisis and tragedy such as we are now passing through, I am disturbed to find the action of a psychopathic fanatic being used to blacken the American character with the stigmas of hate inspired and violence oriented. Our reputation abroad as the leader of the free world, and our morale at home can only suffer from this unwarranted national character assassination that has been taking place in the news media and even in some of our churches.

The Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, in making this same point, quotes an editorial from the Wall Street Journal which clearly dispels the illusion that violence and hate are characteristic of American life, and recalls our attention bluntly to the fact that Lee Oswald was not a spokesman for antiadministration forces of the far right, by any stretch of the imagination, but was a professed Marxist.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Dominion-News article be printed in the RECORD.

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

LET'S PUT HATE WHERE IT BELONGS

We rarely find ourselves in complete agreement with the unofficial spokesman of economic royalists'—meaning the Wall Street Journal, but in attempting to get this hate business into proper measure as it applies to our American people we couldn't be more in agreement in what it says so exceptionally well. We, therefore, quote this business journal as follows:

"From pulpits and the pens of commentators, from Government officials and assorted other citizens is issuing a torrent of talk to the effect that the American people are consumed with rancor and hatred. In the words of the outgoing head of the National Council of Churches, President Kennedy's assassination forces us to our knees in shame for all our unharnessed hates.

"The prevalence of such views is somewhat puzzling and not a little disturbing. Frightful and frightening as the murder was, it is hard to see on what rational grounds it can be made into an assault on the whole character of contemporary America.

"The attack, to begin with, distorts all historical perspective. If this assassination

is read as the result of an outpouring of hate peculiar to our time and place, how are the assassinations of the past to be accounted for? In the case of Lincoln, at the end of a great Civil War, it would seem more appropriate to speak of forces of hatred and violence.

"Nor do the histories of other peoples support the idea that there is something especially wrong with our society. A capacity for violence is obviously embedded in all men, and has shown hideous faces in man's long past; how well or ill it is controlled depends on a varity of civilizing influences. Yet in many more or less civilized places today, not even an election can occur unaccompanied by violent death.

"In America, the picture of a people possessed by hate does not fit the facts disclosed by simple observation. An assassin who even as a boy was considered by a psychiatrist to be a potentially dangerous psychopath—is it honestly believed that this particular individual sums up the American character? Or sensible to say that he and his rifle could only have emerged out of the forces of hate abroad in the land?

"No one could deny that there are individuals and small groups peddling hate. There have always been and probably always will be, but if anything they are today less important in national life and less indicative of national character than at some other periods.

"It is fashionable nowadays to lump the haters with the extremists of the far right. In some individual instances there may be an identity, but individual hatreds also exist at the other extreme, in those who hate so much they would destroy America's institutions. In their obsession with the far right, some people seemingly refuse to believe that the deranged killer was a man of the far left.

"In any event, all this is outside the mainstream of American life. Not hatred but growing understanding and even compassion typify the general temper of this society at this time.

"*Such qualities* are evident all around us—in the normal home, in the comfortable working conditions of the normal company, in the increasing acceptance of once-despised minorities. It is hard to think of a time of so much concern by so many for the dignity of all men.

"And it was such qualities that marked the reaction of the overwhelming majority of Americans to the President's death. It was not violence and hate but an outpouring of deep and personal grief, and that does reflect the American people.

"To make the assassination of a President an occasion for character assassination does worse than confuse issues. The harping on hate is a disservice to the Nation, for it makes it more difficult for the nonviolent majority to get on with their and the Nation's business in a time of sorrow."

## HATE IMAGE IS MISLEADING

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a great injustice is being done toward this country in the press and even in some pulpits where sermonizing is taking place on the subject of hatred in America. The assassination of President Kennedy has touched off a virtual orgy of self-accusation which seeks, by an absurd type of reasoning, to blame this tragedy on an imaginary vicious streak in our citizenry.

An editorial in the December 1, 1963, issue of the Washington Star shows clearly the absurdity of such reasoning and the harmfulness of promulgating it at a time when national solidarity and coolheadedness are called for. It is the outpouring of genuine love and grief that deserves attention now, as a reflection of the true spirit of this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Star editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

HATRED AND HYSTERIA

In the emotional aftermath of President Kennedy's murder, the Nation is being subjected to a seemingly endless series of sermons, both in pulpits and in the public prints, on the evils of hatred. The idea is always pretty much the same. The frame of mind which produced the assassination is equated, in resolute contradiction of any known facts, with the attitude of the radical right—specifically the attitude of those who favor racial segregation. We are urged to purge ourselves of a poison which the dreadful act in Dallas supposedly has revealed in our bloodstream.

The sermons are sincere and, hopefully, edifying as well. But they happen to be irrelevant to the death of Mr. Kennedy.

Segregation is morally wrong. A political program based on the repeal of the income tax is fiscally simple-minded. But neither one had anything to do with the murder.

If it is absurd to try to blame the assassination on the political right, it is yet more absurd to insinuate that it was the result of something dreadfully wrong with American political life as a whole. Until we know something different, the reasonable assumption must be that the assassination was the result of something dreadfully wrong in the mind of Lee Oswald.

It would be good and desirable if the world could now abjure all hatred. But since hatred still exists 1900 years after the crucifixion, it is unhappily unlikely that it will vanish now.

Meanwhile, the continuing hysteria about national hatred as the central feature of this national tragedy does us a national injustice. It ignores, too, the most obvious expression of national feeling.

The line of mourners formed at the Capitol a week ago is still moving.

It may be seen in Dallas, where citizens bring flowers to the place in the road where the President was shot.

It may be seen across the Potomac, where Americans are coming in thousands to visit his grave.

It may be seen in the spontaneous and universal actions taken to reverence the memory of the martyred leader by giving his name to places and institutions that will endure.

Surely it is this outpouring of love and grief which speaks truly of the state of the Nation.

## DANGERS OF VENEREAL DISEASE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Dr. George James, commissioner of health for the city of New York, has written me describing a revolutionary program which has been successful in alerting the people of his city to the dangers of venereal disease, a serious health menace. Dr. James' excellent letter graphically details the manner in which the Federal Government, the city of New York, and the advertising and television industries worked together to effectively, yet discreetly, deal with a subject about which the public had dangerously little information. I feel certain my colleagues will be interested in Dr. James' comments, and that this information may well be of help to other cities and States desirous of utilizing our mass communications media in the fight for a healthier America. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. James' letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
COMMISSIONER OF HEALTH,
*October 29, 1963.*

Senator LISTER HILL,
*Senator Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR HILL: Because of the alarming rise in the incidence of venereal diseases in our Nation and throughout the world, your Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may be interested in how New York City is making known this dangerous situation.

The story I have to tell you is one of cooperation among Federal Government, a city government, and the communications industry.

As those concerned with the public welfare know, venereal diseases are easily cured if detected early. But most cases go unreported either through ignorance or shame. And most of the victims are teenagers. Untreated, these diseases ravage, and even kill.

About 2 years ago the Surgeon General discussed with New York City's Commissioner of Health the need to communicate the serious facts about venereal disease to the greatest number of people, with the impact necessary to bestir them to action. Television could do this, it was felt, if an advertising agency prepared the messages. New York City was envisaged as a test area. If it could be done here, it could be done anywhere.

Mr. Lawrence Valenstein, chairman of the executive committee of Grey Advertising, Inc., was asked if he would help with this project. He was most willing for Grey to participate in this worthwhile battle against disease.

The words "syphilis" and "gonorrhea" had not often been heard on commercial television stations previously. But we were convinced that television was a major medium to use for reaching teenagers and their parents. Grey quickly designed public service messages for TV. The words told what ("syphilis, gonorrhea"), who ("The victims? Mostly teenagers"), and how to get help (a special telephone number was set up by the Department of Health to give information to callers). The visual material was strictly symbolic—a dewy rosebud whose petals open, wilt, fall, and finally blow away. Television stations that were squeamish about the subject when approached changed their minds after seeing the finished film. Today, all but one of the seven TV stations in New York City are using the messages an average of 10 times weekly.

It is interesting to note that this venereal disease commercial was honored at the American film festival in New York as being best in the public service category. This fact has helped create acceptance with TV stations across the country.

The agency's work and the stations' time have of course been contributed as a public service.

Since the messages went on the air, health departments in Philadelphia, Chicago, and California, have requested copies in their cities. Other cities have made preliminary inquiries. Arrangements are being completed to make these prints available to stations all over the country.

It is yet too early for a full result story, but in 1962 there was just a slight increase in VD cases in New York City, compared with the 10.3-percent increase of 1961 over 1960. Still an increase, but a declining one.

We are convinced that the information

campaign will soon turn the figures into annual decreases. We hope the same happens in every city of our great Nation.

Thank you, Senator HILL, for your continued efforts on behalf of the public welfare.

Sincerely,

GEORGE JAMES, M.D.,
*Commissioner of Health.*

## VOLUNTARY WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have learned this morning that four additional State Wheat Growers Associations last weekend endorsed the voluntary certificate approach to a wheat program effective on the 1964 crop.

The State associations in Idaho, Texas, South Dakota, Colorado, and Oregon passed resolutions endorsing the voluntary certificate approach at statewide meetings last week. The convention in Oregon acted to endorse a resolution previously adopted by the State association's board of directors. Other State wheat organizations previously endorsing the plan are: Missouri, Washington, Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Oklahoma.

I am gratified to note that Chairman GRAHAM PURCELL of the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee is resuming hearings Wednesday on a wheat program for 1964 and subsequent years.

Mr. President, the wheatgrowers of the Nation have clearly demonstrated, by resolutions at one State convention after another and at the National Grange convention, that they want a wheat program, and that they are pretty well united behind the voluntary certificate approach.

I interpret Congressman PURCELL's resumption of hearings as a response to the growing demand and unity among wheatgrowers and I want to commend him for the timeliness of his action.

I am greatly encouraged that legislation on wheat may be finally enacted well in advance of spring planting, and that a prospective $600 million decline in farm income for next year as a result of a disastrous decline in wheat prices may be averted.

## NEBRASKA—WIDE-ANGLE STATE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is well known that from time to time Senators, no less than Members of the other body, manage to overcome their modesty on behalf of their home States or districts and call the attention of their colleagues to certain virtues inherent therein.

It is in that tradition that I today offer an article which appeared in the Sunday New York Times travel section, entitled, "Wide-Angle State." It is in praise of Nebraska in the fall.

Written by William Stockdale, the article describes "the land of the big view, where there is no place for a sunrise or sunset to hide, and so there seem to be more and bigger sunrises and sunsets than almost anywhere else."

Mr. Stockdale describes the friendliness of Nebraskans, the quality of Nebraska beef, and frets only about the coffee, which he finds weaker than that served in the East, but concedes "it is always offered generously and cups are replenished endlessly for the same dime."

Those of us who love Nebraska are gratified at Mr. Stockdale's discovery of this fine State and are in full accord with his closing observation that "seeing Nebraska at this time of year is like warming oneself before a fireplace; and the glow lingers on."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Stockdale's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

WIDE-ANGLE STATE—NOW THAT THE CORN IS GONE, NEBRASKA'S GREAT PLAINS ARE A STUDY IN BROWN

(By William Stockdale)

OMAHA, NEBR.—Where can one find a romantic, escapist land, one that is convenient, yet off the accustomed routes, and with friendly natives in interesting dress, fascinating night life, exotic food, and a relaxed way of life?

The South Seas? Uncharted islands in the Caribbean? No. Instead, one should note that at this very moment, planes are waiting at Idlewild and other airports, to whisk people to this magic land in a few hours. The place? Nebraska.

To have seen Paris in April, or Rio at carnival time, is to have done well. But no one can say he has truly lived until he has seen Nebraska in late fall.

LEGENDARY LAND

One arrives in this romantic land at the moment he crosses the broad, rolling Missouri. This is where the West begins. This is the legendary land of the overland trails, the intrepid pioneers, the Pawnee and Otoe, the pony express and names like Buffalo Bill and Wild Bill Hickok.

This is the land of the big view, where there is no place for a sunrise or a sunset to hide, and so there seem to be more and bigger sunrises and sunsets than almost anywhere else. And when the sun rises at the sensible hour of 7 o'clock at this time of year, there is a blast of color stretching from one side of the horizon to the other; it starts as deep orange and turns to gold just as the sun peeps dreamily over the flat sea of land.

This land is flat, yes. It is flat with hills, as the ocean is flat with waves. And from the crow's nest of a hotel window, one looks out over the broad expanse and feels as alone and apart as if he were at sea, many days from shore.

EMPTINESS STARTLING

Motoring over this land, one's first impulse is to be startled by the vast emptiness. Nothing to see, but the view of it is terrific.

This is due to nervous eyes, which are accustomed to taking in simultaneously auto junkyards, filling stations, billboards, traffic lights, highway signs, construction barriers, buildings, stores, people, stray dogs, children on bicycles, and flying pigeons.

It takes a little time to develop lazy eyes, which can drink in an endless expanse of land, broken only occasionally by a ranch house and some cattle. Even the creeping dinosaurlike combines have retreated into winter hibernation.

Still, there is much to see. This is a land of many colors—all of them brown. The thrill of Nebraska in late autumn is in the shades of brown to be discovered.

How different from New England. When the glorious colors of autumn there have died, the word "brown" becomes a term of reproach. In Nebraska, brown is a glorious color.

AUTUMN EVERYWHERE

It is not a dead brown, nor a mournful brown as one native described the brown of the west coast. It is a rich, warm, living brown. Brown is a restful color. Brown is autumn, and brown is everywhere.

Counting the shades of brown is an enterprise. There is the yellow-brown of the corn stubble on the fields, and there is the reddish brown of the stalks of sorghum left remaining after the harvest; these are best seen in the fading light of an afternoon sun.

There is the golden brown of the wheatfields, and the dark brown of plowed fields, revealing the richness of the soil.

There is the gray brown of the tree trunks and the lighter brown of the branches. Trees are to this landscape as islands are to water. Their branches in the autumn are naked, since relentless winds of the Great Plains have taken the leaves on long journeys.

RED-BROWN CATTLE

There is the weathered brown of the ranch buildings nestled in hollows, and the red brown of the cattle standing motionless over the rangeland, as if lost in thought. To an easterner, it might appear that they do have a faraway look and he might even wonder how they like living so far away from everything.

In the soil and in the crops are many shades of brown, each blending with the others in quiet harmony. There is nothing to break this restful expanse—no farmer's fruit stand, brilliant with orange pumpkins or baskets of dazzling red and yellow apples; no hanging jugs of orange cider suspended near a sign proclaiming antiques for sale.

No patient steeple pierces the brown landscape. All is brown, all is serene, all is calm as Christmas morning.

Towns break upon the scene as distinct surprises. They are found like a pendant at the end of a long chain of telephone poles.

On stopping, one finds friendly natives unspoiled by tourists. There is no language barrier, although natives may tell the stranger to go north, south, east, or west, instead of going right or left. This is because most roads and city streets are laid out on a straight north-south and east-west basis.

The talk of the natives at this time of year often runs to shooting deer and pheasant. "Got your freezer full of pheasant?" is a common question.

The native dress is colorful with the male sporting the flashier and more flamboyant attire. Some ranchers and cattle buyers wear light tan, broad-brimmed cowboy hats and boots, while other farmers appear in blue denim overalls with engineers' hats.

If he is watchful, the visitor may see an Indian. Colored, feathered headdress and war paint are no longer in fashion, and may not be counted on to give the Indian away. Actually, he tends more toward conservative dress in the Madison Avenue style. He can best be distinguished by his quiet manners and unobtrusive bearing.

The tourist will find the food midcontinental. Specialties of the region are fine steaks and thick slices of roast beef. The Nebraska car-license plate proclaims itself "The Beef State," and not a single restaurant menu is likely to let guests forget it.

"Nebraska beef" is a headlined item, and a good steak in this bargain haven costs half what a comparable steak might cost in Boston or New York. Pork chops from local corn-fed pigs are another native dish.

GOURMET DINING

Seafood is available, as is gourmet dining. A leading hotel in Grand Island, third largest city in the State with about 25,000 people, advertises a Sunday evening "continental supper smörgasbord" at $2.85. It includes shrimp, lobster, and exotic delicacies.

Most good cafes and restaurants feature inexpensive dining, and a restaurant in

Kearney offers a Sunday night smörgasbord of beef, ham, and fried chicken for $1.25. Sometimes a restaurant will feature home-baked pastries, and one little cafe serves doughnuts that the owner makes herself.

The tourist visiting this region may find that the coffee is generally weaker than that served in the East. However, it is always offered generously, and cups are replenished endlessly for the same dime.

The tourist looking for some little souvenir distinctive of the region can visit a saddle shop, where saddles can be purchased for anywhere from $80 to $300. Saddle shops also sell cowboy boots, lariats, halters, spurs, and similar items that would make good conversation pieces for anyone not owning a horse. One shop features a window display of electric branding irons, the perfect Christmas gift for the man who has everything.

Seeing Nebraska at this time of year is like warming oneself before a fireplace. And the glow lingers on.

## THE CATTLE INDUSTRY NEEDS HELP

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, among the items listed for possible duty reductions during the forthcoming "Kennedy round" of international tariff negotiations are cattle and beef.

These items are on the list in spite of the recent phenomenal increase in beef imports at the present low rates, and in spite of the impact of these imports on our domestic prices for cattle. On many occasions I have spoken out against our policy of permitting these mounting imports. In my opinion, it is ridiculous even to consider additional reductions in the tariff rates on cattle and beef.

Hearings on the cattle and beef tariffs are to be held this afternoon by the Trade Information Committee and tomorrow morning by the Tariff Commission, at which it is my intention to make a personal appearance. The case against the reductions is expressed briefly and well in statements submitted by Robert H. Howard, secretary-treasurer of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, and by C. W. McMillan, executive vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association. I ask unanimous consent to have these two statements inserted in the RECORD at this point, and also to have inserted my own statement which I have prepared to be submitted to the Tariff Commission tomorrow.

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

To: The Tariff Commission, the Trade Information Committee.

From: The Nebraska Stock Growers Association, Alliance, Nebr.

This association represents cattle producers throughout the State of Nebraska. It was organized in 1888 principally as a deterrent to cattle theft. Later in its tenure, new phases of interest became a part of its service to the cattle industry of Nebraska.

A matter of great importance to the cattle producers of this State is the present situation regarding beef imports and tariffs. Nebraska is particularly a large cattle producing and feeding State. Statistics show it to rank third in the Nation in total cattle numbers as well as in beef cattle numbers.

While the United States is the greatest meat producer in the world, we are working toward becoming the greatest meat importer. According to our best statistics, the United States holds second place next to the United Kingdom among meat importers and we are about eleventh among the exporters. We are not suggesting the importing of meat and meat products be discontinued entirely but we feel that there should be more quota controls and fair tariffs to help the American livestock industry recover to a level where decent profits may accrue to the producers and feeders.

More than 10 percent of our domestic consumption of beef is now made up of foreign imports and we maintain that this 10 percent could be cut, whereas it seems that it is increasing each year.

Information has been released indicating that, with our growing population, we will need 25 million more beef cattle by 1970 than we now have on hand. We feel assured that the livestock industry will be able to provide enough beef cattle to meet the growing population, here in the United States, the same way the farmer has been able to increase his production of feed grains on reduced acreage, through improved efficiency and techniques. Such information has been misleading to foreign countries who are not familiar with our markets and ability to produce livestock and feeds.

We further believe that industrial and agricultural tariffs ought to be considered as a package, if and when negotiation is made with any foreign country. Any percentage decrease in our beef imports today would tend to stabilize and stimulate the present livestock markets in the United States.

Attest:

ROBERT M. HOWARD,
*Secretary-Treasurer, Nebraska Stock Growers Association.*

SUMMARY BY C. W. MCMILLAN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

The position of the American National Cattlemen's Association is that fresh, chilled, frozen, cooked, and preserved beef and beef products as well as live cattle (100.40, 100.43, 100.45, 100.53, 100.55, 106.10, 107.20, and 107.25) should be taken off the preliminary negotiation list for a cut of the present existing tariffs on these products by 50 percent or elimination entirely of the duties now in effect.

The above position is based on the following points which are covered in detail in our brief:

1. The economic importance of the cattle and beef industry and the interdependence of agriculture and a dynamic American economy.

2. The phenomenal growth and potential of the cattle industry can provide ample quantities of high-quality beef for the immediate- and long-range future needs of our discerning customers, the consumers of the United States.

3. The present tariff levels for the United States are among the lowest of any of the world trade community.

4. Current levels of imports are having extremely adverse economic impact on our domestic beef cattle industry and further reductions in the present existing tariff would prove catastrophic to the major source of income for the ranchers and farmers of this country.

5. The beef cattle business does not lend itself to the concepts of free trade since there is no other alternative use for the major resources utilized by the beef cattle business—the harvesting of grasses and roughages.

6. This country must maintain a steady and ready source of food and fiber for both peace and war. Our dynamic agriculture is a most effective tool in supporting our world leadership.

7. The American National Cattlemen's Association in summary would recommend that the opposite position be taken of tariff cutting proposed in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 as it affects the domestic cattle and beef industry. We recommend that a quota system be established whereby the exporting countries could continue to participate in our market, but that the world supplies of beef and live cattle would not be continually "dumped" on the U.S. market. There is ample precedent for such action.

INTRODUCTION

My name is C. W. McMillan. I am executive vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo. The American National Cattlemen's Association represents 37 State cattlemen's and cattle feeder's associations, thousands of individual members and over 100 breed, regional and local associations throughout the country. We are pleased to have an opportunity to present their views before both the Trade Information Committee and the Tariff Commission on the economic implications on the domestic beef cattle industry of the upcoming negotiations in Geneva.

ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF THE CATTLE AND BEEF INDUSTRY

The very basis for a sound, prosperous agriculture is the livestock industry, and more particularly the beef cattle business. Twenty out of every $100 in sales in 1962 for agriculture were derived from cattle and calves. The gross income from live cattle and calves has increased from $1.4 billion in 1940 to $8.3 billion in 1962.

Agriculture is a huge customer for the output of the U.S. industries. It invests more than $26 billion in goods and services, and the average farm family expenditure is almost $10,000 annually. Agriculture as a whole grosses in excess of $37 billion annually and its equity in assets is in excess of 90 percent.

Quoting from a research program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in its Agricultural Economic Report No. 28, entitled "Agriculture and Economic Growth":

"The United States provides an outstanding example of what an efficient agriculture can do for the economic growth of the country.

"A marked increase in food supplies helps to set in motion the whole process of economic development. A rapid advance in agriculture productivity means increased food supplies at relatively lower prices. Because wage earners need less of their income to buy food, the effective money demands for other goods increases. This makes it possible for entrepreneurs to expand output of nonagricultural goods and to make additional investments in their production. At the same time the increase in farm productivity releases workers to industry which can afford to hire them because of the expanded demand for its products."

This study also pointed out the high relationship of the decrease in percent of a labor force in agriculture and the increase in per capita income. This decrease in labor force is due to increased use of capital by agriculture.

Item 1 in the Appendix graphically points out the importance an efficient agriculture has on the total economy. For example, the percent of disposable income spent on food and nonalcoholic beverages has decreased from an approximate average of 27 percent in 1912–16 to the present level of 19 percent thus realizing more disposable income for other goods and services.

Since the raising and feeding of beef cattle is the major factor in agriculture, the data as well points out its importance to the economy. Therefore, any decision which might be made by our Government adversely affecting the beef cattle community would be felt throughout the entire structure of our economy.

It should be noted also that any action that damages the efficiency of the cattle industry also adversely affects the economic life of thousands of communities the country over. To permit this through even further reduction in our tariffs on cattle and beef, would also directly affect employment on the thousands of ranches and related segments of the industry to the extent of millions of man-hours.

GROWTH OF THE CATTLE INDUSTRY

In 1948 cattle on hand numbered a little over 77 million head, whereas on January 1, 1963, we had over 103 million. In 1940 we consumed 8.23 billion pounds carcass weight and in 1962 we consumed 17.3 billion pounds (civilian consumption). Per capita consumption of beef was increased from the 1940 level of 54.9 pounds to an estimated 95 pounds in 1963. (See item 2 in appendix.) It has been determined that approximately 70 percent of the total tonnage of all harvested crops were fed to livestock. Beef cattle and calves account for more than 42 percent of the consumption of all feedstuffs produced, according to U.S. Department of Agriculture studies.

The most recent agricultural census found there were roughly 4 million farms and 2.5 million had cattle and calves. Over 1 billion acres of land are involved either in cropland used for pasture, open permanent pasture, woodland pasture, open grazing, and woodland grazing, indicating the tremendous utilization by cattle and calves of this important economic resource.

With this huge production plant, plus the potential that will be realized as production on the land increases (an increase of 80 percent from 1950 to 1975 is estimated in "Long-Term Production Prospects for Western Agriculture," an Economic Research Service publication, May 1963) together with improved breeding, it is evident that our domestic beef plant will be able abundantly to supply domestic demand. All the industry needs is economic incentive.

TARIFF LEVELS FOR THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COUNTRIES

It is pertinent, we believe, to review briefly the present tariff levels on the items of primary interest to the beef cattle producers. These items in Agricultural Handbook No. 143, fall under schedule 1, 100.40, 100.43, 100.45, 100.53, 100.55, 106.10, 107.20, and 107.25.

In 1930 the tariff on beef and veal was 6 cents per pound and this was reduced in 1947 to the present 3 cents per pound. The United States reduced the tariff on cattle under 200 pounds from 2½ to 1½ cents a pound on the first 200,000 head coming into this country annually. The rate on cattle weighing 200 to 700 pounds is 2½ cents; on those weighing over 700 pounds it was reduced from 3 to 1½ cents per pound for not over 400,000 head entering in a 12-month period with not more than 120,000 head entering in any one quarter. Cattle entering in excess of this number carry a duty of 2½ cents per pound. Preserved meats and those not otherwise specified were reduced from 20 to 10 percent on an ad valorem basis.

Since general price levels in the United States have more than doubled since 1930, the tariff reduction from 6 to 3 cents on beef and veal actually amounts to less than 1½ cents in terms of 1930 prices as compared with present price levels. Cow prices are now at about $14 per hundredweight as compared with only $7 in 1930, reflecting the general inflation. The present tariff has become insignificant as a deterrent to imports of beef and live cattle. To give the same degree of protection as we had in 1930, the present tariff level would have to be increased more than 550 percent. We call your particular attention to item 3 in the appendix, figures by the U.S. Department of Commerce dealing with ad valorem equivalents in 1930 and the 1962 rates of duty on live cattle, beef and veal—fresh, frozen, canned and preserved.

Based on a study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service, the United States has steadily been reducing its duties on agricultural imports since enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act some 30 years ago. The study found that the average tariff rates on dutiable agricultural imports have been reduced from 88 percent in 1932 to 10 percent in 1949, with slight reductions since that period. The average duty imposed on U.S. agricultural imports is lower than those on U.S. nonagricultural imports.

Paralleling the reductions in our duties on agricultural imports has been a tremendous increase in cost of production for the domestic industries, particularly in agriculture. Although total farm income has increased slightly since the midforties, the production expenses have increased at a much more rapid rate (see item 4 in appendix). Along with increasing cost of production and slight increase in net farm income, there has been a drop in the purchasing power (see item 5 in appendix). More particularly and perhaps more discouraging, as an example, is the income and expense figure indicating relationship between gross income and net ranch income for cattle ranches in the Southwest (see item 6 in appendix).

Concurrently with the increased cost of production and decreases in duties on agricultural imports, we find that other countries have either maintained or increased their nontariff import controls as well as their import duties (see item 7 in appendix). It is obvious from these supporting data that the direction that the United States has been going, both in their tariffs and other import requirements, is in the opposite direction from the members of the world trade community with whom we deal.

The United States is the envy of the world in agricultural production. No other country produces the abundance of food and fiber with only 8 percent of its population engaged in primary agriculture. No other country has the supplies of healthful and nutritious food that the United States has been fortunate enough to attain. No other country in the world has the enviable health status of domestic animals as well as row crop agriculture.

It is imperative, therefore, that nothing be done in the upcoming negotiations in Geneva to jeopardize the present quarantine procedures protecting our agriculture. This is an animal health problem exclusively and not related to the economics of foreign trade. Any relaxation of quarantines imposed by other than scientific facts could prove absolutely disastrous to the domestic livestock industry.

PRESENT TARIFF LEVELS NO DETERRENT TO PROTECTING OUR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES

The United States consumes one-third of the total world's supply of beef and veal. We have pointed out earlier the potential of the domestic beef cattle industry, based on past history, having the capabilities to provide the consuming public with a continuous supply of a high-quality product.

In 1957 the imports of live cattle and beef and veal amounted to 3.9 percent of our domestic production. In 1962, a record year, imports amounted to approximately 11 percent of our total production. For the first 8 months of 1963, on a carcass weight basis, beef and veal imports were 22 percent above the first 8 months of 1962.

On a carcass weight equivalent basis, the United States in 1953 imported 9.3 percent of the total world meat imports. This amount jumped to 24 percent in 1962, due mainly to increased imports of beef and veal and live cattle. According to the Foreign Agriculture Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the United States is now the largest importer of beef in the world (see items 6a and 7a in appendix).

As a matter of fact, a major concern to the domestic beef cattle producer is that the U.S. market is becoming the dumping ground for the world supplies of meats, particularly beef and veal. Unless corrective measures are taken, additional burdensome amounts will continue to flood our domestic market.

The two best examples of two countries which have shared materially in the expanded export market to the United States are Australia and New Zealand (see item 8 in appendix). These two countries currently are responsible for approximately 80 percent of our beef and veal imports. On a recent trip to these countries, we learned that their cost of production is roughly half that of ours. Also these countries are actively encouraging an expansion of their world trade in beef and veal particularly to the U.S. market. Such things as rapid write-off on investment for improvements, allowing these investments also to be handled as operating expenses, and other factors have greatly accelerated their beef production potential.

In combination with our high U.S. prices for beef, those two nations have added incentive for additional exports. Another reason that both New Zealand and Australia have so materially increased their exports to our market is the fact that these countries now have a modified commitment to the United Kingdom for meat. This has allowed them to divert more of their exportable beef, veal, lamb, and mutton to the U.S. market. To accomplish this, they have decreased their own per capita consumption of beef—mainly because the export market has raised the price to the consumers in those countries. It is fitting to note the high degree that these two countries protect their agriculture from foreign competition: 100 percent for New Zealand and 41 percent for Australia.

With investments in the United States of $700 to $1,000 per cow unit, it is difficult for us to compete without some degree of protection from excessive imports.

A further disadvantage is that imports of cattle, beef and beef products amount to 12 times the value of exports of like products. The figures for 1962 were: exports $34.6 million, imports $412 million.

CONCEPTS OF FREE TRADE NOT APPLICABLE TO THE BEEF CATTLE INDUSTRIES

When the Trade Expansion Act was initiated in the Congress, a theory of free trade was proposed to justify its enactment. In essence, it said that countries should produce those products in which they are most efficient and trade with other countries for other needed items in which they are not as efficient. However intrinsic to this assumption is that those countries involved can make the necessary shifts from one product to another for maximum productivity and efficiency. That is to say that the productive unit needed to put out products is a variable one easily adapted to changing circumstances. This cannot be the case with beef cattle. Beef cattle in the main depend upon using a resource, grass, that has no other alternative economic use. The cattle industry cannot relocate or retool for an alternative use for its plant.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

In our judgment, the commodities to which we refer, now on the preliminary list for possible negotiation in cutting the tariff by 50 percent or to zero must be removed from such consideration. The current level of imports at over 11 percent of our consumption is serving as a severe economic depressant in the cattle industry. This is particularly true in combination with record supplies of domestic cattle and beef and the outlook for rather wide areas of drought with the

possibility of forced liquidation. Using the conservative figure of 10 percent of our total production of beef and veal as being imported on a carcass weight equivalent basis then it is evident, based on the judgment of many economists, these imports are reducing the average price of our beef cattle between $3 and $4 per hundredweight alive. And further, if we compare imports for 1962 to the domestic production of manufacturing type beef, we find imports approach 40 percent of our total consumption. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has pointed out in numerous of their publications that beef is its own worst competitor or that increase in supplies of beef or veal have more effect on price than changes in supplies of pork, chicken, lamb, etc.

Further the argument has been put forth that the present imports do not compete with "block" beef. This assumption ignores two facts: (1) Beef is its own worst competitor and (2) that a large percent of the imports of beef and veal are used for hamburger.

Rather than removal or reduction of the present tariffs, the American National Cattlemen's Association proposes that a system of quotas be established based on an average of imports over a period of time. This, in our judgment, would give the exporting countries of the world access to our market, and an opportunity to share in our expanding market. This as well would give some degree of stability to the domestic beef cattle market. There are many existing precedents for taking such an approach.

No other country has a more casual attitude toward its food supplies than the United States. It is taken for granted by the consumer that it will be there when they want it. Only in the case of a national emergency, such as the Cuban crisis, is the public interested in stockpiling food. Under normal conditions this is the responsibility of the producer, processor, transporter, and retailer complex.

Many people assume because fewer and fewer people are actively engaged in primary agriculture, it is playing a smaller and smaller role in our total economy. Not many years ago the responsibility of producing the food and fiber for this country rested on the shoulders of the many. Today this responsibility is on the shoulders of the few. However, with the increased population the task is even more formidable and the responsibility even greater with many additional industries and workers involved.

The following, among the points covered in the body of our brief, is justification to support the recommendation of the American National Cattlemen's Association.

1. This country should never find itself in the same position as did Great Britain during the early stages of the Second World War. They were largely dependent on imports of food products from countries of the United Kingdom as well as the United States, but these sources were virtually cut off. Will America profit by history, or will we too become dependent upon outside sources for food and fiber?

2. It is necessary to maintain primary agriculture as well as associated industries; for example, one strong reason is the responsibility of agriculture to maintain local government, particularly schools. This source of support is the ad valorem property tax. To help pay this tax means you must have profits in agriculture.

3. The Trade Expansion Act and the entire trade position of the United States has been directed toward more liberal trade policy. Many countries have taken the opposite tack; for example, the European Common Market is establishing common tariff walls, thereby increasing many of their food products so that they may become more self-sufficient. These barriers to trade are rather subtle, taking the form of import licenses, special taxes that affect only products produced outside of the European Common Market and high subsidies within these countries are to encourage maximum food production, as well as higher aggregate tariffs on some items. Is it logical for the United States to move in the opposite direction in our trade policies?

4. Are U.S. industries and our Government willing or able to find other markets to replace the loss of domestic agricultural use of such products as petroleum, steel, machinery and many other items because of dislocation in agriculture resulting in our "free" trade policies?

5. The United States, particularly since the post-World War II period, has exported technology and tools to many countries. This technology and the tools to apply it have materially increased the world expansion of meats, particularly beef. The United States is the world's best cash market for these increasing supplies of beef entering world commerce, and in many cases those countries will literally "take the meat from the mouths of their people" to export beef to satisfy their demands for gold by shipping it to the United States.

We hope the expedient of simply gaining some temporary trade advantage will not prevail at the expense of a continuing sound domestic cattle industry which is basic to an efficient agriculture.

---

STATEMENT BY HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA, TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED DUTY REDUCTIONS ON CATTLE, BEEF, AND HIDES, DECEMBER 10, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my appearance here today is for the purpose of objecting to any reductions in the tariffs covering cattle, and all beef and veal and products thereof. Of these, the most important are live cattle (items Nos. 100.40 through 100.55); beef and veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen (item 106.10); and canned beef (items 107.20 and 107.50). These items are mentioned specifically without intending thereby to imply, by omission, that I am not opposed to reductions in tariffs on other beef and veal products.

Tariffs on cattle and particularly on certain types of beef are already low, and imports are already flooding in, each year more than during the year before. In 1962, beef and veal imports reached an alltime record of 1,445 million pounds (carcass weight equivalent). As recently as 1957 they were less than 400 million pounds; thus, in 5 years the increase was more than 3½ times. Imports during the first 9 months of 1963 have run almost 200 million pounds ahead of the corresponding period of 1962.

Thus, we seem to be headed for another record year on imports. Meanwhile, we are also close to a record low price for cattle, at least for the postwar period. As imports have gone up, prices have gone down.

During November of last year the price of choice steers in Chicago averaged $30.13 a hundred. In November of this year, the corresponding average price was $23.51. That is not a decline in price—it is a total collapse.

Your attention is particularly invited to the fact that the November 1963, average—$23.50—is the lowest November average since cattle and meat were taken out from OPA control in 1946, with the exception of a single year.

The cattle industry is simply up against it, gentlemen, and I do not believe you are justified in imposing further serious injury on it by additional reductions in duty. Duties are too low already.

Furthermore, in my judgment the present structure of tariff rates is illogical and "out of kilter" to such a degree that the rates still in effect fail to provide even the limited degree of protection they are supposed to.

The great volume of beef is entering under the rate of beef or veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen, 3 cents a pound. The rate is 3 cents a pound whether it is beef with the bone in, or boneless beef. The foreign packinghouse can save on the duty by taking the bone out and removing excess fat and other waste before shipping the beef. Thus the weight of the shipment is sharply reduced while little of value is removed.

We are told by the Agriculture Department that 1 pound of boneless beef is equivalent, on the average, to 1.45 pounds of beef carcass. In other words, by performing the boning operation before shipment the shipper in effect pays the equivalent of only 2 cents a pound in tariff, compared with the tariff he would have had to pay if he had shipped whole carcasses, from which the bone would be removed in this country.

Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture figures that the carcass weight of imported cattle is equivalent, on the average, to only about 53 percent of the live weight on the animals. Thus, figuring back to the tariff equivalent on the live cattle, 3 cents a pound duty on boneless beef corresponds to only a little over 1 cent a pound on the live animal.

The duty on feeder cattle is 2½ cents a pound and on heavy cattle (over 700 pounds) is 1½ or 2½ cents. These duties on live cattle don't give the protection they should, since the product comes in anyhow in the form of boneless beef and takes away the market of the men who raise the cattle and operate the feedlots.

In other words, the low duty on boneless beef is a loophole in the tariff structure, since it is lower, relatively speaking, than the rest of the scale of duties on cattle and beef. It operates as a sort of gigantic funnel through which these tremendous and increasing imports of beef have been poured into this country from abroad.

Now we have reached the ridiculous point where more than 10 percent of our beef supply comes from abroad, although we could certainly increase beef production here to an almost unlimited extent—to whatever level the market would absorb.

If any duty is to be changed, therefore, it is suggested that the duty on boneless beef be increased, instead of decreased, and thereby the tariff structure will at least be restored to a more logical form.

While I am about it, I will also register a protest against any reduction in the duty on cattle hides (item 120.13). This duty is only 4 percent ad valorem now and can hardly be called a serious impediment to trade. I realize that we export a great deal more cattle hides than we import, but those exports go chiefly to countries that have serious deficits in their domestic sources of hides. They must import because they cannot produce enough for their own needs. With us the case is different, and in my opinion this very moderate production given to a byproduct of the meatpacking industry tends to strengthen the general cattle market to a degree. We sorely need any source of strength we can find.

It is not my purpose today to go into an extended analysis of markets, prices, competitive factors, and the like. However, I have one general recommendation to put before you covering the whole field of tariffs on agricultural products.

In this country we employ few quantitative restrictions and other nontariff restrictions against imports. On most agricultural imports we apply only our rather low scale of tariffs.

With most other countries this is not so. According to a study recently made by the Department of Agriculture, every single important trading country included in the

study made far greater use of nontariff barriers—quotas, licensing systems, variable levies, state monopolies, and the like. For example, 93 percent of the farm production of West Germany is protected against imports by nontariff barriers, 94 percent of that of France, 63 percent of that of Italy, 76 percent of that of Japan, and even for the United Kingdom, 37 percent. I introduce in evidence a table, taken from the Department of Agriculture publication entitled "Agricultural Protection by Nontariff Trade Barriers," showing the percent of domestic agricultural production protected by nontariff trade barriers for each of the following countries: the United States, France, West Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Belgium, Greece, Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan.

Also, I ask to have included in the record at the conclusion of my remarks a similar table making the same kind of comparison, but for livestock and meat only. Again, the United States is conspicuous by the fact that we do not resort to nontariff trade barriers to protect our American livestock and meat producers, whereas almost all other principal foreign countries do. For example, France, Germany, and Italy all use some form of nontariff barrier to protect their own domestic livestock and meat industries, to the extent of 95 to 100 percent. We do not utilize any form of protection except a tariff, for this country, and the only other countries in this study of which the same statement can be made are Canada and Australia.

Third, I present as evidence a tabulation of "Quantitative restrictions maintained on imports by certain foreign countries," compiled by the State Department and reprinted in a joint committee print of the Joint Economic Committee entitled "The U.S. Balance of Payments—Perspective and Policies." This tabulation lists all the commodity imports on which quantitative restrictions are imposed by the following countries: Austria, Belgium and Luxembourg, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and several other countries. The lists of imports thus controlled through quotas or licensing systems by these countries are lengthy. Not all of such items are agricultural products, but most of them are. These lists thus reinforce what the Department of Agriculture has also discovered—that, by and large, quantitative or other nontariff devices are major instruments of policy in restricting agricultural imports by many of the principal commercial countries of the world.

The point is simply this. There is no use talking about "tariff bargaining" on farm products if other countries rely primarily on import restrictions other than tariffs.

This country needs a wholly new approach to the subject of foreign trade policy in farm products. Other countries again and again have given us reductions in their tariffs on our farm products, then nullified those reductions by imposing some different type of barrier. Meanwhile, we have steadily reduced our own tariff rates on agricultural products along with manufactured goods. We have given the farmer empty promises of the foreign markets we would secure for him, while simultaneously cutting away the protection which in the past at least preserved for him his market at home.

Until we find some effective way to breach these foreign nontariff trade barriers against our agricultural exports, I urge that we cease making reductions in our own tariffs on agricultural products. Instead of continuing with indiscriminate tariff cutting, I recommend that the administration devote itself to finding some means of inducing foreign countries to get away from their systems of variable levies, import licenses, and the like.

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of the proportion of agricultural production benefiting from nontariff import controls in the United States and selected important agricultural countries*

| Country: | *Percentage* |
|---|---|
| United States | 26 |
| France [1] | 94 |
| West Germany [1] | 93 |
| Netherlands [1] | 79 |
| Italy [1] | 63 |
| Belgium [1] | 76 |
| Greece [1] | 82 |
| Austria [2] | 91 |
| Denmark [2] | 87 |
| Norway [2] | 97 |
| Portugal [2] | 100 |
| Sweden [2] | ([3]) |
| Switzerland [2] | 94 |
| United Kingdom [2] | [4] 37 |
| Canada | 41 |
| Australia | 41 |
| New Zealand | 100 |
| Japan | 76 |

[1] European Economic Community countries.

[2] European Free Trade Association countries.

[3] Neither total output in terms of value, or representative prices for majority of commodities are available.

[4] Because this analysis is limited to direct restrictions on imports it does not take into account the operation of the United Kingdom deficiency payment system, extent or manner of payments to farmers, or impact of the system on prices and imports.

Source: "Agricultural Protection by Nontariff Trade Barriers," ERS–Foreign–60, September 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Livestock and meat: Proportion of the value of domestic production protected against imports by nontariff trade barriers, selected countries*

[In millions of dollars]

| Country | Total value | Protected value | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| France | 2,479 | 2,355 | 95.0 |
| West Germany | 2,349 | 2,231 | 95.0 |
| Netherlands | 475 | 452 | 95.2 |
| Italy | 1,136 | 1,136 | 100.0 |
| Belgium | 341 | 156 | 45.7 |
| Greece | 109 | 109 | 100.0 |
| Austria | 310 | 310 | 100.0 |
| Denmark | 560 | 560 | 100.0 |
| Norway | 112 | 106 | 94.6 |
| Portugal | 102 | 102 | 100.0 |
| Switzerland | 242 | 232 | 95.9 |
| United Kingdom | 1,355 | 456 | 33.7 |
| Canada | 854 | 0 | 0 |
| Australia | 531 | 0 | 0 |
| New Zealand | 312 | 311 | 100.0 |
| Japan | 618 | 355 | 57.4 |
| United States | 9,255 | 0 | 0 |

Source: Compiled from data in "Agricultural Protection by Nontariff Trade Barriers," ERS-Foreign-60, September 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture. See that publication for precise statements of coverage and of use of terms, limitations of the data, and original sources.

## DAVID LAWRENCE PAYS TRIBUTE TO LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the U.S. News & World Report of December 2, 1963, published an article, "The Incredible Tragedy," by David Lawrence, worthy of preservation in the permanent archives of this Nation. This is a fine tribute to the memory of our gallant fallen leader, the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. 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 INCREDIBLE TRAGEDY

(By David Lawrence)

The American people and the peoples of the whole world mourn the death of President John F. Kennedy.

For the assassin's bullet ended the life of a young man whose sincerity of purpose, dedication to duty, and devotion to what he believed was right characterized his service to the United States. Even as he had responded to the cheers of the crowds and had ridden happily in an open automobile through the streets of Dallas, Tex., he reflected the confidence of a man with faith in his fellow citizens.

What shall we say of the insane impulse which caused a despicable individual to destroy the President of this great country? Americans, regardless of party or faction, believe in morality and in respect for human life.

Three times before in American history a President has been killed while in office—Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, and William McKinley. In each instance, individuals, of an erratic or unbalanced mentality were responsible. This strange hand of fate has taken from the White House four men of dedicated character. It is difficult to understand these tragic events in our history. For as a President is removed from this mortal life in a few minutes, there emerges a feeling that life and sudden death, even in high office, are beyond the comprehension of our finite minds.

We do know that every year the number of crimes committed by deranged individuals is increasing. Can we not devise some means of detecting in advance the symptoms of such behavior in our society?

The Secret Service has grappled with this problem for decades. Observation of the houses and buildings along a parade route, inspection in advance, and a multitude of bodyguards close at hand have evidently provided no sure preventive.

It was during a theater performance in Washington, on the night of April 14, 1865, that Abraham Lincoln, sitting in the Presidential box, was shot by an erratic individual, who was subsequently killed for his crime by soldiers in pursuit of him.

James A. Garfield was shot by a disappointed officeseeker as he was entering the railroad station in Washington on July 2, 1881. His assailant was hanged.

William McKinley was shot by a man who came up to shake hands with him after a Presidential speech at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo on September 6, 1901. The revolver was concealed beneath a big handkerchief and thus escaped notice. The assassin, an anarchist, was electrocuted.

These happenings cast a cloud of gloom over the whole of our country. But somehow we do not seem to be able to forestall such incidents.

One wonders whether Presidents will venture hereafter to make public appearances except in halls and auditoriums under tight security guard. But our Presidents have been brave men who seem to feel that they must go before the people and take the risks that come with the duties of high office.

John F. Kennedy had that spirit of bravery and felt that he must see the people frequently, without regard to danger. On these pages in 1959 there was printed a detailed story of Lieutenant Kennedy's heroic exploits as commander of a PT boat in the Pacific during World War II. He was never governed by fear. His personal courage has been demonstrated on more than one occasion.

Mr. Kennedy came into office at a crucial time in world history when emotions ran high and differences of opinion on domestic and foreign questions were deepseated. But no President has tackled as many problems and such a variety of delicate and difficult issues as those into which John F. Kennedy delved so deeply during his 34 months in office.

President Kennedy listened patiently to his advisers and showed a remarkable familiarity with detail. Perhaps his outstanding characteristic was his readiness to listen to the arguments of those who disagreed with him. If a resolution of differences were possible so as to lessen friction and bring about an agreement, he conscientiously sought such a solution. He had shown the same attitude when he was in the Senate and in the House.

Mr. Kennedy manifested, in other words, a spirit of mediation and a desire to attain out of every controversy the maximum good for the public. For he adopted again and again the maxim that "half a loaf is better than none."

In world affairs, Mr. Kennedy exhibited a rare quality of patience and restraint. Whatever setbacks his administration may have encountered around the world, the fact remains that he tried his utmost to preserve peace for his country while maintaining the military strength so necessary to deter an enemy.

It is hard to believe that our President is dead at 46. It is hard to believe that this man who sought so earnestly to serve his country should be cut down in the prime of life.

This is an incredible tragedy.

## FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS VETERANS' NURSING HOME CARE BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I would like to invite the attention of the Senate to a very important bill, H.R. 8009, which is presently before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. This bill is designed to provide nursing home care and nursing home care facilities to deal with the problems of our aging veterans population. I would like to announce at this time that the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs will hold its second day of hearings on this bill, tomorrow, December 10, at 10 in room 4232 of the New Senate Office Building.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. R. A. Means, the national secretary of the Fleet Reserve Association, in which he states his organization's support for the goal of H.R. 8009.

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

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963.*

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I have read with great interest your newsletter of Thursday, November 21. I hope and pray you will keep behind this most serious problem.

The need for a solution of these nursing home care cases is mounting daily, as you know. I have just today had a case of one of our members in Georgia who is dying of cancer. He needs no further hospitalization per se at this moment but his aging wife is unable to help take care of him. This is just one of many we receive constantly.

In the very near future the Fleet Reserve Association will forward to you a study concerning the medical problems and hospitalization in particular for retired career men which we are preparing. I know you will be interested in the way we see the problem and our recommended solution.

I just wanted to let you know that the more than 53,000 career Navy and Marine Corps enlisted personnel of the Fleet Reserve Association appreciate your interest in our problems.

My very best wishes for a happy holiday season.

Yours in loyalty, protection, and service,
R. A. "BOB" MEANS,
*National Secretary.*

## FRANCE'S TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have received in my office a copy of the official messages of tribute from France to the late, beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. In addition, there are comments from French newspapers and other expressions of public opinion. These touching tributes from our great sister republic in Europe, and from the first nation to come to the aid of the embattled colonies in our War of Independence, move the American people with all our old sentiments of love for our ally, France.

General de Gaulle, by coming to the funeral of our late President, and leading the march of foreign dignitaries behind the casket of our late President, won new esteem and affection from the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the following publication from Ambassade de France, entitled "France's Tribute to the Late President Kennedy," be printed in the RECORD.

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

FRANCE'S TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY—GENERAL DE GAULLE'S STATEMENT—OFFICIAL MESSAGES—GENERAL DE GAULLE ATTENDS THE FUNERAL—FRENCH PUBLIC OPINION

General de Gaulle's statement on the death of President Kennedy:

"President Kennedy died like a soldier, under fire, in the line of duty, and in the service of his country.

"In the name of the French people, ever the friend of the American people, I salute his great example and his great memory."

OFFICIAL MESSAGES

Message to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy from General and Madam de Gaulle: "The great sorrow that has just befallen you distresses my wife and myself to the bottom of our hearts. Rest assured that we are with you in our thoughts and in our prayers. President Kennedy shall never be forgotten."

Message to President Lyndon Johnson from General de Gaulle, President of the Republic:

"The death of President Kennedy is a source of deep sorrow to the French people, who held in the highest esteem this great head of State, illustrious servant of freedom and of the destiny of mankind.

"In the face of a misfortune which so profoundly affects your country and which concerns all the peoples of the world, and at a time when fate bestows upon you the highest responsibilities, rest assured, Mr. President, of the more than ever loyal and confident friendship of France for the United States of America."

Message to President Lyndon Johnson from M. Georges Pompidou, Premier:

"Deeply moved by the tragic loss experienced by the United States on the death of President Kennedy, whose courage and great gifts as a statesman were admired by all, the French people wish to convey to you the grief felt by all my fellow countrymen.

"Rest assured that at a time when under such cruel circumstances you take up your high office, my colleagues of the French Government and myself join with you in a feeling of most grieving and most loyal friendship."

Message to Secretary of State Dean Rusk from M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs:

"Profoundly shocked by the news of the act which has just cost the life of the President of the United States, may I assure you that I deeply share in your mourning and in that of the Government and the American people. Mindful of the welcome that President Kennedy extended to me only a few weeks ago, I can appreciate the extent of your sorrow.

"All my countrymen join with me and share in the feelings of friendship toward your country which have existed for two centuries."

Message to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara from M. Pierre Messmer, Minister of the Armed Forces: "Upon hearing of the tragic death of President Kennedy, I ask you to accept the condolences of the French Armed Forces and also my own personal, sincerest and grieving condolences."

Message to Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from Gen. Charles Ailleret, Chief of Staff of the French Armed Forces:

"May I express to you, and request that you convey this message to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the shock and the indignation of the French armed forces on hearing the news of the outrage against President Kennedy.

"May I also express to you my deepest personal sorrow at the death of the President of the United States who welcomed me such a short time ago with so much friendliness and warmth."

Statement by M. Roger Seydoux, permanent representative of France to the United Nations, before a plenary session of the United Nations General Assembly, held on November 27, 1963, to pay homage to the memory of the late President Kennedy, M. Roger Seydoux, permanent representative of France to the United Nations: "All my compatriots, for whom the visit in Paris of Mr. and Mrs. John Kennedy remains a bright memory, turn toward the people of the United States, our everlasting friend. We wish them to know that their trial is our trial, their sadness our sadness, their mourning our mourning. Ours also is, despite the heavy loss they must bear, their steadfast faith in the future as is steadfast our confidence in their great destiny."

Statement by the French Premier, M. Georges Pompidou (the statement by the French Premier was broadcast over French television and transmitted to the United States by satellite via the Pleumeur-Bodou relay station):

"The stupefaction engendered by a despicable assassination, the indignation at seeing President Kennedy struck down by the side of his young wife in the fulfillment of his duties as a humane and liberal head of state, is accompanied by a great sadness also felt in our hearts: sadness because, once again, blind violence has triumphed; sadness because a great and friendly people is plunged into mourning; sadness because the free world has lost one of its surest guides.

"In these tragic hours, all France is at the side of the United States in anger, in grief,

and, despite everything, in confidence also for the future."

Statement by French Foreign Minister, M. Maurice Couve de Murville (the statement was carried over the three major American television networks. It was transmitted by the communications satellite Relay):

"It was with the most grievous impression of shock that we all, in Paris and in France, heard the appalling news of President Kennedy's cold-blooded murder. Many elements combined in our thoughts: the terribly premature disappearance of a statesman of the first magnitude, the death of a man who was the incarnation of youth and vitality, the awful tragedy that hit a glamorous and lovable family, the general feeling of a blow inflicted to a great country for which France has, from the beginning, felt the closest friendship, further reinforced by comradeship in three wars.

"For me, who had the privilege of long talks with President Kennedy, the memory will not pass of his friendliness, his eagerness, his wisdom and his courage.

"Believe me when I say that we, the French people, today all grieve and pray together with the American people."

Statement broadcast over American television by M. Hervé Alphand, French Ambassador to the United States:

"The tragic death of President Kennedy has deeply moved the French people, forever the friend of the American people. Your sorrow is our sorrow and this sorrow we share with Mrs. Kennedy and her family, tonight we pray with them.

"The President had always displayed toward my country a great fondness, particularly on the occasion of his visit to Paris in 1961.

"For me it was also a personal friend who always showed me a profound affection and understanding.

"As General de Gaulle said today, he died as a soldier. We shall never forget his example or his memory, the memory of a great man."

GENERAL DE GAULLE ATTENDS PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S FUNERAL

The Presidency of the Republic issued a communique on November 23 announcing that General de Gaulle, President of the Republic, would attend the funeral of President Kennedy. He would be accompanied by M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Gen. Charles Ailleret, Chief of Staff of the French Armed Forces; and M. Etienne Burin des Roziers, General Secretary of the Presidency of the Republic.

FRENCH PUBLIC OPINION

*France mourns President Kennedy*

On the personal orders of General de Gaulle, all flags on public buildings were flown at half staff from 9 a.m. on November 23.

In paying this respect to the memory of President Kennedy, General de Gaulle departed from French tradition, which requires flags to be flown at half staff only during the funeral of a head of state of an allied or friendly power.

On November 23, the Paris Municipal Council sent a telegram to Mrs. Kennedy in which it told her that the city of Paris was in mourning. In addition, a member of the council proposed that the name of John F. Kennedy, defender of the fundamental freedoms of man and who fell for these freedoms, be given to a street in Paris. The council unanimously adopted this proposal on November 28.

In addition to messages of condolence addressed by official French circles to Mr. Charles Bohlen, many people from all walks of life, veterans' associations, French-American associations, and others sent messages of sympathy to the U.S. Embassy in Paris.

Among many expressions of sympathy, mention should be made of a group of between 2,000 and 3,000 students of all nationalities who went to sign the register of condolence in the U.S. Embassy in Paris.

A service in the memory of President Kennedy was held on November 25 in the cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris. It was attended by the U.S. Ambassador and Mrs. Bohlen and by Madam Charles de Gaulle. M. Georges Pompidou, French Premier, the President of the Senate and Madam Gaston Monnerville, members of the Government and members of the diplomatic corps in the French capital were also present in the great cathedral which was unable to hold the crowds of Parisians who wished to attend the service and who overflowed into the square in front of the cathedral, where members of the Garde Républicaine, swords unsheathed, formed an honor guard.

*The French press*

The entire French press without exception reflected the feeling of affliction among the French people at the death of President Kennedy. Raymond Aron in Le Figaro of November 23 wrote: "The assassination of J. F. Kennedy affects all mankind. * * * He wanted to be one of those statesmen whom history remembers because they accomplish their task. * * * He will leave a memory which will not be unworthy of the grandeur which he dreamed of achieving."

In an editorial of November 23, Combat wrote: "The crime committed yesterday is the worst one can imagine, since the man it struck down was a symbol in the eyes of hundreds of millions of our contemporaries."

Also on November 23, France-Soir wrote: "Like lightning, anguish and grief have hit the world. The hearts of men and women sank, at the same moment, in every country and on all continents. * * * All peoples weep also and above all for this man who, in the words of Pope Paul VI, 'defended the liberty of peoples and the peace of the world.'"

La Nation of November 25 published the following editorial comments: "He was one of the great men in this world. * * * A man with a personal fortune for whom it was possible therefore to have narrow views and yet he was more aware than millions of others of man's fate, a man above all who had the courage to direct his actions in tune with his heart."

Paul Bastid, in l'Aurore of November 25, wrote: "There was in the personality of John Fitzgerald Kennedy a kind of lucid fire in the service of liberty and peace which commanded admiration and sympathy. He devoted himself entirely, with the energy of his temperament and of his age, to causes that are dear to us."

Le Monde, in an editorial in its November 26 issue, said: "He leaves an inspiration, a style, a line from which America will not easily stray." In the same issue, the French poet and Nobel Prize winner Saint John Perse wrote: "Kennedy * * * was an athlete running in a race against fate. He fought fairly and squarely always and his encounter with death came with his face uncovered."

The next day Le Monde published an editorial containing the following comment: "The gesture by the President of the Republic who, right at the outset, decided to be present at the funeral of a man whom many considered his rival, has come opportunely to show that, in difficult time, he intends to behave as a loyal friend of the United States. He had already proved this during the Cuban crisis."

*Eulogy pronounced by M. Jacques Chaban-Delmas, President of the French National Assembly*

At the opening of the November 26 sitting, in the presence of Mr. Charles Bohlen, U.S. Ambassador to France, M. Jacques Chaban-Delmas, President of the French National Assembly, pronounced the following eulogy of the late President Kennedy:

"John F. Kennedy was not only the world's most powerful head of state. He was also an exceptional man.

"The murder of this hero, who fell in the flower of his youth, who knew what power and glory was, this murder in which the fate of the ancients finds expression has already taken on an historic amplitude and its echo will never die away. No, we shall not forget John F. Kennedy.

"Yesterday, in Washington, France expressed her grief through the presence of the most famous of her citizens, he who, without a doubt, already belongs to history and continues to forge the future.

"Today, the National Assembly shares as one in the mourning of the United States and of its Congress. It participates with emotion in the sorrow of the Kennedy family. Deeply shocked, it pays its respects before the anguish of this charming, worthy, and courageous young woman who brought a little of the gentleness of France into the harsh existence of America's first citizen.

"Tomorrow it will be up to each and every one to pursue his task in defending and expounding the great principles shared by our two countries, principles in whose respect President Kennedy lived and also died."

M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs, associated the Government with the words of the National Assembly: "The homage paid by the National Assembly marks the share taken by the French people in the mourning of the American people and shows the esteem and affection for the President who died in the line of duty."

More than 400 Deputies stood and observed 1 minute's silence. Meetings were suspended for 1 hour as a sign of mourning.

## STOPGAP LEGISLATION NO ANSWER TO COTTON PROBLEM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, as the needs of the cotton and textile industries become more and more apparent to all, there is increasing recognition of the fact that nothing short of a totally new approach will alleviate the problems now confronting cotton farmers and textile manufacturers.

It is my contention that the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill is the needed approach and it is my earnest hope that this bill can be substituted for the one passed in the other body.

Mr. President, there appeared on December 6 and 7 four excellent editorials in the Atlanta Constitution, the Augusta Herald, and the Augusta Chronicle discussing the merits of the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill, as compared to the other bill, and I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Dec. 6, 1963]

COOLEY COTTON BILL IS STOPGAP MEASURE—TALMADGE PLAN OFFERS EFFECTIVE SOLUTION

The Cooley cotton bill, passed by the House of Representatives with the support of President Johnson, will not solve the problem of either the cottongrowers or the textile industry. It does help to remove an unfair competitive disadvantage under which textile manufacturers are placed under the present system. It does add another

subsidy to manufacturers on top of that already paid to growers.

Under this plan there will be no lessening of the burden now borne by taxpayers in this business of the Government's buying and storing cotton in spite of a lowering of support prices. The latter will hit the small producer hardest. It will eliminate, however, the Government-created differential between the cost of cotton in this country and on the world market by a subsidy to cover the differential.

The cotton textile industry has been losing in the competitive race because of this differential. Cotton has been losing out to synthetics at an accelerated pace, compounding the Government's problem of buying and storing cotton. There are now more then 8 million bales in storage and this is growing.

Trouble with the Cooley bill is that it does not attack the basic problem. It prolongs it. The plan proposed by Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, with support of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and many others, is much more sensible and offers hope of eventual solution. It would end this double-subsidy system and end the Government program of buying and storing cotton.

Briefly, Senator TALMADGE's plan would end price-supporting purchase by the CCC and substitute income subsidies to farmers which are equal to the difference between the world cotton price and a percentage of the domestic parity price. Income subsidies would vary with individual farm production, thus protecting the small producer and end the paying of millions to large producers under the present system. Payments on the first 15 bales would be on a basis of 80 to 90 percent of parity. Payments for production in excess of 30 bales would be scaled down to 70 percent of parity.

Senator TALMADGE's plan would be based on a national acreage allotment. Lightening the taxpayers' burden, it would lower prices for consumers and increase consumption. It would help the small farmer to survive until he can make a transition to other work and would end the huge payments to the big, efficient producers who now enjoy a windfall.

The Talmadge plan reportedly is gaining support in the Senate. The stopgap Cooley bill, which does relieve an injustice to textile manufacturers, is no permanent solution. Gradual abandonment of the present system for the Talmadge program offers a way out.

---

[From the Augusta Herald, Dec. 6, 1963]

GEORGIAN'S PLAN IS BETTER

With passage by the U.S. House of Representatives of the Cooley bill—of limited merit—to relieve the plight of the American cotton industry, it is up to the Senate to decide whether to go along or to insist on the much better Talmadge bill.

The bill passed Wednesday night by the House, 216 to 182, is the one introduced by Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina. It provides a subsidy to U.S. textile mills for purchase of cotton. The proposed new subsidy of 8½ cents would be in addition to a subsidy in the same amount paid by the Government in order to put surplus American cotton in the export market at the world price of 24 cents, without which no U.S. cotton would be sold abroad. It also is in addition to the parity payments to producers, thus creating a triple subsidy system.

It cannot be denied that the use of American cotton in American mills is in jeopardy unless something is done. Japanese and other foreign industries can buy our cotton so much cheaper than American mills that they can—with the further assistance of cheap labor—ship back the same cotton in finished form and undersell our own manufacturers. Such imported cotton fabrics now constitute 8 percent of our own national consumption.

Without relief, the textile industry in this country will turn to synthetic fibers, as much of it already has done, or will simply cease operations. In either event, U.S. cotton producers or U.S. millworkers or both are the losers. At a time when President Johnson insists that the national economy must be built up to support the creation of 5 million new jobs, we cannot afford to remain idle while the cotton industry is wrecked.

An alternative to the Cooley bill, however, promises a better and less expensive remedy. That is the bill introduced by Georgia's Senator HERMAN TALMADGE. Instead of loading still a third cotton subsidy onto the backs of the U.S. taxpayers, it would remove one of the two already in force.

The Talmadge bill would give each cotton farmer an allotment of a certain number of bales, rather than a certain number of acres. The total number of allotted bales would be based on domestic consumption. For the allotted bales, the farmer would be paid a subsidy to guarantee a minimum per-pound return. Each farmer would be permitted to grow as much cotton over the domestic allotment as he wished, but the overage would sell at the world price—almost certain to be a lower price, in view of production costs in Egypt and other cheap-labor countries.

The Talmadge bill would retain most of the protection now given the cotton producer, would relieve the American textile industry of its present unfair burden of discriminatory costs and would take much of the subsidy cost off the back of the public. It would get the Government out of the cotton surplus business. It would permit the big mass-production cotton planters of California with their mechanized low-cost methods to compete on the world market if they could economically do so.

The advantages of the Georgia Senator's bill so far outweigh those of the Cooley bill that the Senate should take a good, hard look at the consequences of each.

If the Senate also should approve the triple-subsidy Cooley proposal, however, it should be accepted only as an interim solution to give immediate relief to the textile industry, with the Talmadge plan remaining as a permanent and sensible system to be adopted as soon as possible.

---

[From the Augusta Chronicle, Dec. 6, 1963]

MORE THAN ONE BENEFICIARY

The House-passed cotton bill is far more than merely the windfall to domestic textile mills that it was charged with being during debate on the measure. It may be—or at least lead to a bill that will be—the redeemer of domestic cotton.

Undeniably, the bill will prove to be a boon to American mills in their continuing economic battle with foreign competition. It will, if finally approved, enable the U.S. mills to purchase American cotton at the same price charged foreign mills. Currently, the differential is 8½ cents a pound, or about $46 a bale.

But that the domestic mills are going to gain 8½ cents on each pound of local cotton they buy does not, by any stretch of the imagination, mean that they are going to boost their profit by any fabulous amount.

What it means is that by purchasing American cotton at a price comparable to that paid for it by foreign mills, the local mills can reduce the cost of manufacture, price their cotton goods cheaper—and become more competitive on both the domestic and world market with foreign made goods.

Principal beneficiaries, however, are not just the mill owners. The consumers and, perhaps even more so, the cotton farmers themselves stand to be directly aided when the present two-price cotton system is replaced by a more equitable order.

For the consumer, the benefits will derive, obviously, from the reduction in the retail price of cotton fabrics and made-up garments.

The advantage to the farmer will be more subtle.

The loss he has been daily facing comes from the fact that in recent years the mills, all of which have been hurt unnecessarily by the two-price system, have been striving to overcome their losses by turning from cotton to synthetics. The situation, instead of easing, has continued to grow more acute.

By its action therefore, the House at long last has given recognition to the dismal fact that continuation of the two-price system is going to result in an increasing decline in the use by domestic mills of cotton. It is becoming less profitable to them with almost every passing day.

This reduction in the consumption of American cotton by American mills is bound to have its effect on cotton as a farm commodity. It could, conceivably, lead to its elimination as a major crop.

Therefore, while the House bill—named for Representative HAROLD COOLEY of North Carolina, its sponsor—leaves much to be desired, it is, we think, a step in the right direction. Left to the Senate now, if cotton is to be saved, is the job either of placing its stamp of approval on the Cooley measure, or coming up with its own ideas of what a cotton bill should be. It might very well, in fact, turn to the Talmadge farm plan as that best serving the interests of the Nation.

It will be interesting to see if that develops in the Senate.

---

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Dec. 7, 1963]

TALMADGE'S PLAN IS BETTER

In moving toward elimination of this country's two-price cotton system, the House Wednesday passed what is commonly known as the Cooley bill. Named for its sponsor, Representative HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina, the measure in essence, is, while better than none at all, an agricultural hodgepodge and a political expedient designed to please all cotton interests and do everything for everybody.

In the main, as we explained yesterday, the measure provides some surcease for the American textile mills. Under terms of the bill, they would be permitted to purchase domestic cotton at the world price and thereby become competitive with foreign concerns which currently are permitted to buy American cotton at some $46 a bale cheaper than do the American firms. We firmly believe they should be permitted this privilege.

In order to do this, however, the COOLEY bill provides what foes claim is a triple subsidy. There already is an 8½-cent-a-pound subsidy given cotton shippers in order that they may meet the world price of 24 cents and permit the sale of American cotton abroad. In addition, the Government aids the cotton farmers by way of parity payments. Now, say opponents, the assistance to the domestic mills would amount to another 8½-cent subsidy.

Stiff opposition for the measure, which passed the House by a vote of 216 to 182, is seen when it is called up in the Senate. In fact, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, has expressed open antagonism. "I can't support a cotton bill which would

greatly increase costs of the farm program * * *," he said.

The additional increase has been estimated to be some $600 million in 3 years, although COOLEY insists the figure is nearer $118 million for the first year, and less in succeeding years.

As we said yesterday, this opposition in the Senate may cause that body to turn to the farm plan of Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, as one that is better for the Nation.

We think it would be.

In the first place, the Talmadge plan, while also helping the domestic mills, would be more economical, both as a program for the Government and as a burden for the taxpayers than will be the Cooley bill.

It calls for domestic prices to drop to world levels—some 8½ cents less—and then provide Government payments to farmers to bring them up to the U.S. support level. The subsidies would be designed to bring farmers' income up to figures comparable to workers, in other fields of endeavor.

Primarily, however, the Talmadge plan would get the Government out of the cotton surplus business. It would eliminate all acreage controls and would assign each farmer a domestic production quota based on bales. The latter number would be based upon domestic consumption. For his allotment, the farmer would be paid a subsidy guaranteeing to him a minimum per-pound return. He could grow as much cotton as he wished, but would be compelled to sell the overage at the world price, which, in light of cheaper production costs overseas, could be expected to be well below the price guaranteed under his production quota.

Additionally, it would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, transporting, storing and selling all farm commodities. A savings of $8 billion for the storage of farm surpluses has been estimated by Senator TALMADGE as one of the advantages accruing to the taxpayers if his bill is ultimately adopted.

Support for the Cooley bill came from the administration, which saw it as the best bill possible to please all interests in the cotton business. It has had the support of the mills because they, by and large, didn't feel the Talmadge bill could be enacted, even though they may have preferred it.

Farm groups, ironically, have been the chief opponents to the Talmadge plan. Because it would provide direct subsidies to them, many farmers have felt—especially those who would receive large amounts—that the Government would take a look at the payments—and then vote to place a lower ceiling on them.

Under the Cooley bill the Government support prices are in the form of loans on cotton placed in Government warehouses.

## TRIBUTE TO MATHIAS F. CORREA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this morning in Arlington National Cemetery was buried Mathias F. Correa, a great contributor to the public and military life of our Nation for the past quarter of a century.

He was appointed, prior to World War II and at just past 30 years of age to the office of U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York.

He sought to put on the uniform as soon as he could, leaving that job to become a lieutenant in the Army and was sent to the Mediterranean theater. He transferred to the Marine Corps, and became special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal. He gave strength and depth to Secretary Forrestal's office and contributed a great deal to the success of the Secretaryship of Mr. Forrestal.

Following the war, he continued to be interested in public life, playing a definitive role in setting up the present Central Intelligence Agency as one of the three citizens, along with William H. Jackson and Allen W. Dulles, who drafted the original blueprints for the Central Intelligence Agency.

Over the years, along with his demanding private work, he retained an interest in our Government.

In fact, if the ideas he had advanced and believed in in 1948 had been fully carried out and implemented by the Central Intelligence Agency, many problems could have been avoided.

He also continued in the Marine Corps, which enjoyed his loyalty and affection throughout his life.

This grand gentlemen was buried today in the national cemetery of the Government he served so well.

His lovely widow, his devoted mother, his three wonderful daughters, and his many friends are and will be immensely sad at his loss.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order agreed to this morning, the Chair now lays before the Senate H.R. 9140, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

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. ELLENDER. 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. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate has for consideration today the public works appropriation bill. I am very hopeful that consideration of the bill can be concluded this afternoon, so that, as soon as possible, we may go to conference with the House on the disagreeing amendments.

I regret that again this year the public works appropriation bill is being considered at the tail end of the session. The bill passed the House on November 19, and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations on November 20. The bill was reported to the Senate on December 5.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to give a lengthy explanation of the bill. The report on it is on the desks of the Senators, and I believe it quite clearly sets forth the action of the committee.

Except with respect to title IV, I believe the bill is noncontroversial. I expect that amendments will be offered to decrease or strike from the bill amounts recommended for public works acceleration.

At the conclusion of my statement, I will ask that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text, so that the Senate will have ample opportunity to work its will on the bill.

Mr. President, as is customary, the Subcommittee on Public Works divided itself into three subcommittees for the consideration of the pending bill. The portion of the public works appropriation bill dealing with the Bureau of Reclamation and the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior was handled by my good and able friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The portion of the bill covering the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority was handled by my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I handled the portion dealing with the civil functions of the Department of the Army, and the Public Works Acceleration Act.

The hearings on this bill started on May 7, and continued through November 20, 1963. The subcommittee held 54 sessions for the purpose of taking testimony, and 4 executive sessions for the purpose of marking up the bill. The subcommittee heard 1,059 witnesses, which included representatives of various organizations; 908 of the witnesses appeared before the subcommittee dealing with the civil functions of the Department of the Army; all but 16 of the remaining witnesses appeared before the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The hearings comprise 4 volumes, which contain 4,540 pages of testimony. Senators have a complete set of them on their desks. They constitute the basic information upon which the subcommittee based its recommendation to the full committee.

It is my belief that in the future the committee should, in a measure, curtail much of the repetitious testimony that

is given from year to year on the continuing projects. Before hearings are started next year on the 1965 appropriation bill, I shall, in advance, ask witnesses to confine their testimony, more or less, to new matters that may be presented to the committee. So far as the testimony on projects that are in the process of being constructed is concerned, I believe it is repetitious for the committee to take the same testimony from year to year.

As Senators can see on their desks, the size of the printed record of hearings conducted this year is huge. All of that is costly. It is my belief that in the future it might be possible to curtail some of that expense. I do not believe the projects would suffer thereby.

Mr. President, with respect to title I, before marking up the civil functions portion of this bill, we reviewed every project that was presented to the subcommittee, budgeted or unbudgeted. We examined into every single request made of the subcommittee for planning or construction. After all the requests were made, Engineers were called back to obtain their views on the projects presented to the subcommittee. The purpose of this recall was to find out whether the Engineers could economically and efficiently utilize the additional funds requested by the local witnesses, and whether the Corps of Engineers had the capability to undertake the unbudgeted new starts requested.

As in the past, the subcommittee heard all the witnesses who desired to present testimony on unbudgeted projects, and also on budgets for which more funds were asked than were budgeted. The same is true of surveys and new planning starts. As in the past, there is not a single project that has been recommended by the subcommittee or by the committee as a whole for which there is not justification in the hearings before the Senate.

I am proud to say that the subcommittee has not included, either in this instance or in the past, any projects that were not completely justified by the Corps of Engineers, and as to which their capability was not clearly shown.

As to projects that were requested and that were budgeted, the subcommittee spent considerable time reviewing them with the Engineers.

The Senate has before it a complete justification for all planning and construction projects that were included in the bill by the Senate committee, and for all projects that were recommended by the House as well.

In order to balance the bill, and in order to take care of worthy areas not previously included in the bill, I recommended to the subcommittee the inclusion of a number of projects that had been requested by witnesses from all over the country, and by Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I hope that the Senate will agree to the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations and that it will be possible to retain the majority of the projects in the conference with the House.

As in the past, the committee has recommended some of the new projects, both construction and planning; and in a moment, I shall place in the RECORD, for the information of the Congress, a list of the new additions proposed by both the House and the Senate.

The House committee added, as I have just stated, 19 unbudgeted construction projects and 17 unbudgeted planning items. The House sent us a bill which on its face showed that title I was under the budget; but in order to attain that goal, the House reduced the budget for construction, general, by $32,318,300; of which $19,672,000 was an increase in the item reduction for savings and slippage, and $6,033,300 was a general reduction in estimates for recreation facilities.

I am not surprised by the action taken by the House, because the House has exercised that privilege in the past, by adding more for slippages than was provided by the Corps of Engineers. As we all know, many projects are delayed because the Engineers or the local people may have difficulty in obtaining sufficient land on which to build projects, or rights-of-way to construct roads. It is normal that over the years this slippage has amounted to from 4 to 5 percent of the overall amount provided by the bill. The House increased, percentagewise, this amount from a little under 5 percent to between 6 and 7 percent. In so doing, the House was able to accomplish what appears to be a more or less balanced budget; that is, the House bill was actually a few dollars under the budget. But that was accomplished by cutting 2½ to 3 percent further on slippages.

Restoration of the budget estimates accounts for $28,845,300 of the $51,573,300 increase recommended for construction generally.

The Senate committee recommended $2,143,000 for 28 unbudgeted planning items and $6,879,000 for 23 unbudgeted construction projects.

I ask unanimous consent to have a table explaining the committee action on title I printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the new Senate committee items, both planning starts and construction starts, and also the unbudgeted items of the House, for both construction and planning.

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

NEW CONSTRUCTION STARTS ADDED BY HOUSE

| Project | Total cost estimate | Appropriations to date | Amount allowed by House | Balance to complete |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maniece Bayou, upstream extension, Arkansas | $673,000 | $60,000 | $200,000 | $413,000 |
| Redwood City Harbor, Calif. | 670,000 | 10,000 | 660,000 | ---------- |
| Tahchevak Creek, Calif. | 1,110,000 | 160,000 | 200,000 | 750,000 |
| Savannah River below Augusta, Georgia and South Carolina | 3,824,000 | 3,554,000 | 270,000 | ---------- |
| Coralville Reservation, Mehaffey Bridge, Iowa | 1,220,000 | 82,000 | 150,000 | 988,000 |
| Rathbun Reservation, Iowa | 23,600,000 | 555,000 | 400,000 | 22,645,000 |
| Saylorville Reservation, Iowa | 36,500,000 | 700,000 | 400,000 | 35,400,000 |
| Narragus River, Maine | 507,000 | 7,000 | 500,000 | ---------- |
| Gloucester Harbor, Mass. | 1,120,000 | 20,000 | 500,000 | 600,000 |
| Muskegon Harbor, Mich. | 660,000 | 10,000 | 100,000 | 550,000 |
| Chariton River, Iowa and Mo. | $4,300,000 | $1,184,000 | $400,000 | $2,716,000 |
| Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. | 7,520,000 | 120,000 | 1,000,000 | 6,400,000 |
| Buffalo Outer Harbor, N.Y. | 3,240,000 | 33,000 | 250,000 | 2,957,000 |
| Ithaca Cayuga Inlet, N.Y. | 4,480,000 | 223,000 | 300,000 | 3,957,000 |
| Swift Creek, N.C. | 915,000 | 76,000 | 250,000 | 589,000 |
| Conneaut Harbor, Ohio | 9,170,000 | 118,000 | 225,000 | 8,827,000 |
| Swinomish Slough, Wash. | 910,000 | 22,000 | 150,000 | 738,000 |
| Washougal area | 1,718,000 | 75,000 | 100,000 | 1,543,000 |
| Kenosha Harbor, Wis. | 710,000 | 23,000 | 200,000 | 487,000 |
| Total | 102,847,000 | 7,032,000 | [1] 6,257,000 | 89,560,000 |

NEW PLANNING STARTS ADDED BY HOUSE

| Project | Total cost estimate | Appropriations to date | Amount allowed by House | Balance to complete |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Buchanan Reservoir, Calif. | $14,600,000 | $115,000 | $125,000 | $14,360,000 |
| Dana Point Harbor, Calif. | 3,760,000 | 30,000 | 95,000 | 3,635,000 |
| Dubuque, Iowa | 5,650,000 | 50,000 | 35,000 | 5,565,000 |
| Boston Harbor, Chelsea River, Mass. | 2,516,000 | 16,000 | 40,000 | 2,460,000 |
| Plymouth Harbor, Mass. | 1,230,000 | 10,000 | 35,000 | 1,185,000 |
| Oswego Harbor, N.Y. | 1,260,000 | 42,000 | 60,000 | 1,158,000 |
| Rosendale, N.Y. | 2,450,000 | 37,000 | 100,000 | 2,313,000 |
| Salamanca, N.Y. | 1,520,000 | 50,000 | 20,000 | 1,450,000 |
| Caesar Creek Reservoir, Ohio | 14,410,000 | 23,000 | 75,000 | 14,312,000 |
| East Fork Reservoir, Ohio | 17,215,000 | 86,000 | 75,000 | 17,054,000 |
| Manchester (deferred), Ohio | $1,330,000 | $10,000 | $8,000 | $1,312,000 |
| Copan Reservoir, Okla. | 26,500,000 | 22,000 | 100,000 | 26,378,000 |
| Raystown Reservoir, Pa. | 32,150,000 | 153,000 | 150,000 | 31,847,000 |
| Narragansett pier, Rhode Island | 1,172,000 | 20,000 | 50,000 | 1,102,000 |
| Point Judith hurricane barrier, Rhode Island | 2,458,000 | 44,000 | 50,000 | 2,364,000 |
| Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to Palacios, Tex. | 829,000 | 11,000 | 30,000 | 788,000 |
| Kickapoo River, Wis. | 16,800,000 | 158,000 | 50,000 | 16,592,000 |
| Total | 145,850,000 | 877,000 | 1,098,000 | 143,875,000 |

[1] Includes $18,000 in budget for planning Muskegon Harbor, Mich.

*New construction starts added by the Senate*

| Project | Total cost | Appropriated to date | Budget estimate | House amount | Senate amount | Balance to complete |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sitka Harbor, Crescent Bay Basin, Alaska | $965,000 | $44,000 | | | $921,000 | |
| Garland City, Ark | 948,000 | 230,000 | | | 250,000 | $468,000 |
| Noyo River and Harbor, Calif | 13,500,000 | 75,000 | (P) $150,000 | (P) $150,000 | (P) 150,000<br>(C) 100,000 | 13,175,000 |
| Trinidad Reservoir, Colo | 21,000,000 | 379,000 | (P) 86,000 | (P) 86,000 | (P) 86,000<br>(C) 300,000 | 20,235,000 |
| Connecticut River below Hartford, Old Saybrook, Conn | 581,000 | 3,000 | | | (C) 578,000 | |
| Palm Beach Harbor, Fla | 5,120,000 | 110,000 | | | 250,000 | 4,760,000 |
| Pensacola Harbor, Fla | 447,000 | 23,000 | | | 299,000 | 125,000 |
| Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee, Illinois | 1,180,000 | 55,000 | | | 150,000 | 975,000 |
| Rend Lake Reservoir, Ill | 36,000,000 | 499,000 | (P) 501,000 | (P) 501,000 | (P) 501,000<br>(C) 10,000 | 34,990,000 |
| Tri Pond levee, Illinois | 1,260,000 | 60,000 | | | 300,000 | 900,000 |
| Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky | 61,300,000 | 425,000 | (P) 20 ,000 | (P) 200,000 | (P) 200,000<br>(C) 750,000 | 59,925,000 |
| Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier, Louisiana | 3,340,000 | 90,000<br>9,000 | (P) 103,000 | (P) 103,000 | (P) 103,000<br>(C) 47,000 | 3,181,000 |
| Campti Clarence levee, Louisiana | 1,320,000 | 70,000 | (P) 23,000 | (P) 23,000 | (P) 23,000<br>(C) 100,000 | 1,127,000 |
| Gladstone Harbor, Mich | 812,000 | 15,000 | | | 200,000 | 597,000 |
| Natchez, Miss | 368,000 | 34,000 | | | 115,000 | 219,000 |
| Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, Mo | 140,000,000 | 1,155,000 | (P) 650,000 | (P) 650,000 | (P) 650,000<br>(C) 350,000 | 137,45,000 |
| Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic River, North Reach Channel | 1,532,000 | | | | 400,000 | 1,132,000 |
| Fort Macon Atlantic Beach, N.C | 410,000 | 5,000 | | | 54,000 | 351,000 |
| Bowman Haley Reservoir, N. Dak | 2,810,000 | 195,000 | | | 300,000 | 2,315,000 |
| Missouri River bank stabilization below Garrison Dam, N. Dak | 3,000,000 | | | | 300,000 | 2,700,000 |
| Tacoma Harbor, Wash | 2,480,000 | 21,000 | | | 150,000 | 2,309,000 |
| East Lynn Reservoir, W. Va | 14,000,000 | 120,000 | (P) 280,000 | (P) 280,000 | (P) 280,000<br>(C) 220,000 | 13,380,000 |
| Snagging and clearing | 750,000 | | | | 750,000 | |
| Total | 313,123,000 | 3,527,000 | | 1,993,000 | 8,887,000 | 300,709,000 |
| Senate increase | | | | | 6,894,000 | |

*New planning starts added by the Senate*

| Project | Total cost | Appropriated to date | Budget estimate | Senate amount | Balance to complete |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss | $263,000,000 | $1,494,000 | | $225,000 | $1,269,000 |
| McKinney Bayou upstream extension, Arkansas and Texas | 251,000 | 5,000 | | 44,000 | 302,000 |
| Village Creek, White River and Mayberry Levee Dist ict, Arkansas | 1,371,000 | 45,000 | | 75,000 | 1,251,000 |
| Corte Madera Creek, Calif | 5,780,000 | 78,000 | | 20,000 | 5,682,000 |
| Mormon Slough, Calif | 2,060,000 | 40,000 | | 50,000 | 1,970,000 |
| Santa Barbara Harbor, Cali | 3,080,000 | 40,000 | | 50,000 | 2,990,000 |
| New London barrier, Connecticut | 2,431,000 | 30,000 | | 50,000 | 2,351,000 |
| Kaunnakakai Harbor, Hawaii | 7,970,000 | 44,000 | | 100,000 | 7,826,000 |
| Chicago Harbor (1962 act), Ill | 1,560,000 | 15,000 | | 27,000 | 1,518,000 |
| Island levee, Indiana and Illinois | 1,780,000 | 12,000 | | 50,000 | 1,718,000 |
| Big Hill Reservoir, Kans | 4,100,000 | 35,000 | | 35,000 | 4,030,000 |
| Kansas City, Kans | 19,100,000 | 17,000 | | 50,000 | 19,033,000 |
| Merriam, Kans | 992,000 | 10,000 | | 50,000 | 932,000 |
| Eagle Creek Reservoir, Ky | 10,790,000 | 20,000 | | 100,000 | 10,580,000 |
| Ontonagon Harbor, Mich | 5,070,000 | 29,000 | | 75,000 | 4,966,000 |
| Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev | 2,840,000 | 40,000 | | 100,000 | 2,700,000 |
| New Hope Reservoir, N.C | 25,293,000 | 150,000 | | 180,000 | 24,963,000 |
| Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 48-foot depth (1962 act), North Carolina | 6,400,000 | 28,000 | | 135,000 | 6,237,000 |
| Cleveland Harbor, deepen east basin, Ohio | 1,580,000 | 43,000 | | 27,000 | 1,510,000 |
| Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | 68,600,000 | 50,000 | | 150,000 | 68,400,000 |
| Hugo Reservoir, Okla | 4,900,000 | 5,000 | | 100,000 | 4,795,000 |
| Gate Creek Reservoir, Oreg | 19,400,000 | 98,000 | | 100,000 | 19,202,000 |
| Shelton Ditch, Oreg | 1,860,000 | 6,000 | | 10,000 | 1,844,000 |
| Muddy Creek Reservoir, Pa | 7,640,000 | 49,000 | | 25,000 | 7,566,000 |
| Lake Kemp Reservoir, Tex | 8,600,000 | 52,000 | | 50,000 | 8,498,000 |
| North Fork Reservoir, Tex | 13,100,000 | 10,000 | | 50,000 | 13,040,000 |
| Beech Fork Reservoir, W. Va | 11,400,000 | 19,000 | | 150,000 | 11,231,000 |
| Green Bay Harbor, Wis | 4,420,000 | 14,000 | | 50,000 | 4,356,000 |

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a table explaining the committee action on title I.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

*Title I—Civil functions, Department of the Army*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Cemeterial expenses | | $10,800,000 |
| The House amount, and $46,000 below the budget. | | |
| No restoration requested. | | |
| Corps of Engineers: | | |
| General investigations | | 20,625,000 |
| Above the budget | $565,000 | |
| Above the House | 2,625,000 | |
| Above 1963 | 2,525,000 | |
| Construction, general | | 849,856,000 |
| Restoration of House cut, including $25,705,000 for slippage | $28,845,300 | |
| 28 new planning starts | 2,143,000 | |
| 23 new construction starts | [1] 6,879,000 | |
| 18 budgeted construction items raised | 13,731,000 | |
| 2 budgeted planning items raised | [2] 175,000 | |
| 1 House increase reduced | −200,000 | |
| | 51,573,300 | |
| Above the budget | 30,370,000 | |
| Above the House | 51,573,300 | |
| House compared with the budget: | | |
| 17 New planning starts | 1,098,000 | |
| 19 New construction starts | [3] 6,257,000 | |
| 2 Increases in budget planning | 100,000 | |
| 3 increases in budget construction | 3,900,000 | |
| 9 Budget items reduced | −32,318,300 | |
| | −20,963,300 | |

[1] New future construction commitment, $300,709,000.
[2] Budget estimate received Dec. 4, 1963, for 1 item covering $150,000 of this increase, S. Doc. No. 45, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Corps of Engineers—Continued | | |
| Operation and maintenance | | $157,368,000 |
| The budget estimate— | | |
| Above the House | $7,368,000 | |
| General expenses | | 15,000,000 |
| Below the budget | 252,000 | |
| The amount allowed by House— | | |
| Above 1963 | 834,800 | |
| Mississippi River and tributaries | | 80,406,000 |
| Above the budget | 5,546,000 | |
| Above the House | 5,906,000 | |
| U.S. section, St. Lawrence Joint Board of Engineers | | 10,000 |
| Not included in the budget this year, since it was expected that the Board's work would be concluded in fiscal year 1963. The full amount is reimbursed to the United States by the New York State Power Authority. | | |
| Canal Zone Government: | | |
| Operating expenses | | 25,725,000 |
| Below the budget | 740,000 | |
| Above the House | 725,000 | |
| Above 1963 | 2,319,350 | |
| Capital outlay | | 7,250,000 |
| The budget estimate— | | |
| Above the House | 750,000 | |
| Above 1963 | 4,130,000 | |

[3] New future commitment, $89,560,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the budget estimates provided for 27 new planning starts and 34 new construction starts. I commend the administration for taking such action. The projects recommended are all necessary, and it is essential that each year an adequate number of new planning and construction projects be added to the program if the national needs for the development of our water resources are to be met in an orderly and efficient manner.

Mr. President, the House inserted language in the bill this year requiring the Panama Canal Company to obtain approval of the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate prior to the disposal or transfer by license, lease, or otherwise, except to another agency of the U.S. Government, any real property or rights to the use of real property.

A bill intended to accomplish essentially the same purpose, H.R. 3999, passed the House of Representatives and is now pending consideration in the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. The House report on that bill, Report No. 363, states in part:

> It is not the intent of the bill to interfere with the ordinary functioning of the Panama Canal Company as a business enterprise, but it is intended solely to prevent discontinuance of activities or divestment of assets which will have a major impact upon the operations of the company as a business enterprise.

In recommending retention of the House language, we contemplate an interpretation of the language which would be consistent with the position taken by the legislative committee of the House which reported H.R. 3999. Certainly, neither the Governor of the Canal Zone nor the legislative committees referred to want to have the language interpreted in such a strict sense that the approval of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House would be required in order to grant a permit for the Elks to erect a clubhouse in the Canal Zone. It is not intended that the language in the bill apply to churches, recreational and fraternal organizations, employees' organizations, or other similar entities authorized to conduct their activities in the Canal Zone.

TITLE II

Mr. President, title II deals primarily with reclamation projects. As I have said, it was handled before the committee by the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The budget estimates in the amount of $455,285,000 were considered by the committee for the activities and programs of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration. The committee recommends an appropriation of $420,290,200 for these purposes. This is $8,580,500 over the House allowance of $411,709,700, but is $34,994,800 less than the budget estimates. The committee recommendation exceeds appropriations for fiscal year 1963 by $16,661,900.

The bill, in conformity with the budget proposals, includes the following new reclamation starts: Arbuckle project, Oklahoma; Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; Rio Grande project recreational facilities, New Mexico; Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oregon; and Spokane Valley project, Washington-Idaho. In addition these new starts in the Colorado River storage project are provided: Lyman, San Juan-Chama, and Silt participating projects. And provision is included for commencement of an extra-high-voltage electrical interconnection between the Columbia River Basin and the Hoover Dam powerplant. Construction of this line will not begin until the Northwest power preference bill is enacted into law.

Budget estimates for the Bureau of Reclamation totaled $370,347,000. The committee recommends $356,223,200, which is $14,123,800 less than the budget and $8,076,500 more than the House allowed. Over $4,500,000 of the amount above the House allowance is accounted for by a restoration of the increased slippage reduction made by the House.

There is a small increase of $204,000 over the House allowance, in the amount approved for Bonneville Power Administration construction. This is accounted for primarily by adjustment of proposed construction items. Most of the reduction from the budget estimate—$20,283,000—was either suggested by the Department, or was not appealed by the Department from the results of the House action.

The Southeastern Power Administration, under the committee recommendation, will receive the full amount of the budget estimate; and only $588,000 less than the budget request is proposed for the Southwestern Power Administration.

TITLE III

Mr. President, the committee recommended $2,868,658,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission, Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission. The committee recommendation is $102,334,000 above the House allowance, $61,427,000 below the budget, and $331,047,610 below the appropriation for 1963.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

For operating expenses, the committee recommended an increase of $61,355,000, of which $18,500,000 was for the reactor development program; $12 million was for physical research; $7 million for biology and medicine; $1,500,000 for training, education, and information; $500,000 for the isotopes development program; $3,500,000 for civilian applications of nuclear explosives; $1,355,000 for program direction and administration; and $17 million for change in selected resources. For plant and capital equipment, the committee recommended an increase of $38,695,000, including a restoration of $20 million for slippage, and $17,945,000 for weapons construction projects in connection with safeguards under the nuclear test ban treaty; and the remaining $750,000 was for the community building at Los Alamos.

For the Tennessee Valley Authority, the committee restored the House cut in the budget estimate.

The committee recommended no change in the amount provided by the House for the Delaware River Basin Commission.

TITLE IV

A moment ago, I referred to title IV. The committee recommended $45 million for the public works acceleration program.

It will be recalled that last year Congress passed an authorization bill for $900 million for a public works acceleration program; and last session $450 million was provided in order to make a start on this program. In the supplemental bill passed early this session $400 million was added, leaving a total of $50 million, under the authorization bill, that was not appropriated. Last month Mr. Batt, who heads this agency, appeared before the committee and asked that $45 million be included in this bill, in order to continue this public works acceleration program. Hearings were held; and as I have said, the committee recommended the appropriation of $45 million.

The Bureau of the Budget was a little late in sending its recommendations to Congress. When the matter was presented to the House committee, it did not hold hearings on this item. I do not know whether that was because of lack of time, or just what the reason was. However, the House considered it without having held any hearings, and decided to eliminate it from the bill and not to provide any funds whatever for it.

The Senate committee did the reverse; and after holding hearings, the Senate committee voted to provide for the $45 million requested. The request was justified on the basis of allocating $28,200,000 to the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture; $3 million to the Bureau of Land Management, $4 million to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, $4 million to the National Park Service, and $3,100,000 to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—a total of $14,100,000 to these bureaus in the Department of the Interior. The balance of $2,700,000 has been reserved for administration.

The all Federal programs were proposed because of the short leadtime required in placing these programs underway. During the hearings it was also stressed that projects of this type could be carried on during the winter months when other types of construction work could not be performed. The committee felt, however, that half of the funds provided should be allocated for community facilities where the Federal funds are augmented by the utilization of local funds for the construction of urgently needed community facilities; and the committee so recommended. I am sure that we are all aware of the large backlog of requests made and applications pending with the Community Facilities Administration.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that while the $45 million would be apportioned almost entirely, if not entirely, to Federal projects, those projects do lie in depressed areas in which there is heavy unemployment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that would be the purpose. As Mr. Batt testified, the idea was to provide funds for projects which could immediately be used to relieve unemployment in the areas where the funds would be used.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. That was my understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the burden of the testimony given by Mr. Batt. The committee went on record as suggesting to Mr. Batt that at least half the amount should be used for community facilities projects in the various localities in which public works had been authorized—that is, the construction of various projects in cities, such as sewer systems, water projects, and so forth. But we did not include such a provision in the law itself. It is really optional with Mr. Batt to do what we suggest, or to proceed as he said he would—that is, to use the entire amount for projects that will relieve unemployment in many areas in which there is a serious situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that half the total sum would be used for what are called community facilities in depressed areas?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. As the Senator knows, there is a formula in the bill which directs how the funds should be used. I asked Mr. Batt specifically whether he would be in violation of the act by proposing to do what he contemplated. His answer was that he could use all the funds as he proposed, because, as the Senator knows, the main purpose of the program is to relieve unemployment in places where it is acute.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that the $45 million would come out of the unappropriated balance remaining under the act that was passed last year, and there would still be left about $5 million unappropriated out of the authorization?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I commend the Appropriations Committee for its action in reference to the $45 million item which has been under discussion. I am grateful, also, for the understanding of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who has been patient, diligent and cooperative with Members in his management of this important measure. He has been thorough. His advocacy of this appropriation for the accelerated public works program is appreciated.

That the RECORD may be perhaps supplemented at this point, I wish to say that not only has the need of this item to further the attack on unemployment been great, not only has the need been met only in part, but we feel that the effort to meet the needs of the economy and the people of eligible areas must be continued in the months ahead.

Tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock a special subcommittee of the Public Works Committee will begin hearings on legislation to authorize extension and further expenditures under the accelerated public works program.

I bring this to the attention of Senators to indicate that there will be in Washington this week officials and citizens from municipalities and from other political subdivisions who will testify concerning the need for a continuing program. There is still too much unemployment and too many unmet public facility needs in many sections of the country.

Again I compliment the committee, and I commend its chairman and the managers and diligent and efficient staff members who have brought to the Senate a meaningful and vitally important measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know what the Senate will do in the future, but I was more or less interested in carrying out what Congress undertook to do in the past. I believe we should appropriate the balance of the authorization in the measure enacted last year. As to what Congress will do in the future, I do not know. But from past experience, we know that when programs start, there is a demand to continue them. The testimony revealed that the total of the applications which have been made to Mr. Batt exceeds $1 billion. Many communities bonded themselves and raised money in order to be able to contribute and be eligible for money under the program. I believe they went far afield in doing so without the Congress having voted the necessary additional funds.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I commend the Senator for bringing before the Senate the appropriation bill. It is an important part of the public works program, and represents a capital investment in the future of our country.

I should like particularly to refer to title IV. I notice that the Department of Agriculture would receive $28,200,000. Will the Senator tell me in what type of projects the Department of Agriculture intends to engage?

Mr. ELLENDER. That amount is for reforestation in parts of our country in which there is a good deal of unemployment. We were told that it would be used for that purpose and in areas where it will also serve to relieve unemployment.

Mr. CARLSON. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The report states that Federal funds will be augmented by utilization of local funds. Would that statement also be true in respect to Department of Agriculture projects?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; that would not be true, because the agriculture projects are all Federal.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. First, I commend the Senator for his usual painstaking task. I was interested in what he said in the earlier part of his remarks about the voluminous hearings, and his intention to try to bring a cessation to the redundant hearings which have been held on projects underway.

I am afraid that I have been as guilty as some other Senators in bringing delegations before him. I sympathize thoroughly with his position. The chairman has been most patient. In many cases he has probably known the subject better than many witnesses whom we brought in as proponents of the subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is because I listened to them so often that I learned something.

Mr. MORTON. I assure the Senator that he will have my cooperation in the future on this subject. I believe his point is well taken. As one who has had the privilege of appearing before the chairman, both as a Member of the House and as a Member of this body, I have always found him to be fair, thorough, and perhaps the most painstaking man in this important area who has ever served in Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is very kind to make that statement.

Mr. MORTON. I mean it.

Mr. ELLENDER. A moment ago, when I made the statement about curtailing the size of the hearings, I did not mean to cut off anyone, but I am certain that——

Mr. MORTON. Even Job's patience was finally exhausted.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain that if last year's and this year's hearings were analyzed, the Senator would find a great deal of repetition.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. A short while ago there was a colloquy between the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] in which it was developed that from the $45 million, if appropriated for accelerated public works, $28 million would be allocated for the Department of Agriculture. If the language in the Senate report will have any efficacy at all, there will be a proportionate adjustment in that $28 million, I presume.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. As was suggested by the Senator, one-half of the $45 million should go for community facilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. I wish to place that correction in the RECORD at this time.

The amount will have to be apportioned. If the money were apportioned, half of it would be spent on a more or less matching basis.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the explanation which has been made. I caught this item as I glanced through the report, and I wondered how it would be handled.

Mr. ELLENDER. When Mr. Batt appeared before us, he was desirous of spending the money through the Federal Government in places where unemployment could be relieved and where many people could be employed directly so that the unemployment could be relieved.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has the Senator completed his remarks?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I have not concluded them yet.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then I will wait until the Senator has concluded his remarks.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to discuss with the Senator the subject of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and especially the testimony dealing with that subject which appears on pages 1408 and thereafter on part I of the testimony.

Tomorrow hearings will begin to ascertain the situation prevailing in the operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I observe from the hearings that the Senator asked the St. Lawrence Seaway representatives certain questions. Am I correct in my understanding that the use of the St. Lawrence Seaway is less, in terms of tonnage, than was originally estimated?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 1408 of the hearings the statement is made:

> According to the original Tolls Committee estimates, our tonnage for 1962 should have been 37 million as shown on this chart. The cumulative yearly total lag of actual tonnages in comparison with the estimated tonnages amounts to 34 million.

So the actual tonnage was 3 million less than anticipated.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Since the tonnage was less than anticipated, there was an adverse impact upon the ability of the corporation to pay not only the amount needed for amortization of the bonds, but also the interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I turn now to page 1408 of part I of the testimony. It shows that for the year 1963 Mr. Jose testified that the revenues would be about $3.8 million, with an interest obligation of $4.4 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am following the Senator. That is in the record.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So there is $600,000 less than is needed to pay the interest obligation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Of course, that is bound to come about because of a lower tonnage going through the canal than was anticipated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How is the deficit made up? Is it made up through an appropriation bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; no money is appropriated for this purpose. The funds required to pay the interest, at the normal rate, and to pay whatever interest amount is due each year comes from corporation funds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How is that done? Does the Government guarantee the bonds?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is paid out of tolls. I am sure the Government supports the bonds; otherwise, they would not be purchased. I presume in time, if the revenues for the project continue to decrease, or are not sufficient to pay the outstanding bonds or interest, Congress may have to do something about it. Not only will our Congress have to do something about it, but Canada will have to do something about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Canada is in the same position. Canada's engineering estimates were overoptimistic, and the income now is less than was anticipated.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So if this Government is $600,000 in arrears in the payment of interest, the United States, owing only three-tenths of the debt, and Canada owing seven-tenths of the debt, Canada would be approximately twice as much in the red on their interest payments.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not be able to state the facts with respect to Canada. Canada may have had some traffic in the interior which resulted in higher revenue to her than we received. As the Senator knows, all the traffic that passes through our part of the Canal comes from abroad. It is possible that inside Canada there is some traffic for which Canada receives tolls, and the United States does not. I have no knowledge of that.

If the same pattern is followed in Canada as in the U.S. part of the canal, there is no doubt that Canada's lack of funds will be in the same proportion to her investment as the deficit on the U.S. portion has been.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I direct the Senator's attention to page 1414, which sets forth the narrative statement—I read from the second paragraph under the subhead "Capital outlay":

> The total construction cost of the U.S. share of the seaway is estimated at $132.4 million. Work in place at the end of the current year 1963 is estimated at $131.2, and the budget year 1964 program to complete the project is estimated at $1.2 million.

That $132.4 million equals three-tenths of the cost of the seaway. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That is my information.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I substantially correct that the total cost was $400,410,000?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; for the navigation portion. As the Senator knows, there is a power project on the river. I think it was constructed jointly by the State of New York and the power entity of the Province of Ontario, Canada. The cost the Senator has mentioned does not cover that power feature of the project. It is being financed through the sale of electricity that is sold from the hydroelectric plant constructed by the State of New York and Ontario Hydroelectric.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator give me an estimate of the cost of building the navigable system on the Arkansas River through Arkansas and into Oklahoma when it will be fully completed?

Mr. ELLENDER. The estimate at the moment, including the power dams, and storage for flood control as well as the locks for the purpose of navigation is in the neighborhood of $1 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not intended to have tolls charged to ships that will use that navigable stream.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That has been the policy of this Government from time immemorial, so far as I know.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any other river or river basin in the United States where tolls are charged to ships that use the river, except in the case of the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know of any. As I stated a moment ago, that is so because of the agreement between the United States and Canada. I assume that if the canal were totally within the United States, tolls would not be charged. In accordance with past policy, that project would have been constructed by the U.S. Government and be toll free.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For probably two decades efforts were made to have the Congress improve the St. Lawrence Seaway so it would be navigable, but the proponents were unable to muster the necessary votes. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. When does the Senator mean?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Prior to the time it was decided to build the Seaway on a self-liquidating basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Prior to that time I think the reason the Senate rejected the proposal to construct the St. Lawrence Seaway was that the cost was to be in excess of $1 billion, and the United States was to have borne most of the cost, while most of the Seaway was to be located in Canada. That is why there was so much opposition to construction of the project. It would have been almost totally in Canada, but financed entirely by the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I was interested in the statement made by the Senator to the effect that if the revenues were not adequate to pay off the obligations of interest and principal, eventually something would have to be done, especially if increasing the rates did not produce revenues necessary to amortize the debt.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain that if the tonnage increases, it will not be necessary to do anything. The past history of all these navigation projects has shown that the tonnage always increases. I could cite the Senator any number of projects constructed in the United States with respect to which that was true.

So far as Canada is concerned, I do not know that she uses the same yardstick we do. As the Senator knows, a very small part of the canal itself is in the United States. I do not want to criticize what the Canadians have done, but they may have been overoptimistic as to the tonnage that would pass through the waterway. If the tonnage does not increase, I believe it will be incumbent on the Canadian Government and the United States to get together and increase the tolls, so that revenues will be sufficient to meet principal and interest on the outstanding bonds. I believe the Canadian Government will do so. In the past I do not believe she has been as liberal as we have in providing toll-free projects in that country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The reason why I asked the question is that I have received letters complaining of the huge sums of money that are being spent in the development of navigable streams all over the United States, without tolls being charged; but on this river, serving the Midwest and the Great Lakes States, tolls are charged. It seems to me there is logic in the question. Why tolls only on the St. Lawrence Seaway when everywhere else there are no tolls? I refer especially to the Arkansas project, which is to cost $1.1 billion, which will go through Arkansas and into Oklahoma, and on which no tolls will be charged.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my good friend that the Arkansas River navigation system is wholly within the United States. With respect to the St. Lawrence Seaway, Canada was unwilling to put up the money in order to make it toll free. As I remember, the only way in which the program could be constructed was to agree to the proposal of Canada that it be self-liquidating.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that to be the fact. Canada insisted that the St. Lawrence Seaway be self-liquidating.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That still does not destroy the feeling of many people in the Midwest that they are compelled to pay tolls in other places while they have free use of their navigable streams.

Mr. ELLENDER. I invite the attention of my good friend from Ohio to the fact that in addition to the money spent jointly by Canada in constructing that part of the Seaway at Masenna, N.Y., and in the St. Lawrence area, the U.S. Government is engaged in building connecting channels in the Great Lakes totally within the United States. The cost of such construction is currently estimated at $125,300,000, and will be spent to make that part of the route entirely toll free.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; that refers to the dredging of harbors, and things of that kind, I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. All of that will be done at the expense of the Federal Government, without any charge being made to the users of the completed projects. The reason is that the projects are wholly within the United States, and they follow a pattern that has been followed almost from time immemorial in constructing navigation projects, entirely with Federal funds, without any tolls being charged.

Mr. LAUSCHE. President Eisenhower recommended that the moneys expended to make inland waterways navigable should be recouped to the Treasury through the imposition of user charges. Some day that will have to come about, especially in connection with projects of the type we have described, costing $1,100 million on the Arkansas River, for example.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out—and I am not saying this boastfully—that for the past 10 years, ever since I became chairman of the subcommittee, the subcommittee was instrumental in providing funds to reconstruct the locks on the Ohio River.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I remember, 10 locks have been built without a budget estimate. We were opposed at the time by the railroads, because it was felt by the railroads that a large part of their business would be taken away from them. However, the railroads are now finding out that the cheapest method of transporting bulk products or commodities is by water. There are developing in the Senator's State, in Ohio, as well as in Indiana and in Kentucky, industries, which are taking advantage of the pools of water which are being formed upstream from these dams, which furnish a great deal of fresh water. It is my information that many new industries have been established in those areas. The railroads find now that they are benefiting greatly by being able to transport the finished products, which, as the Senator knows, pay higher freight rates than do the bulk products.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are getting into another subject. I should like to discuss it, but that is another subject. The point is that the railroads have been asking for the right to carry bulk products without regulation in the same manner as carriers on the inland waterways are now permitted to do. Congress, however, has refused to give the railroads the same right.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was not my intention to discuss this program. The only thing I was trying to point out to the Senator was what our policy was, what it has been, and what it is hoped it will be in the future. I believe it would be a grave mistake to place tolls on all our navigable rivers and streams on which we have constructed projects to aid navigation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My own belief is that there is no justification for subsidizing inland water carriers at the expense of other carriers. I concur in what President Kennedy recommended, that efforts be made to recoup the subsidies that were being granted to the airlines and inland water carriers, and to truckers on the basis of building highways for truckers, to which purpose the general taxpayer is contributing and to which the owners of passenger cars are contributing. I believe an effort should be made to revise the entire program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The railroads were subsidized to the *n*th degree when they were first constructed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Federal Government gave millions of dollars worth of property to the railroads, which has since been sold in many instances. Much of the revenue was used in the construction of railroads. I do not believe the railroads have lost anything. Some of them still own a good deal of land.

I do not want to go into that program, but it strikes me that it is essential to our future development to continue the program of utilizing the water resources of the Nation for navigation and for many other purposes, such as for hydroelectric power, and things of that kind. We have been neglecting that resource too long. That is why I have given so much time to trying to continue these studies.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has been very generous in recommending funds for the Ohio River. I appreciate it. Of course there is money in the bill for other States, such as Pennsylvania, for example, as well as for Ohio along the river.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; for all the States. The Senator knows that land and water are among our greatest resources. The only way to improve such resources is by building the dams that are now being constructed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree that it should be done. However, I repeat that someday there will have to be a review of all the subsidy programs, not only with respect to ships on navigable streams, but also with respect to the airlines. The trucks have already been compelled to pay a share through excise taxes on accessories and tires, for example. The general taxpayer ought not to pay for the purpose of subsidizing these operations.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. To supplement the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I say to my good friend from Ohio that there is much to be said in support of the program that is underway in the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In the first place, those who advocated it most actively in the form in which it was adopted came from the very area of the country which is now being served by it; namely, the Midwest.

The Senator from Florida was one of those who supported the authorization and, later, he handled in the Appropriations Committee the items affecting the seaway.

He attended the dedication of the Seaway, representing the Senate. He is strongly for it.

But I call attention to the fact that there would not have been a St. Lawrence Seaway if it had not been for the very strong advocacy of the program by Senators and Representatives speaking for and representing the people of the great Midwest, who, in effect, were placed upon the Atlantic by means of its construction.

The second point I wish to make is that the Seaway provides a two-way movement. Those who were for it were not only speaking in behalf of moving their products, notably grain, but were speaking in support of their need for iron ore from Labrador, in order that the great steel centers should not have

to be displaced. They were extremely anxious, in view of the approaching depletion of the great ore fields in Minnesota, to have the St. Lawrence waterway completed for that purpose.

As a third matter—and I have been down along the St. Lawrence since the seaway was opened—they were very anxious to have winter travel. I visited one of the great granaries at Baie Comeau, in Upper Quebec Province, where grain is taken down the seaway and stored during the warm portion of the year. Ships can now come to Baie Comeau all year because the river is not frozen below that point. So the people of the Midwest were very active in behalf of that program, and accomplished it.

This was truly an international project. To have constructed a canal either all in Canada or all in the United States would have cost billions of dollars. The way to do it reasonably was to construct that part in the United States where relatively cheap construction was possible, and to do the same thing in the larger mileage which lies within Canada. Canada insisted upon tolls not only because Canada was not able to meet its proportionately greater investment without having some repayment, but also because it had a competing canal or canals, as to a part of the route of the Seaway, on which tolls were charged.

So every aspect of this project was carefully thought out in the legislative committees and on the floor of each House. The Senator from Florida did not support the program when he first came to the Senate, but after thorough consideration of it, he concluded that it was the right thing to do, changed his position, and became a strong advocate of it. He is well familiar with what happened at that time. He supports the chairman of the committee now in his statement that it was a good arrangement. It was the only arrangement that could be devised that was practical. It was reasonable then, and is still reasonable.

The Senator from Florida hopes that the distinguished Senator from Ohio will review the subject before he presses for the removal of any tolls.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, I am not pressing for the removal of tolls; I am arguing that tolls ought to be imposed everywhere. Let us be clear about that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood from the latter part of the Senator's remarks, but not from the early part, that he was complaining because there were similar streams in the United States, wholly navigable or canalized streams, on which no toll was charged.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct. I contend that it is wrong to spend $1 billion in the building of a navigable stream and not charge tolls, and to spend $130 million on the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence Seaway and charge tolls.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the existence of an international agreement makes a great difference. In the case of the Panama Canal, there is an international agreement, without which the canal could not have been built. Not only our own ships but the ships of all nations are allowed passage, and allowed passage on similar terms.

Also there is an international accord concerning the St. Lawrence Seaway, which is not required in other cases.

So far as I am concerned, I believe excellent work was done by all those who negotiated this project.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is speaking of the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am speaking of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was constructed in the cheapest way possible and brings the most advantages that are possible to be had. It is a wonderful thing for the whole country to have the great Midwest, in effect, placed upon the Atlantic. I hope there will not be a lack of accord as to the very splendid nature of this fine project.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out a while ago, there is no question in my mind that the Seaway will require the expenditure of millions of dollars more than I indicated, for the deepening of the major harbors on the Great Lakes. This will be necessary to accommodate drafts of at least 25 feet.

If the Senator will examine the record concerning the applications that have been made by the various ports along the Great Lakes, he will note that millions of dollars will be spent there, with no tolls to be charged. That will be done in order to carry out a policy that has been ours for a long time.

I am hopeful that in the future it may be possible to have Canada pay off its bonds without tolls. I am sure in that event the United States would reciprocate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With that statement I cannot agree, and I will point out why I cannot.

If tolls were not charged on the Seaway, the taxpayers would have had to pay this year $4,750,000 for interest alone. But $3,300,000 in tolls was collected. So the general taxpayers, for this 1 year, on interest alone, were saved $3,300,000. I anticipate that the tolls will increase; and as they do, the taxpayers will have to pay nothing. The cost will be paid by the people who use the Seaway, and that is how it should be.

I was one of the proponents of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I was then Governor of Ohio. I said that tolls should be charged. I have not changed my view on that subject.

But if tolls are helping to spare the taxpayer his obligation on the St. Lawrence Seaway, tolls can spare the taxpayer on the Arkansas River, on the Ohio River, on the Mississippi, and everywhere else. That is my point. This very case demonstrates that tolls can be charged and can pay off the interest, and probably later pay off the principal.

I wish an answer would be given to the situation concerning the $3,600,000 that is now available, through tolls, to pay interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain the Senator from Ohio must realize that the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway has been of great benefit to all the States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course it has. It has brought about a great increase in business. Except for the fact that Canada did not choose to put up the money as we did, a canal would not have been constructed. As the Senator from Florida has said, the only way to have had this waterway built was to make it self-sustaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Canada was smart in doing so. If Congress began doing things in that way, by insisting that such projects be self-liquidating, the taxpayers of the country and the fiscal position of the United States would be better off.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then fewer and fewer projects would be constructed, and our country would lag behind, because the entire country benefits through such a system of transportation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to have the Senator from Ohio hear this statement, also.

At the time when Congress acted, the Dominion of Canada served notice that if the United States did not act on this much cheaper program, whereby a part of the canal would be in our country and the major part in Canada, Canada proposed to build one by its own means, which would have been much more expensive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator recalls that?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recall that.

Mr. HOLLAND. The canal would have been constructed through Canada and would have called for much higher tolls. From every point of view I can think of, the arrangement made was the most economical one possible and the most helpful possible to that great area of the country which the Senator from Ohio represents, in part, with such great distinction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman about an item under the "Mississippi River and tributaries," $50,000 for the Cache River project, listed under the heading of "Construction." The item was in the budget estimates.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The House did not allow it. The House omitted it. I did not realize it had been restored in the bill until the report was printed.

I ask my distinguished friend if the $50,000 item in the present bill is intended to start construction on the drainage project which is known as the Cache River project.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I refer the Senator to page 3273 of the hearings. Mr. McRae appeared. He said:

Mr. Chairman, as you recall, the 1963 Appropriation Act directed the corps to make a study to determine whether additional

protection for lands in this area should be provided. The report of the division engineer has been completed and is now under review in the Chief's office. Until that report is completed, Mr. Chairman, we are not in a position to initiate construction of this project.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished chairman. That was my recollection of the matter.

Mr ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. For that reason, it would be inadvisable to initiate an appropriation for construction of the project.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the House had reasons for deleting the item. As my good friend from Arkansas knows, our subcommittee has seldom rejected budgeted items.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate that. I do not know that I am opposed to the project as such.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the Senator's position.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is a belief among the people in the lower area of the river—what is called the White River backwater area—that construction of the project would only increase the backwater height and thus cover lands not now subjected to being inundated. For that reason, there is strong opposition in that section. In the upper reaches of the river, the landowners are quite eager to have the project approved, to have appropriations made, and to have the project constructed.

I believe I am correct in saying that the appropriation in the bill now under consideration is intended to cover the Federal Government's contribution on bridges involved in interstate highway construction in that area.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the bridges are not constructed to make allowance for the improvement, the cost in the future would be much higher.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. It is not intended to construct the project the Senator has been discussing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The money is intended to help in the construction of highway facilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would be a part of the Federal Government's contribution.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. As I said, the House struck out the amount. I do not know the reason for that. I do not attempt to look behind the House action for a reason.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not checked with members of the House committee, but I believe the reason was that they were waiting for a full report. There is an unsettled and uncertain situation as to what the improvement would do in respect to landowners in the lower end of the valley.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure my good friend from Arkansas that if the amount is left in the bill—as it will be in all probability—this item will be taken up in conference with the House conferees.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not wish at this time to move to strike it. Ultimately, I may support the overall project and appropriation for it. I understand that the money is for the Federal Government's contribution to highway construction, rather than to start an overall drainage project. I am not certain I would oppose the project.

Since the bill must go to conference, I shall make further inquiry about this matter and be more certain later as to whether I feel the item should be left in or whether the Senate should yield in conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the interest and cooperation of my good friend the chairman on these matters. I know how he feels about such projects. He is enthusiastic, as I am, when good projects are presented which show a proper ratio of benefits to cost. I appreciate that. I especially appreciate his interest in projects in my State.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Congress has shown its interest. This is not merely my interest.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I know. The Congress has.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are times, with respect to such improvements, when one group of landowners is greatly benefited and another group of landowners suffers property damage. Until that question can be resolved, I would not wish to have the project started.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that what he is discussing now is not peculiar to the Cache River project.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is true with respect to many projects.

Mr. ELLENDER. A similar situation faced the committee with respect to a project in the State of Kansas. There had been a lot of opposition. Today I believe everybody is happy, because the dam in question has proved to be better than was anticipated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure the people of Arkansas will be happy about this project if the Corps of Engineers can find a solution to the backwater problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope they can do so. I hope that a satisfactory solution will be set forth in the report which is now in the process of being reviewed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, I would not attempt to provide construction money which would do damage to a great many people.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I had no doubt about that. I merely wished to make the record clear. Although the report does not discuss the project, the record will be clear as to what the money is for.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, for yielding.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; and that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text; and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 18, after the word "construction", to strike out "$18,000,000" and insert "$20,625,000".

On page 4, line 11, after the word "construction", to strike out "$793,282,700" and insert "$849,856,000".

On page 5, line 16, after the word "activities", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$157,368,000".

On page 6, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "$74,500,000" and insert "$80,406,000".

On page 6, after line 7, to insert:

"UNITED STATES SECTION, SAINT LAWRENCE RIVER JOINT BOARD OF ENGINEERS

"For necessary expenses of the United States section of the Saint Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers, established by Executive Order 10500, dated November 4, 1953, including 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 day for individuals; $10,000: *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be obligated until agreement has been entered into, by the United States Government and the United States entity authorized to construct the power works in the International Rapids section of the Saint Lawrence River, providing for the reimbursement of the expenditures of the United States section of this Board by the construction entity."

On page 8, line 5, after the word "transfusions," to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$25,725,000."

On page 8, line 15, after the word "assets", to strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$7,250,000".

On page 9, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$9,285,000"; in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "sixteen" and insert "twenty-one"; in the same line, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which sixteen are", and in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,300" and insert "$7,800".

On page 10, line 23, after the word "expended", to strike out "$9,894,000" and insert "$10,442,000"; in line 24, after the word "which", to strike out "$8,621,000" and insert "$8,902,000", and on page 11, line 4, after the word "That", to strike out "$340,000" and insert "$388,000".

On page 11, line 17, after the word "expended", to strike out "$180,190,000" and insert "$187,425,000".

On page 13, line 5, after the word "program", to strike out "$12,217,000" and insert "$12,367,000".

On page 13, line 16, after the word "expended", to strike out "$97,845,700" and insert "$97,989,200", and in line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "$3,809,000" and insert "$3,952,500".

On page 16, line 23, after the word "law", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That net revenues not to exceed $140,000 arising from the lease of grazing and agricultural lands within the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath Lake Divisions as determined by the Secretary may be credited to the cost heretofore and hereafter incurred for the Klamath Project water rights program, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2(c) of the Act of June 17, 1944, and Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) of the Act of August 1, 1956."

On page 19, at the begininng of line 5, to strike out "$36,000,000" and insert "$36,204,000".

On page 19, line 10, after the word "energy", to strike out "$13,200,000" and insert "$13,500,000".

On page 22, line 25, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$2,308,169,000" and insert "2,369,524,000".

On page 24, at the begininng of line 9, to strike out "$380,000,000" and insert "$418,-695,000".

On page 27, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "$46,000,000" and insert "$48,284,000".

On page 28, after line 10, to insert a new title, as follows:

"TITLE IV

*"Funds appropriated to the President*

"Public Works Acceleration

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $45,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that has ever been rejected by the Senate or House of Representatives or by any Committee of the Congress."

On page 28, line 23, to change the title number from "IV" to "V".

On page 28, line 25, to change the section number from "401" to "501".

On page 29, line 6, to change the section number from "402" to "502".

On page 30, line 14, to change the section number from "403" to "503".

On page 30, line 21, to change the section number from "404" to "504".

On page 31, line 3, to change the section number from "405" to "505".

On page 31, line 14, to change the section number from "406" to "506".

On page 32, line 6, to change the section number from "407" to "507".

On page 32, line 19, to change the section number from "408" to "508".

On page 32, line 24, to change the section number from "409" to "509".

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate has been favored with a very lucid and detailed characterization of the civil functions bill for the fiscal year 1964. That statement was made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I offer my congratulations to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, Senator ELLENDER, for the competent and conscientious way in which he has handled the time-consuming and—at times—somewhat thankless task in the appropriation of funds contained in the Public Works Appropriation bill.

Senator ELLENDER has been in charge of this bill for approximately 10 years. He has earned a deserved reputation as an expert in the field of water resource conservation and related subjects. He is familiar with the problem faced by each State in the Union. Every project request is given a thorough examination by him and his subcommittee before consideration can be given to appropriation of funds. This is evident in the fact that we started hearings on the Corps of Engineers budget on Tuesday, May 7, and concluded on November 20. The vastness of the job is demonstrated by the fact that 3,328 pages of printed testimony are before Members of the Senate for reference to Corps of Engineers requests.

The subcommittee heard over 900 witnesses. All told, the hearings on the overall public works bill comprise more than 4,500 pages of testimony, and more than 1,000 witnesses were heard.

I assure the Senator from Louisiana that, after having participated in many of the numerous sessions of the subcommittee, I not only sympathize with the suggestion he made for curtailing the repetitive parts of the hearings, but also assure him of my cooperation in every possible way.

While the amounts in this bill are large, it must be remembered that America's problems in this area are here and now. They cannot be shunted off to some future years. Members of the Committee on Appropriations are very much aware that they cannot and should not provide all the funds requested for all the projects urged by many thousands of individuals and organizations in the country. Senator ELLENDER has always taken pride in the fact that no projects are approved by our subcommittee unless adequate hearings have been held on them. The subcommittee shares in this pride.

As ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, it is a continuing pleasure for me to work with Senator ELLENDER. I also welcome this opportunity to congratulate him, publicly, as I have already done privately.

Other distinguished Senators have played a major part in this important bill—although perhaps in lesser degree, because the number of items dealt with in other parts of the bill are lesser in number. For example, our respected President pro tempore and Appropriations Committee chairman, Senator HAYDEN, has performed his usual valuable service in handling another difficult phase of the bill, the funding of requirements of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation. This is also a major water resources program. We are fortunate to have Senator HAYDEN as chairman of this subcommittee. As an Arizonian and as a Member of the Congress since 1912, he knows more about the great water problems faced by much of the Nation than virtually any other Member of the Congress. He is also responsible for the financial requirements of the several power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior.

My close friend and distinguished colleague on this side of the aisle, Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota, is the able ranking Republican member of the same subcommittee. He has done an excellent job in the examination and sifting of testimony for the great many requests for funds.

Senator HILL is another devoted member of the Committee on Appropriations and it is my privilege to serve as ranking minority member on his subcommittee on the important section of the bill dealing with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority. He, too, deserves our gratitude and congratulations.

Mr. President, let me also state that, in common with other Senate committees, we are particularly favored by our excellent staff. Ken Bousquet, the clerk of the subcommittee, has done an excellent job. It is a delight to work with him, not only in the committee room in the hearings, but also in executive sessions and in the field. It has been my privilege to do all those things. On the minority side, Ed King has rendered similar fine service.

Mr. President, most cities and towns in America at one time or another have had problems which came within the purview of this national program: Floods, ravaging property and human life, hurricanes, beach erosion, navigation, multiple-purpose river basin problems, locks and dams and canals are just a few of the great many problems involved.

In my own State of Nebraska, like all other States and especially those in the West, water is literally a life-or-death matter. We Nebraskans, working with the Federal Government, have spent large sums over the years in a massive effort to conserve our natural resources and to prevent the ravages of natural disasters. And we will spend a great many more millions in the years ahead.

In the area of the rivers and harbors, flood control, and navigation program, an estimated $85,000 will be spent this fiscal year on general investigations of projects pertaining to Nebraska. There is the Big Blue River, Nebraska and Kansas, for which $30,000 has been programed; the Elkhorn River, $10,000; the Nemaha-Little Nemaha River, Nebraska and Kansas, $15,000; and the Platte River, $30,000.

Advance engineering and design for projects in my State will amount to $120,000, with $80,000 scheduled for the Little Papillion Creek and $45,000 for Norfolk River.

Two large construction projects are underway and funds have been earmarked to the extent of $650,000 for the Gering Valley project, and $4,200,000 for the Salt Creek and tributaries.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated an expenditure of $685,000 for operation and maintenance requirements of existent Nebraska public works projects.

In addition, Mr. President, there is a program identified as small authorized projects. A serious flood control problem exists in the vicinity of Clarkson, Nebr., which comes within the provisions of section 205 of the 1948 Flood Control Act. This project has been fully investigated and found to be eligible under the provisions of the act. It is expected that the Corps of Engineers will find it possible to allot construction funds from the appropriation allowed for small authorized projects for which the Senate committee provided a modest increase.

Completion of this work will enable Clarkson to proceed with public works of its own financing, including a sewage disposal plant.

The people of Nebraska are also especially interested in the Missouri River channel stabilization program which covers the States of Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, as well as Nebraska. The Senate has approved an amount of $6 million for the project ranging from Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr., and $2,700,000 for the part of the program extending from Omaha to Kansas City, with a like amount from Kansas City to the mouth of the Missouri River—including a 9-foot channel.

The latter item is of particular interest to Missouri River navigation from Kansas City to Omaha. It will eliminate the "bottleneck" of a less-than-9-foot channel between Kansas City and St. Louis which has imposed upon river traffic upstream from Kansas City, the lesser channel depth. This action will make possible fully loaded barges heretofore barred, thus bringing about a lesser per-unit freight cost.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Under the direction of the Bureau of Reclamation, the vast natural resources of the 17 Western States and Alaska are being conserved and developed for the welfare of the Nation. This is accomplished through the planning, construction, and operation of facilities to irrigate lands, furnish domestic and industrial water supplies, and develop related hydroelectric power and flood control.

An estimated $18,927,000 will be used in fiscal 1964 on reclamation construction and rehabilitation projects in and around Nebraska. For example, $8,100,000 has been programed for the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project; another basin program, the Farwell unit, has been allocated $5 million. There is also the Frenchman-Cambridge division, $1,787,000.

The Senate and the House Appropriations Committees allowed $23 million for the Transmission division of the Missouri River Basin, a $956,000 reduction from the budget estimate. Of this reduction, $641,000 is to be absorbed by the several States involved in this program. Both committees agreed that this cut could readily be absorbed since funds for new construction will be available for only about 6 months.

The Bureau of Reclamation had earmarked $2,578,000 as the amount for Nebraska.

An estimated $805,000 will be expended for drainage and minor construction on the Bostwick division of the Missouri River Basin project in Nebraska and Kansas. Another item for which $657,000 has been approved is the rehabilitation and betterment program for the North Platte project in Nebraska and Wyoming.

RECLAMATION—PROJECTS INVESTIGATIONS

The Bureau of Reclamation's project investigations include the following items:

Elkhorn division, $64,000; Little Blue unit, $10,000; Mirage Flats extension unit, $56,000; North Loup division, $8,000; O'Neill unit, $10,000; Wilber unit, $158,000.

Basin surveys which affect Nebraska include the comprehensive framework plan covering Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming, $522,000.

Advance planning funds for basin projects include Cedar Rapids division, $195,000, and the North Republican unit, Colorado and Nebraska, $84,000, for a total of $1,174,000.

Mr. President, my colleague, Senator CURTIS and I are appreciative for the favorable consideration the members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations gave to our request for an item of $100,000 for continuation of the preauthorization investigations on the Nebraska midstate unit. Taxpayers in the midstate district have spent a great many thousands of dollars of their own money to pursue this project; in fact, more than $300,000.

Mr. President, the Senate can consider the first three titles of this bill with the confident knowledge that they have been carefully considered by both the subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee.

The projects represented in this measure may lack the glamour of the space program or weapons tests or exotic medical research, but they are of vital importance in terms of saving lives and providing for a brighter future for generations to come.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS

Title IV of the bill, Mr. President, is quite a different matter.

Accelerated public works, for which title IV appropriates, like so many crash programs, was launched with a great fanfare and witl. extravagant claims of potential reductions in the unemployment market. The facts have never borne out the claims.

The program has been roundly criticized as one of the most poorly administered in Washington, in many cases putting even our foreign aid bungles to shame.

In addition, one of the most respected Members of the Senate, and a member of the Appropriations Committee, has publicly charged that the program has been administered with willful discrimination and with glaring discrepancies.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that at this point in my remarks there be printed excerpts from the hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which contain the exchange between the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration, Mr. Batt.

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

MISSISSIPPI PROJECT

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter now that I have had to deal with for months and months regarding projects in my State out of the money that has already been appropriated through the previous two appropriations. My office dealt with them on these matters for a long time, and they were told that there was a long construction season envisioned in the South and a short construction season envisioned in the North, and that they would get to Mississippi later.

Later, the tone changed. They said that all of these projects in Mississippi were under review—under review.

And, in the meantime, I have had people in Mississippi call me, they were calling me, and they were calling Senator EASTLAND and the other members of the Mississippi delegation. I advised them to go to Atlanta, the area office, and to talk about this project and they did, and finally the projects came on into Washington.

I then got into the picture myself by calling about these projects and was told that they were under review, and so forth.

PROJECTS IN OTHER STATES

Now, I gather from press releases from Mr. Batt's office that the figures would run like this—and I am talking about the second appropriation. In the first appropriation, I think that Mississippi fared all right. But we pieced together from the agencies press releases facts like this:

Alabama received 67 projects—and I am sure they are worthwhile, for a round sum of $13 million.

Arkansas, a number of projects. I don't have the exact number, for $8,500,000.

Georgia, 65 projects, for $8,067,000.

Louisiana, 45 projects, with a total of $14 million.

Now, I mention these because they are in areas in the country similarly situated and with similar unemployment.

TWO PROJECTS APPROVED FOR MISSISSIPPI

Now, of all those sums and this great number of projects, only two projects were approved for Mississippi, two small ones, totaling $242,000, instead of $10 or $12 million, as for the other States, we had received only $242,000.

Now, I took this up with Mr. Batt and later I took it up again with Mr. ROOSEVELT and the chairman of the full committee. I also talked on the telephone with Secretary Hodges about it. And I charged that there is a willful, deliberate, and purposeful discrimination against Mississippi, for some reason. I don't know what.

Now, I voted against this original program. I was not convinced that it was needed. But when this appropriation came up the last time for the second $450 million, I took issue with the members of the committee arguing against it and said that I thought it had been fairly and properly administered, which I did. I will have to withdraw those remarks now. I cannot say that.

COMMITTEE INVESTIGATORS

Now, I talked to Mr. Batt and I have talked to others and, when this thing came to a head, the committee investigators went into it. I think that Mississippi under any fair rule would have been entitled to $10 or $11 million in projects of like kind. Now, that is not just a guess, it is by comparison with other States similarly situated.

Now, what is a man going to do when his State is treated that way? What is the man going to think? What is the committee going to do?

Now, I have asked for the name of the person that is guilty of this discrimination. Mr. Batt said that he is responsible for it. That is not the question. I have asked Mr. Roosevelt and he talked about something else—no answer to my question.

I asked Mr. Hodges to look into this matter personally. They say now that there are no more funds.

There are 80 projects, I understand, gentlemen, on this list from Mississippi, that have been approved at the Atlanta regional level and they have come up to Washington. Some of them have been lying on the desks for a long while, while I was being told they were "under review, under review."

Now, I don't want to embarrass anyone unnecessarily, but I feel compelled to bring this out. I am only asking for just treatment for my State.

So, I am ready to prove by witnesses from this staff all of these allegations that I have made here, plus more—but I do want the committee to go into it, and I raise that point now after months and months of being patient and being put off.

RELEASE OF ADDITIONAL PROJECTS

Now, after this came up, they did release 12 projects in the total amount of $1,472,000 in Federal money—but that was after this disclosure and later confrontation and after this charge was proven and after the committee investigators went into it.

Now, later—those releases were about 3 weeks ago—later they released some small forestry projects, totaling in all, I believe,

about $325,000. Stretching that figure a little, you can say about $2 million worth has been released.

ADMINISTRATION OF FUNDS

Now, they say the money is all gone in the community facilities program. And a lot of these projects in Mississippi were in community facilities. I understand there is no money in this $45 million for the community facilities. I don't know how to meet that situation, but the point I raise is the administration of these funds.

How can the Congress go along with this if these facts are true? And they are true. They are proven, every one of them. I think they are admitted. As I say, I don't want to be unjust or unfair to anyone, but the whole representation to my staff and to me has been misleading and evasive, and these matters were not under review, except there has been a black mark put on them, and somebody in this Department did it. I don't know who did the dirty work. I am not laying any charge against Mr. Batt, not at all, I don't know. I doubt if he is the one, and I don't have any reason to believe he is the one, except he wants to assume responsibility.

I want to thank the chairman of this committee, too, for his consideration to me in this and say to the chairman of this subcommittee, Senator ELLENDER, I just thought that the chairman of the full committee handled this project when it was up last time, in a supplemental, but I did mention it to you, as soon as I learned it was within your jurisdiction.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, I remember, Senator, your mentioning this problem to me.

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. I contacted someone in the Department, and requested certain information.

Mr. Batt, do you have anything to say for the record regarding the charges made by Senator STENNIS?

STATEMENT REGARDING CHARGES

Mr. BATT. Well, sir, I think it is the only case I know of, the only State I know of, where the allegation has been made that they have gotten less than their fair share.

I was as distressed as the Senator when it was brought to our attention, and we immediately looked into it. We found, as the Senator pointed out in all fairness, that the State has fared rather well on the first appropriation and that they had not done as well on the second appropriation and had not gotten as much as their neighboring States or, indeed, as much as they had every reason to expect.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, who is responsible for that?

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTION

Mr. BATT. I will assume full responsibility for it, Senator.

Senator ELLENDER. That doesn't do any good. You must have had somebody under you who didn't keep his eye on this.

Mr. BATT. No, I'll assume all responsibility. As the President said, you know, in another connection, failure is an orphan; success has a thousand fathers.

When the Senator first brought this to our attention, the program was not complete and the situation has changed from week to week. We have succeeded in ameliorating some of that underage.

HEW PROJECTS

As the Senator pointed out in all fairness, we have succeeded in getting 12 HEW projects—these are the hospital projects and the sewage disposal plants which are all that the State of Mississippi has submitted that are not interlinked with CFA projects, we have gotten all that the State submitted approved. We were fortunate in having funds still unallocated in HEW.

FOREST SERVICE PROJECTS

On the Forest Service side, we have done better. As the Senator has pointed out in all fairness, we have gotten in 11 projects with $325,000. The Forest Service tells me incidentally, Senator, that if this additional funding would be approved, we can again do better, although, in the one national forest that I understand you have there—we ought to be able to put in about $700,000 worth.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

The CFA has been out of funds. That has been our big problem. We never, of course, could fund the 80 projects. No State got all the projects they asked for. We have a backlog of $700 million——

Senator STENNIS. By CFA, you refer to the Community Facilities Administration?

Mr. BATT. CFA is Community Facilities Administration—Housing and Home Finance.

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. BATT. So, we never could in a million years fund all the projects that are in. We have a backlog of $700 million of State and local projects.

We can, we feel, fund some of those from Mississippi, the most pressing ones, if and when some of the projects under CFA that have already been approved are not accepted, don't come through. There will be some fallout there. There is some slippage, and we hope to be able to improve the CFA picture in Mississippi, and that, I think, is the one that looks the worst. It looks good in Forest Service, it looks good in the HEW, and it looks very bad in CFA.

Senator STENNIS. May I ask you a question? You are talking about it looking good. Now, how did it look before this thing was exposed?

Mr. BATT. I think it was, I am still——

Senator STENNIS. What is your evaluation of that?

Mr. BATT. I think, sir, in the first appropriation, as you pointed out, it looked fair. In the second appropriation, Mississippi was very severely under what they should have received, no doubt about it.

Senator STENNIS. May I ask some questions, Mr. Chairman?

Senator ELLENDER. Surely, proceed.

CHARGE OF WILLFUL DISCRIMINATION

Senator STENNIS. I charge that this is a willful discrimination. What is your response to that, that this was deliberately done and willfully done and it couldn't have been any other way. What is your answer?

Mr. BATT. Well, sir, I would personally accept the responsibility for the——

Senator ELLENDER. But that is not the question.

Mr. BATT (continuing). Unwisdom or poor wisdom. I don't believe it was willful discrimination, and I think that our efforts at the direction of Secretary Hodges and Under Secretary Roosevelt, to improve the situation and bring Mississippi up much closer to their—to what they have every reason to expect—is an indication that we have no—that as soon as it was brought to our attention, we have done all that we can to repair it.

Senator STENNIS. But may I go back to that question?

Mr. BATT. I would be the first to say, though, Senator, however, that we have made a lot more mistakes than this.

FUNDS FROM RECORD APPROPRIATION

Senator STENNIS. Well, go back to my question. Before it was disclosed here by me, before I contacted and confronted you with these figures, there were only $242,000 given Mississippi.

Mr. BATT. Out of the second appropriation.

Senator STENNIS. Out of the second appropriation. Do you say that that was a willful discrimination or not?

Mr. BATT. Well, sir, I would not—I would say that the evidence is that we then pitched in and did our best to make up that underage that was evidence of our—it was our indication of desire on the administrative part to——

Senator STENNIS. That is certainly not the question. I am sure that the Chair and the committee understand it.

Looking at that picture as it was, when I confronted you with those pictures, $242,000 had been allotted for Mississippi and these other figures for the other States, do you say that that was a willful discrimination or not?

ADMISSION OF MISTAKE

Mr. BATT. Sir, I would call it a mistake. Obviously, this is a matter of semantics——

Senator STENNIS. A willful mistake?

Mr. BATT. I would say it was a mistake.

Senator STENNIS. Just a plain mistake?

Mr. BATT. I would say it was a mistake and I say we have made many other mistakes and we have tried to repair them when they were brought to our attention——

* * * * *

GLARING DISCREPANCIES IN ADMINISTRATION

Senator STENNIS. Do you expect this committee to give you more money in view of such glaring discrepancies here in the administration of this fund? Do you expect us to accept your statement here that it was just a mistake?

Mr. BATT. Well, what the committee does, sir, is of course, entirely up to the committee, but I do feel that this is an opportunity to make up for some of this shortfall in Mississippi and other States through the Forest Service. We also hope that we can put some 15,000 or 20,000 people to work as the result of this proposal.

Senator STENNIS. May I ask you to get back to the subject. Were you directed by anyone above you to withhold these projects from Mississippi?

Mr. BATT. No, sir.

CRITICISM WITHIN DEPARTMENT

Senator STENNIS. Have you reprimanded or criticized anyone under you for doing this act?

Mr. BATT. I think it is true to say that when you brought this to the attention of the Secretary and myself and Mr. Roosevelt that we thoroughly criticized everybody that had anything to do with it, including ourselves.

Senator STENNIS. Well, have you done anything about it? Have you investigated to find out how it happened?

Mr. BATT. I think we know the facts, and I think they are as I represented them to you, Senator.

* * * * *

QUESTION RE ARA-APPROVED PROJECTS

Senator STENNIS. Just one more question, it might shed some light on these Mississippi projects being declined out of the second appropriation. Isn't it true that a number of these projects were approved by ARA, but never were approved and therefore fell by the wayside by what you call the CFA, the Community Facilities Administration—there was no money came out of that part of it. Weren't they the ones that were holding up?

Mr. BATT. I would have to check that back on a project-by-project basis, I do not know, Senator.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, I think that we shed light on who is really responsible.

Mr. BATT. I take complete responsibility for it, sir—if I also get credit for the success of the program.

Senator STENNIS. Well, I understand that. I think that that answer is just a little too clever, if I may say so. We have been over that many times. What I am trying to get at is the facts.

Now I want to know who did this dirty work, and I don't think that you originated it, frankly.

Mr. BATT. Well, sir; I think that——

Senator STENNIS. But I do want to know if the CFA had approved any of these, whether it was left on their desk or not. I think the committee is interested in who did this.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this testimony makes out a convincing case of unfair and discriminatory treatment. Factors unrelated to the guidelines and standards adopted for allocation of such funds were allowed to govern. If the regular processes and channels of congressional action had been followed, no such inexcusable results would have occurred.

In view of the showing of willful discrimination in Mississippi, it stands to reason that there is high probability of similar abuse by the executive department in other areas, though proof thereof might be difficult. At any rate, the testimony quoted above shows clearly how foolhardy it is for Congress to abdicate its power over the purse strings in favor of difficult-to-control administration of another branch of government. We should not extend such abdication. The $45 million provided in title IV of this bill should be deleted on this ground alone; and in due time it will be my intention to submit an amendment which will have for its purpose the achievement of such a deletion.

Mr. President, the Congress had authorized $900 million for accelerated public works. All but $50 million of that amount has been appropriated, and, as I understand, has already been spent or earmarked. What we are being asked to approve now, in the closing days of this session, is that last final bite.

This demand is completely unrealistic and premature, because the policy of the Congress toward this program is far from clear. The Public Works Committee has before it two bills to increase the authorization to $2.4 billion and $3.9 billion for this accelerated public works program—but not a single hearing has yet been held.

Earlier this afternoon, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] made an announcement that hearings would commence in a day or so on these bills. At long last. After all the weeks and months that have passed during the pendency of these bills, we have not yet arrived at the point of establishing the current sense and the current thinking of the Congress, in either body, in regard to continuation of the accelerated public works program.

I would hope and expect that in the course of those hearings, information will be developed on which the Congress can make a considered judgment. We have already seen the maladministration which inevitably accompanies a crash program such as this one. Let us not fall victim to more of the same disease. Let us concur in the action of the House of Representatives which denied the entire $45 million.

Mr. President, the failures and mistakes of the accelerated public works program are well known. In many cases the projects cannot properly be called public works; they are more in the nature of the WPA-type leaf raking, makework. Specific examples that have appeared in the RECORD are cemetery maintenance, archeological research, exotic plant control, and pasture improvement.

But there are many other examples of mismanagement. One of our colleagues could recite the case of a town in a certain Southern State which inquired of the Administrator as to whatever had happened to its application. The reply was that the county in which the community was located had received its quota and hence the request was denied. Further inquiry showed that the Area Redevelopment Administration had sent some funds to another county of the same name, but in a totally different State.

There is the example of the town to which the Administrator sent glad tidings that its project had been approved. It developed that a year earlier it had withdrawn its request because the community had voted against the necessary local bond issue by a vote of some 9 to 1.

Congressman KYL, of Iowa, on April 9 of this year regaled his colleagues in the House with a hilarious comedy of errors involving projects in his State where, again, the aid went to the wrong county for the wrong project by the wrong agency.

I could go on, Mr. President. Perhaps it is enough to recall the loan to reopen a closed coal mine in Utah where another mine had just laid off 125 miners because of the drop in the coal market. Or the vast number of motels which have been built in areas already overburdened with hundreds of unused motel rooms. Or the sewage work done in the poor little suburb of Detroit known as Grosse Point. Anyone who has ever visited that part of the Detroit area knows that it is not a rundown area.

Preisdent Johnson, in his message to the Congress several days ago promised us that "the expenditures of your Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. I ask your help. I will insist that the Government get a dollar value for a dollar spent."

Mr. President, the record of the accelerated public works program clearly demonstrates that its falls far short of yielding a dollar value for a dollar spent.

These funds of $45 million were originally requested for direct Federal activities, namely, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior, with $2.7 million skimmed off the top for "administration"; that is, to pay for salaries and paper shuffling.

These were not to be community projects in which the local areas shared. They were to be work in the national forests and parks over the winter. They were designated as short leadtime projects whose effect on unemployment would be immediate.

But the Appropriations Committee, in its wisdom, recommends that half of the amount be allocated to projects of the Community Facilities Administration which, with a much longer leadtime, will not be able to reduce unemployment in the immediate weeks and months ahead.

Thus, the argument for this special $45 million has been cut precisely in half.

Mr. President, page 7562 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 1, 1963, contains some rather lengthy remarks by me on the efficacy of this whole accelerated public works program. In that statement, I made the point that the whole effort amounted to only about a drop in a 5-million-man bucket of unemployment—a drop of about 2 percent of that figure. Unless one counts the additional Federal employees who are at work administering—or maladministering—this program, the effect on unemployment is insignificant. To solve the unemployment problem by this means and at this rate would require 30 billion of tax dollars.

But that is still not the major objection to this bill, Mr. President. Nor is the principal defect in this proposal its poor timing, before the Public Works Committee has held hearings on new authorizations.

The really fatal flaw is the fact that it is a poorly conceived, hastily devised scheme to crash our way to a solution of the unemployment problem.

Sometimes crash programs are justified, as in war or other times of national peril. But we have seen the folly of the waste and extravagance that inevitably accompany such all-out assaults on any national program. I would call to the Senate's attention the series of recent reports by the General Accounting Office of the millions upon millions of dollars that have been lost in the space program because of its crash character.

What is required is an orderly system for the allocation and expenditure of these funds, through the regular congressional process, by appropriation to existing and established agencies of the Government. There is neither need nor justification for a superagency like the Area Redevelopment Administration, sitting atop the old-line agencies like Agriculture and Interior in the running of this program. There is no need for the appropriation of these funds to the President for reallocation to the ARA and then for re-reallocation to Agriculture. It is a perversion of the traditional and accepted system of our governmental routine.

Mr. President, the evidence is overwhelming against the accelerated public works program. It is entirely outside the limits of congressional control.

The merit of handling an additional $45 million to the accelerated public works program has not been demonstrated. In fact, the hearings before our subcommittee would suggest the opposite.

But if there is a case to be made for this program, then the place for it to be made is before the Public Works Committee which can then recommend a course of action to the Senate.

Until then, Mr. President, I strongly urge that we withhold the $45 million.

Mr. President, I repeat my remarks as to the quality of the hearings that were held, the patience of the chairman, and the very fine work that was done by all

of the staff and members of the committee. This bill is worthy of serious consideration by the Senate, and, with the exception of title IV, I commend it.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

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

S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER obtained the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma providing that in doing so, I shall not lose my right to the floor.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Iowa for giving me this opportunity, so that I may thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the spectacularly fine work he has done in considering all the great public works projects that have been laid before his committee. He has done so with fairness, with care, with discrimination, and I believe with a careful view as to their utilization and their effect on our entire national program. I do not believe there is a portion of the United States that has not benefited from the work which has occupied so much of the chairman's time. The work has been handled with great care.

I wonder if I may ask the Senator from Louisiana a question, in order to clarify some of the language on page 41 of the Senate committee report on the bill. I refer to a part of title II of the bill, dealing with Interior Department agencies—specifically, the Southwest Power Administration.

The Southwest Power Administration is a 20-year-old institution which was established to help deliver the power generated at multipurpose flood control dams to various REA's within the State of Oklahoma. The Administration has been cognizant of the fact that its job of delivering power should be beneficial not only to the cooperatives but also, where possible, it should assist in distribution of power and the sale of peak power to private utilities, thereby eliminating the need for costly extra generating plants that would have to be built by private companies to serve a 2- or 3-hour peak load. Trading peak power for regular power has been helpful in the entire region. Many friends from whom I have heard since the report was made are fearful that the language appearing in the second paragraph relating to the continuing fund for the Southwest Power Administration might result in severely hampering it in its duty to supply the public power generated at dams to the preference users.

They have no fault to find with the first phrase which reads:

> The committee directs that no part of the continuing fund be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines which are not immediately needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration.

They are anxious, and hope that this language would not prevent them from delivering the power, when subsequent dams in this region have been completed and the power is ready to be delivered to the preference users—namely, distributing co-ops of the REA.

I interpret the language as being merely a restatement of the Flood Control and Power Marketing Acts.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman if that is not generally the meaning of the Flood Control Act?

Mr. ELLENDER. In my opinion it is a restatement of the law. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma recalls that in the budget for fiscal 1947, there was a request made by SPA for $23 million to begin construction of a system of generation and transmission facilities. After this request was denied, REA began making loans to co-ops for generating facilities to produce power which would be purchased by SPA and for transmission facilities which would be leased to, and operated by, SPA. The committee interpreted this arrangement as meaning that the Department of Agriculture was being asked to put up the money to establish co-op generating and transmission facilities for use by SPA and which depended for their feasibility on these arrangements with SPA. The committee then thought it was wrong to have one department put up the money to construct generating and transmission facilities and then have another Government department use them in order to make the loans feasible.

The committee took positive action on that and Congress amended the law on the committee's recommendation. The Senator read only a portion of the statement in the current report to which he referred.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The statement attempts to reiterate what is the law.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the lines were necessary, there would be no objection, in the language of the committee report, to the construction.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course not.

Mr. MONRONEY. When the dams are ready to produce power, the cooperative arrangement with any group building the lines would be permissible, under the Flood Control Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to read a short statement which was prepared, to indicate the reasons why this was done, and when it was done.

The committee report contains the admonition on page 41 that no part of the Southwestern Power Administration's continuing fund is to be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines not immediately needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration. This, of course, amounts to a restatement of the law.

The Southwestern Power Administration was created to market surplus power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the Department of the Army. The projects were constructed for flood control and for other purposes. The electrical energy was only a byproduct, and there was no intention of putting the Government into the power business, except to the extent necessary to market the surplus power from these reservoirs. When the Southwestern Power Administration sought funds for a steamplant to firm up the surplus hydroelectric power, those funds were denied—those are the funds to which I have referred—in order to prevent the gradual buildup of a tax-supported public power industry against which private power could not compete.

In 1949, the continuing fund was increased and its use to cover costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and rentals for transmission facilities was authorized. The purchase of power was justified at that time as a necessary adjunct to the marketing of the hydroelectric power. In an opinion dated July 15, 1949, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior stated that the marketing of the hydroelectric power, in accordance with section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, necessitated interchange agreements under which the Administration might during certain accounting periods purchase more than it sold.

In 1950 Congress learned that the continuing fund was being used indirectly to finance the construction of generating and transmitting facilities. The Rural Electrification Administration made $66 million worth of loans for generating and transmitting facilities, the feasibility for such loans being dependent on agreements with Southwestern Power Administration. As soon as Congress learned that Southwestern Power Administration funds were being used indirectly to finance these facilities, Congress in 1951 amended the continuing fund law to limit expenditures therefrom to amounts authorized annually by Congress. Congress thereby sought to reassert control. Congress has at all times tried to limit SPA, as nearly as possible, to the use of existing facilities in marketing the hydroelectric power, and to prevent the

construction of a great public power project.

The hearings on the bill now before us disclosed that REA once again is looking to arrangements with the Southwestern Power Administration to provide feasibility for loans to construct power facilities. The committee therefore felt it necessary to restate the law and the congressional policy.

That is what is involved.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished friend. However, the language which continues, from the first of the paragraph, arouses a fear in the minds of REA leaders and users that it would, in effect, make a change in the law.

Picking up the language:

The committee directs that no part of the continuing fund be used—

And adding the words—

to contract with a generation, transmission, or distribution cooperative organized under Federal or State law if feasibility——

Mr. ELLENDER. "If."

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes—

if feasibility of a Federal loan to the cooperative is dependent on a contract with the Southwestern Power Administration.

It is said that the language might cause an adverse effect on contracting which must be done with an ordinary distributing REA cooperative. These must contract for the use of power, and by contracting they make the loan more feasible, if they expect an extension of their distribution system or the "heavying up" of their lines.

The use of the words, "feasibility of a Federal loan" particularly works against distribution cooperatives, which feel that this would severely hamper their opportunity to make contracts necessary in the normal course of their operations.

The language is not subject to amendment on the floor. I hope the language can be discussed in conference with the House conferees and the conclusion reached, after careful study of the language, that it would not be detrimental to the preference users and their right to public power, as the Federal Flood Control Act intended. If the language needs to be modified, I hope it will be so reported when the bill comes back from conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator knows that I have always been for REA.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has been a pioneer in that field.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am a great advocate of the REA. It is handled by the committee of which I am the chairman.

At the moment we are seeking to prevent any increase in the agitation now going on throughout the country in respect to REA loans being made on a commercial basis. Several bills are now pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Up to now hearings have not been held on them.

It is my belief that the REA has been doing a good job; and I should like to have that continue.

In the budget for fiscal 1947 $23 million was asked by the Department of the Interior to begin construction of a system of powerplants and transmission facilities to firm the power generated at various dams. A program was presented which indicated that a grid would be established throughout various parts of the country. Congress rejected this plan, since SPA was created only to market surplus power from Federal reservoirs, not to build a public power empire. In 1949 and 1950, SPA and REA tried to develop such a system without coming to Congress and obtaining its approval. Instead they worked out an arrangement whereby REA was to loan the money to build the grid and facilities and the SPA was to lease and operate the transmission facilities and purchase all the power. We amended the continuing fund law in 1951 to prevent this type of arrangement by making SPA come to Congress for annual approval of expenditures from the fund.

What we are doing now is to restate what is the law.

As the Senator knows, this language in the report would not change the law. It is only a suggestion that REA follow the law as we understand it. In my opinion, it would not in any manner affect the ability of the cooperatives to proceed to do what they desire, provided that in obtaining loans they would not be entirely dependent on the Southwestern Power Administration in order to be able to make sufficient funds to repay the loans.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true, but I think the entire dependency would be a matter that should be established. They are, of course, dependent upon the amount of power that is distributed. The extension of the benefits of the SPA power to cooperatives many miles away is important to the existence of cooperatives, particularly in places such as the western part of my State, where there is what has been called a power desert.

The need for power generated at those dams, which can also be interchanged between the power-generating facilities and certain REA's to feed into the southwest power network, gives a balance of potential that makes for better service in areas where that power would not otherwise be available.

Mr. ELLENDER. This provision would not have any effect on that situation. The committee report reiterates the preference to be given to cooperatives in the sale of power generated at those dams.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are very anxious to be sure of that. If the Senator, as he goes to conference, will discuss this matter, I am certain that, from his record of help to the REA's from the beginning, it will be most helpful to us if he makes sure there is to be adequate power and an adequate sharing of the power.

Mr. ELLENDER. I give the Senator that assurance.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for that assurance.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to join in praise of the REA. I consider it one of the great achievements of the last quarter of a century, created by the administration of President Franklin Roosevelt. As a result, electricity was brought into remote areas, rural areas, which never had had it at prices its people could afford to pay. The REA has been of great value to my State of Alaska where we have a dozen REA cooperatives and I know to other States. I hope nothing will be done to interfere with its efficient functioning.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I thought that would happen, I would never have consented to this provision.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question, if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, in regard to rural electrification, having served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with the Senator from Louisiana when this matter was before us many times, and knowing of his attitude toward rural electrification, I am sure he will see that nothing is done to injure rural electrification in any way.

Personally, I feel very close to rural electrification. It may be of interest to know that South Carolina was made a guinea pig, so to speak, in regard to rural electrification. South Carolina was given $100,000 to make a survey for rural electrification, before the Rural Electrification Act was passed from a national standpoint. Naturally, we feel very close to rural electrification. I know the Senator from Louisiana will do nothing that would injure it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his remarks. I return the compliment to him.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask to call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 18, to strike the figure "$20,625,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,600,000".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered would reduce the amount of appropriations for general investigations by $25,000, from $20,625,000 to $20,600,000.

The purpose of the amendment is to eliminate the Skunk River and Squaw Creek engineering survey itemized on page 5 of the House report.

I feel dutybound to offer this amendment on the basis of information which I shall present to the Senate, so that the Senate may decide whether or not this item should be approved.

The only trace of justification which can be found for this survey is that the dams on the upper reaches of the Skunk River would allegedly provide flood control. However, there appear to be no supporting data and information indicating a need for such a flood control project. For example, I am reliably advised that the industrial development area of Ames, Iowa, which is supposed to be primarily concerned, has not had a flood since 1944, and that this was not serious.

In 1951 a study was made by the Corps of Engineers of this proposed project.

The corps made a preliminary recommendation that two reservoirs be constructed—one on the Skunk River and the other on Squaw Creek. However, the corps advised that before any final determination would be made regarding the feasibility of the project, seven questions would have to be answered; namely:

First. Feasibility and probable cost and benefits for transmittal channel rectification and other practicable local flood protection measures, including levees in downstream areas and possible use of small automatic discharge dams on important tributaries.

Second. Siltation above and below the possible dam sites, including such information as is available on the source of silt and the influence the dams would have on channel silting with reference to downstream water supplies, particularly at Oskaloosa.

Third. Land and property values in the flood plan where benefits from reservoir operation are granted.

Fourth. Flood frequencies and benefited reaches.

Fifth. Stage-area inundated curves and supporting data for the estimates of losses and benefits.

Sixth. Effect of reservoir modification on specific floods and on flooded area.

Seventh. Amount of land enhancement and the proportion of cost that local interests should bear.

These questions have not been answered, and it would require a study by the corps to provide the answers. Meanwhile, because of an apparent lack of local interest, nothing has been done to authorize such a study until now.

Of major concern to the city of Ames is prompt completion of Interstate 35, and of major concern to Iowa taxpayers is that this completion be without undue cost. Should one or more reservoirs be constructed under the Skunk River or Squaw Creek project, the grading elevation for Interstate 35 would have to be increased by from 10 to 14 feet, thus entailing considerable additional expense.

Moreover, if this project goes forward, it will mean delay in completion of Interstate 35. Within 60 days the Iowa State Highway Commission is scheduled to commence right-of-way acquisition. It will take months for the Corps of Engineers to complete its survey and for Congress to determine whether or not the project is to be approved and appropriations provided—possibly years. If Interstate 35 is to go forward on schedule, rights-of-way acquisition must proceed on schedule.

If it be suggested that the Iowa State Highway Commission can proceed in its acquisition of rights-of-way, it should be called to the Senate's attention that these will entail payment of severance damages; whereas, later on, if this project should ever be approved, the Corps of Engineers would acquire whole farms, so that the previous payment of severance damages would have been wasted—thus increasing the cost to taxpayers unnecessarily.

Because of the apparent lack of danger from recurring floods or from serious floods, it would appear that the cost-benefit ratio on such a proposed flood control project would not be favorable.

There has been no initiation of this flood control project for further study by the city of Ames, the Ames Chamber of Commerce, the Ames Industrial Development Corp., or Iowa State University; and I have received not one telephone call, letter, or conversation requesting support for it; but I have received some objections.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the matter referred to by the distinguished Senator from Iowa relates to survey funds. In the past our committee has followed the policy of not earmarking any of the moneys provided for navigation or flood control surveys. But the House follows the practice of earmarking quite a few surveys. In this instance the House, as I recall, earmarked money for 30 unbudgeted surveys. It is a practice the Senate does not follow.

Since there is opposition by the Senator from Iowa on the subject matter, I would be willing to accept the amendment so as to put the matter in conference, and present it to the House conferees.

As I said, the money the Senate committee recommended for surveys is not earmarked for any particular project. We leave it for the engineers to do that. It may be that we can do something about this matter on which the House has acted. Perhaps the House will agree to strike the survey to which the Senator has referred, or, if there is sufficient evidence produced showing how the money is to be used. I assure the Senator that we will use all the information necessary to insure that the subject is adequately treated in conference.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate that statement by the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Iowa has undertaken to do a conscientious job, on rather short notice, in trying to ascertain the full background of information on this project, and in searching through the hearings for an answer which justifies inclusion of this item in the bill. I thought the Senate should be apprised of the information, or, I should say, lack of firm data to support this item, and also the information which I have presented.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, with respect to surveys, very little justification is submitted to the subcommittee of either the House or the Senate. The reason for that is that the engineers are usually provided with whatever funds are necessary so that they can investigate the feasibility of the project. When it comes to providing money for planning or construction, the committees require detailed justifications before recommending the funds, must be fully justified. That is not true and every dollar that is appropriated with respect to surveys.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize that fact. However, I am sure the Senator from Louisiana did not understand during the hearing on this particular item that there was a problem regarding Interstate 35, which might be delayed, and is of great concern to the people of this community, plus the fact that it was looked at first more than 12 years ago, and nothing has been done since that time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Should the Senate adopt the Senator's amendment, I suggest that he furnish me as much information as he can, and I will take the matter up in conference and do whatever I can.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I ask to have considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, it is proposed to strike out lines 11 through 22, as follows:

TITLE IV

*Funds appropriated to the President*

Public Works Acceleration

For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $45,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that has ever been rejected by the Senate or House of Representatives or by any Committee of the Congress.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this amendment is calculated, as was suggested a little earlier this afternoon, to strike from the bill the $45 million which is proposed to be appropriated for the final installment of the accelerated public works program.

Congress originally authorized $900 million for this program. All but $50 million of that amount has been appropriated. What we are being asked to do now in connection with the $45 million is to appropriate the balance of the authorization, less about $5 million, which presumably is being withheld at this time to defray administration costs which may be encountered at a later time.

It will not be my purpose to go into much detail in arguing the merits of the amendment, because in my opening remarks on the bill as a whole, I went into great detail; nor will it be my purpose to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

By way of review, the record of the accelerated public works program is anything but brilliant. Certainly it has been one of some confusion. It has been a record that is often made in connection with a crash program, when a superagency is superimposed upon regular agencies to which the allocation of money is usually made.

The program has been administered in a discriminatory way. That has been demonstrated. The record, as it will be printed, including the remarks I made earlier this afternoon, will demonstrate that to be the fact. It has been discriminatory in at least one instance. It will be discriminatory in similar in-

stances, and certainly can be expected to be discriminatory in other instances. It is a program which bypasses Congress and the regular congressional procedures in connection with the appropriation of funds. It certainly is an abdication of the power which Congress holds most dear, namely, the control of the purse strings.

The final argument that I suggested a little earlier in my remarks is that it would be premature to make an allocation and to appropriate at this time for this purpose. Not more than 30 minutes before I rose to be recognized to discuss the bill, an announcement was made that hearings would commence tomorrow or the next day on two authorization bills for additional authorizations for the accelerated public works program. One of these bills has been pending since March of this year; the other bill has been pending since July. Neither branch of this Congress has acted on authorizations for additional funds for this program, indicating that in all fairness to ourselves Congress should await the hearings on the merits of the appropriation bills for this program as of now. If the sense of Congress, following those hearings is that we should proceed, very well; that will be the decision. It might be said that we should do this and await the hearings for the additional appropriations. It is anticipated that there will be a deficiency appropriation bill brought up some time in January, and that the funds could be considered at that time, if in the meantime the hearings have been completed and a decision made on the merits of the authorization bill.

The hearings on the pending bill indicated, furthermore, that as of the end of October, there was actually obligated $245 million of the $450 million appropriated in the second appropriation, and all of the first part had been obligated. It is not as though they were without funds, although a great many applications have been made for community facilities which the administration of these funds is not reaching.

Therefore, I ask that the amendment be adopted, and the $45 million be deleted, which would consist of striking title IV of the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. A good case was made for the expenditure of the $45 million. This appropriation should have no connection with any pending legislation authorizing the expenditure of additional funds for this purpose.

As I indicated earlier this afternoon, the money will be used primarily to generate work in areas which have a great deal of unemployment. It is true that the committee has written into the report a hope that half of the funds should be used for community facilities, but it is left to the Administrator to use the money where he can best take care of unemployment.

Inasmuch as Congress has already enacted the authorization, which was done last year, and since the remaining $45 million is authorized, and in accord with the basic authorization, I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I merely wish to second the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana and to say, regretfully, that I find myself in total disagreement with the points raised by the Senator from Nebraska. I know of no program which is more vital in the United States today than the program of putting people to work. Accelerated public works is one means of doing that.

The Senator from Nebraska raised the objection that somehow or other Congress was being circumvented by having projects go through without an authorization and by the accepted and established congressional procedures. That is precisely the criticisms I have made against the foreign aid legislation, where it is done on a gigantic scale, with billions of dollars being voted with no control by Congress.

Here we are dealing with a program for the benefit of the American people. It is about time that we considered the importance and the interest of the American people as first and foremost. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 344 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 18, it is proposed to change "$187,425,000" to "$182,425,000" and on page 12, line 5, insert the following: *"Provided:* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the Glen Elder unit in Kansas."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not expect to ask for a rollcall vote on this amendment. However, following the disposition of this amendment, I shall call up another amendment, very closely related to it. On that amendment, I shall ask for a rollcall vote.

I have offered the amendment because I think this project is the most wasteful I have seen since I became a Member of the Senate. Last year I went into great detail about the project. I shall not detain the Senate at any length today, because on Friday I spoke at some length and explained my position on the project. This afternoon, I shall briefly summarize my position and ask for a voice vote on the amendment.

The amendment would eliminate from the public works appropriation bill $5 million proposed to be spent for the construction of the Glen Elder project in Kansas.

The Glen Elder project is primarily for flood control, and secondarily for irrigation, in western Kansas. The project is justified based on a 2½-percent discount ratio and a fantastic 100-year life. Of course, when these two components are brought together, almost anything can be justified. In spite of that advantage, this project has only a 1.34 benefit-cost ratio, with an extraordinarily low 2½-percent discount, as I have said. If the discount were a little higher—if it were, for example, at a level at which the Government actually had to pay for the money it borrows—4 percent—the benefit-cost ratio would be negative. The benefit would be substantially less than the cost.

The project was authorized in 1944 in a one-line authorization that authorized several hundred projects. At that time it was estimated that the Glen Elder project would cost $17 million. Last year the estimate was that it would cost $60 million. This year, the estimate is that it will cost $76 million.

The President spoke eloquently and convincingly when he addressed Congress a few days ago on the importance of economy in Government, particularly the difficulties which he has referred to as the built-in spending provisions in the law.

What this item would do if we proceed with the appropriation would be to "build in" over the next several years many millions of dollars the President would be compelled to ask and the Congress to give for the construction of a project which is about as wasteful as can be imagined.

The flood control benefits of this project are marginal, at best. They would provide control over a relatively small proportion of the water that endangers an area some 200 miles away from where the dam would be located. But if the flood control aspects of the project are questionable, the irrigation aspects are frankly ridiculous. The Glen Elder project would provide for the irrigation of land which would bring into production $1 million of additional feed grain surpluses. At present we have approximately $3 billion—three thousand million dollars—worth of feed grain in surplus. We are spending $1.3 billion a year on our feed grain program. The Glen Elder project would aggravate and increase that cost at the rate of $1 million a year. This is really Alice-in-Wonderland economics. We would spend scarce dollars to use scarce water to bring into production an additional surplus of feed grains that we do not need.

I recognize that there is courtesy in the Senate and a respect for other Senators; and that when a project develops in the State of a Senator, we honor that project whenever we can. I also recognize that the two Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON] are not only distinguished and popular Senators, but are two of the finest, most able Members of this body. I know they have fast friends on both sides of the aisle. But I believe this is not a matter of friendship; it is a matter of realism. It makes absolutely no sense for the Senate, if it believes in economy at all, to spend $76 million, much of which will be used to bring into production feed grain that is not needed.

To put the icing on the cake, the farmers in the area which would be irrigated have made sworn affidavits, which I have seen and which I have, including their names and addresses. These I have placed in the RECORD. Ninety percent of the farmers in this area who own 85 percent of the land that would be irrigated have indicated their opposition to the project. Eighty percent of the farmers

who own land that would be irrigated have indicated that under no circumstances will they join the irrigation district or irrigate their land. The farmers must think Congress has gone mad if it plans to go ahead with a project which they do not want, and of which they would be the only beneficiaries; a project which would cost an enormous amount of money, bring additional land and additional crops into production, and impose a heavy cost on the Treasury and the taxpayers over a long period.

Finally, if Congress proceeds with this $76 million project by appropriating $5 million today, the case on this project will be closed and locked tight. We won't be able to stop it. Last year Congress appropriated a few hundred thousand dollars to begin the planning. I think that amount has not been completely spent; certainly it is not lost. It would be a relatively modest loss if Congress decided not to proceed with the project. But once we spend $5 million and start construction, the expenditures for construction will be irrevocably and permanently committed for the project; there will be no turning back.

I hope that my amendment No. 344 will be accepted. I ask for a voice vote on the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it will be recalled that the Senator from Wisconsin spoke last year for a period of 10 hours concerning the Glen Elder project. At that time, the committee had recommended the project.

I admit that the benefit-cost ratio is rather low; but by the expenditure of the additional sum beyond that appropriated last year, to which the Senator has referred, the program would be one to hold back water, and would increase the benefit-to-cost ratio to 1.34 instead of 1.18. Most of the money would be spent for flood protection, especially in the vicinity of Kansas City.

This is a worthwhile project. From all I can understand, it comes under reclamation, which is handled by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The cost to the Government will be for flood control only, which amounts to about $56 million of the entire $76 million. The rest of the sum would be reimbursable to the Federal Government on a long-term basis.

I hope the Senate will maintain the same position it took last year on this proposal.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana said that the irrigation part of the program would be repaid to the Federal Government on a long-term basis. Would the irrigators pay interest on this money?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They would pay no interest?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. When would the repayment be made?

Mr. ELLENDER. Within 40 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Government would have to pay interest on the money it borrowed to put into the project. The interest would be calculated on the amount the Government would pay of the $17 million cost of the irrigation aspect of this project more than $15 million or about 90 percent of the cost listed in the bill would be the cost to the Federal taxpayer, the general taxpayer, because the interest would accrue to that extent over the long period during which the payment would be made on the principal, and that interest would never be repaid.

Mr. ELLENDER. The policy the Senator is talking about was determined by Congress many years ago. Many projects were constructed in that manner. The revenues that have come to the Federal Government because of the development of the land by way of income taxes have been great—much more than the cost of building the projects. It is my belief that the entire irrigation program has in the past paid off very handsomely; and I believe the program should be continued.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the issue presented by the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin was raised, I believe, some time last year, on the occasion when we had before us the authorization bill which included this project. At that time the facts in this connection were brought out in great detail—including the philosophy in regard to the reimbursable features of reclamation advances of this kind, as well as the engineering part, consisting of flood-control protection. Economic justification was made at that time, and has improved since then.

On the strength of the authorization, certain actions have been taken, as I understand, by some of those living in the area.

Mr. President, in connection with such matters there must come a time—after due debate, discussion, and showing—when a decision will be made, and there must come a time when it will be made firmly.

It is submitted that that time has passed, and that Congress has committed itself to construction of the project, after due deliberation and the submission of many pertinent facts, all of which have stood up well under the standards which were established long ago for such projects.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be rejected.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I shall speak only briefly on this amendment.

I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the remarks of the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] in reference to this project, which has been authorized by Congress, and has been studied by the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation and by the engineers of the Corps of Army Engineers. This project has been approved continuously, and last year an authorization was made for an appropriation by Congress.

At this time, I should like to read into the RECORD a telegram I have received in regard to the amount of work done on the project:

BELOIT, KANS., *December 7, 1963.*

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR: As of November 30, 1963, on Glen Elder project, latest Bureau of Reclamation data shows they have spent $1,018,000 for construction, $720,000 for investigation. They have 22 signed contracts for land acquisition, involving 1,900 acres fee land and 800 acres easement land. These 22 contracts represent a commitment of $572,000 about half of which has been paid out. Twelve families have made financial commitments to purchase other properties. Impossible to estimate economic disruption to this community if funds are held up as it would touch almost everyone.

DEAN D. HADDOCK,
*Executive Secretary, Solomon Valley Flood Control Association.*

I mention this because this project is underway; this is not the first appropriation for it. There is a $5 million item to carry on this project; and extensive plans have been made by the Bureau to carry it on.

The Senator from Wisconsin has mentioned the increased production of feed grains which might result. However, he failed to state that the project will take out of production the most fertile areas there, located above the dam. In short, the construction of the dam would take out of production a number of very productive acres of land located within the site of the reservoir.

I would be less than frank if I did not state that this argument is causing great concern in that area. I know the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is familiar with that situation.

On page 48 of the report the following is set forth:

Missouri Basin project, Glen Elder unit, Kansas: None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes.

I wish to comment briefly on that point, because I hold in my hand a letter from Representative ROBERT DOLE, who represents that district in the House of Representatives. In his letter he expresses some concern in regard to possible changes in the plans in regard to the fish and wildlife area. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD, in addition to the statement I have read, which is a part of the committee report, because I, too, share the same feeling in regard to the land purchased in fee simple for this project.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963.*

Re Glen Elder unit.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The committee report (p. 48) accompanying H.R. 9140, the public works appropriations bill for 1964, contains the following language: "None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the

normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes." I requested this language, as there were plans to acquire 13,527 acres in consideration of fish and wildlife resource planning, some to be acquired in fee and some covered by flowage easements. This is attributed to a revised interdepartmental policy agreed upon by the Secretary of Interior and Secretary of the Army in February 1962.

Frankly, I could see no reason for removing this much acreage from local tax rolls, nor devoting this much acreage for fish and wildlife purposes. I would point out that those persons affected are not opposed to negotiating an easement in most instances, but do oppose the land being taken in fee.

At any rate, I felt inclusion of the above language in the report, along with my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 22263, November 19, 1963, would clarify any question which might arise; and just as an additional precaution I directed a question to Congressman CANNON, and he affirmed my position that none of the land in the Glen Elder project would be taken in fee for fish and wildlife purposes.

On Tuesday of this week I asked Bill Kats to make certain the Bureau of Reclamation was in accord with what I still consider to be the proper interpretation of the legislative history. In his discussions with Mr. Casey and Mr. Palmer of the Bureau of Reclamation, he was advised of many things, including a statement by Mr. Casey that still another revision in policy had been made late this summer; hence, all the land I had referred to except 1,400 acres would now be needed in fee for flood control. In other words, simply by changing the designation of what the acreage would be used for, my efforts had been completely circumvented.

So you may be fully informed, I am enclosing and attaching hereto copy of a statement prepared earlier this year which contains the following: "From the foregoing, it can be seen that considerations of fish and wildlife resource planning involve an increase in lands to be acquired in fee title by 13,527 acres." Also attached is a copy of the report containing the language I have referred to on page 48, a copy of my comments in the RECORD, and a letter signed by William I. Palmer, Acting Commissioner, dated December 5, which, in my opinion, is a weak attempt to avoid the clear intent of my efforts.

Let me make it clear there is no misunderstanding on my part, but because of the interpretation contained in Mr. Palmer's letter, it would be appreciated if you would make additional legislative history when the Senate bill is debated on the floor. If this is not feasible, I certainly intend to do whatever may be necessary to clarify the unwarranted interpretation when the bill goes to conference.

Sincerely yours,

BOB DOLE.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] in regard to this project.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas explain to me how it is possible to have any irrigation benefits from this project? Yet the irrigation benefits are said to constitute over $500,000 a year. How can there be irrigation benefits if, as I think the Senator said, the land taken out of production is more fertile than the land which would be irrigated? If this is true, there is no justification, none, for the $17 million the Federal Government would invest; none.

Mr. CARLSON. I thought the Senator from Wisconsin was arguing that the production of feed grains would be greatly increased.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Wisconsin should give some thought to the thousands of acres which would be taken out of production in the reservoir area.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have available some tables which show the acreage both before and after the project is completed. I think the production of wheat would be somewhat decreased, but there would be a great increase in the production of virtually every other feed grain.

Mr. CARLSON. I know this area. I live within 25 miles of it, and I know the production of this land. When 21,000 acres of land below the dam are irrigated and when approximately 20,000 acres of land above the dam are taken out of production, it will not be possible to avoid damaging the production, at least in the overall, total view.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then is it correct to state that there will be no irrigation benefits from the project?

Mr. CARLSON. Not until the people establish an irrigation area by voting for it. When they do, of course there will be irrigation. This project is no different from other irrigation projects in the Nation, and I hope we do not today change the established policy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the people do not vote for it—and I think the Senator knows they will not vote for it—it is foolish to spend this amount of money, $17 million of which is for irrigation.

Mr. CARLSON. But all this money is for construction of the dam and reservoir.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am speaking now about my second amendment, which relates to the technical aspects.

But I am delighted to hear the Senator say that advantage would not be taken of the irrigation opportunities. It fully confirms my argument and makes the irrigation expenditures of this project senseless.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I compliment my senior colleague [Mr. CARLSON] and the majority of the committee and the minority of the committee for the fine work done.

Certainly no one appreciates more than I do the great effort and great dedication displayed and the work done by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], in behalf of his convictions in connection with this matter. Last Friday, he made a speech in which he presented his point of view and set forth in great detail his arguments. As I read that speech, I think the presentation he made may be reduced to three points, as follows:

First, that the project was improperly authorized.

Second, that the cost-benefit ratio is inadequate to support the project.

Third, that the project does not meet with the will of the people of Kansas and the governmental authorities affected.

I have set forth as concisely as I could a response to those arguments by the Senator from Wisconsin, as follows:

The Senate has before it two amendments to the public works appropriations bill which relate to the Glen Elder Reservoir project in north-central Kansas. This is a project to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation on the Solomon River, a tributary of the Kansas River. I wish to comment briefly on these two amendments offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin.

The first amendment proposes the deletion of the entire appropriation. The second would prohibit the use of any funds appropriated to provide irrigation capacity in the reservoir.

Mr. President, I oppose both of these amendments. In the course of the Senate's consideration of this proposition in the 87th and now in the 88th Congress, the able Senator from Wisconsin has discussed the details of the Glen Elder project extensively on the Senate floor. In addition, his arguments were forcefully made to the Appropriations Committee and the Reclamation Subcommittee. They have been thoroughly presented with great conviction but rejected by the Senate and the appropriate committees.

It is not my intention to discuss the points raised in detail. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I feel compelled to reply in general to the Senator's contentions. The arguments in support of the amendments may be reduced to three in number. First, the project was improperly authorized. Second, the cost-benefit ratio is inadequate to support the project, and third, the people of Kansas do not want the project.

First, the validity of the authorization: The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin correctly stated that the Glen Elder project was originally authorized for construction by the Flood Control Acts of 1944 and 1946. This is the same basic legislation which has resulted in the initiation of more than $3 billion in water resource development by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. In spite of this fact, however, and in order to satisfy the very question which the senior Senator from Wisconsin has now raised, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate conducted an exhaustive inquiry into the adequacy of this authorization in 1962. The committee, then under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], heard detailed testimony and, by its final disposition, indicated its satisfaction with the original authorization.

Further, Mr. President, it seems to me that the Congress satisfied itself as to the question of authorization last year when it approved a $750,000 appropriation for Glen Elder in the face of this same argument. I might point out that as of November 30, 1963, the Bureau of Reclamation has spent over $1 million on Glen Elder. I am advised the Bureau has signed 22 contracts for land acquisition, involving 1,900 acres of fee land and 800 acres of easement land. These contracts represent a commitment of $572,000, about half of which has been paid out. Twelve families have already made financial commitments to purchase other property. A failure to proceed with this

project at this point would impose considerable hardship on many persons in the area and an expensive loss to the Federal Government.

Next, with respect to the validity of the cost-benefit ratio calculation: I recognize with the Senator from Wisconsin that there are many questions which can be raised about the soundness of the present method of calculating costs and benefits by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Last year I offered to join the Senator in supporting a review of this yardstick. I repeat my statement of last year, however, that there is no justification for singling out this one project for deletion or for modification on these grounds while all other projects approved on the same method of computing the cost-benefit ratio are permitted to proceed.

Finally, it is contended that the people in Kansas, and especially those in the immediate area of the Glen Elder project, do not want the reservoir constructed. Mr. President, the Glen Elder project was reviewed by the Kansas Water Resources Board and was approved by the Governor of Kansas. I have discussed this project with many people in the area and downstream from the damsite as far as the junction of the Kansas River with the Missouri. There is opposition, there is qualified support, and there is endorsement. The range of opinion parallels that associated with any similar project in Kansas or any State. Every Senator here has had experience with these same circumstances.

In the final analysis one must judge the merits of the program along with the desires of the people directly and indirectly affected. In this light, it is my judgment that this project has the support of the people of Kansas and it should go forward unencumbered by the proposed amendments.

I would like to make one concluding point in urging the rejection of the amendment to prohibit the inclusion of irrigation capacity in this reservoir. The natural terrain of Kansas does not lend itself to the construction of a large number of water retention facilities. We must, therefore, be certain that when a site is chosen, the construction is planned so that it will be put to the greatest possible use. I would emphasize that there is no present plan to use the irrigation capacity which is designed into the Glen Elder project. However, to exclude the irrigation capacity from the reservoir would be to underutilize the site and in all likelihood prohibit any future utilization of this resource.

In this connection it is important to note that since the original Bureau studies on this project were submitted to the Congress, the Corps of Engineers has completed and the Congress has approved a revised Kansas River Basin plan which has enhanced the benefit factor of this reservoir for flood control purposes. The availability of this reservoir as a retention dam for floodwaters will permit downstream reservoirs, four of which are still to be built, to be drained and their capacity restored as protection for heavily populated areas. This function of Glen Elder will be taken into consideration in the preparation of plans for the reservoirs yet to be built by the Corps of Engineers and I think we can safely assume will be reflected in their costs. Thus, even if the irrigation factor was eliminated as the amendment proposes, the cost would not be reduced as significantly as my friend and colleague from Wisconsin contends since the flood control function now assigned the reservoir would require substantially the same design.

In conclusion, this project is economically justified for flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, pollution abatement, and other legitimate purposes even if no benefits are ever realized from irrigation. Further, on this basis and in view of the extensive review and the present commitments already associated with this project, I would urge that the Senate reject the two amendments which would, in effect, destroy the project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 343

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 343, as follows:

On page 12, line 5, add the following: "*Provided further*, That no funds in this bill for the Glen Elder project shall be used for irrigation purposes."

Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment I have called up provides that none of the funds included in the $5 million appropriated for the Glen Elder project shall be spent for irrigation purposes. There is some question about the flood control aspect of the dam. Congress has approved it, and, although I disagree vigorously, most Senators seem to agree that it is worthy.

However, there can be no question that it is almost an inconceivable waste of money to appropriate funds for the $17 million for irrigation to bring more feed grain into production. The Senator from Kansas has said that in his judgment the project would not do that because land which is fertile and productive will be taken out of production. If that is the case, it seems to me that adoption of the Proxmire amendment would provide a golden opportunity to save $17 million. If the amendment were agreed to, it would mean that $17 million of the $76 million project would not, in the future, be expended.

It is true the senior Senator from Kansas feels that the irrigation money may not be spent for several years, but unless the amendment is written into the law, a commitment to spend the irrigation money could be made quite promptly. Some of the expenditure that will be made in the coming year may be for the purpose of eventual irrigation.

I repeat my argument because it pertains, one for one, to my argument against appropriating or permitting any money to be appropriated for irrigation.

First, the farmers whose lands would be irrigated are opposed to it. Perhaps some governmental authorities are not. Perhaps a mayor or the Governor of the State are for the project. Perhaps they have good reasons to be for it. But the fact is that the farmers whose land would be irrigated are against it. They oppose it. They have made their position as clear as they possibly can. I challenge the Senator from Kansas or anyone else to show any evidence that the people whose land would be irrigated want this project. The fact is they cannot do so because there is no such evidence. They know that farmers have not only signed affidavits against it, but 80 percent of the farmers have affixed notarized signatures to petitions opposing the formation of an irrigation district which is necessary in order to provide for irrigation.

As I have said, if the land were irrigated, it would increase the production of feed grains by a million dollars a year. I have indicated how big the surplus is—and it is fantastically big.

This farm program is one of the most frequently objected-to programs of the Federal Government. The project is the kind of project that makes the farm program even more criticized and even more vulnerable. On the unlikely assumption that the Solomon Valley farmers will take advantage of the irrigation, a realistic appraisal of the irrigation benefits of the Glen Elder project on the American economy as a whole must be zero.

This irrigation will impose a million dollar burden on the taxpayer to buy additional feed grain surpluses, plus heavy additional storage and interest costs.

I wish to make it clear that adoption of the amendment would not kill the project. The irrigation benefits would constitute only 20 percent of the calculated benefits. The irrigation costs are separable. The Bureau of Reclamation has made it clear that they are separable. If Congress permits no irrigation, the benefit-cost ratio would drop from 1.34 to 1 to 1.25 to 1. But in fact the benefit-cost ratio with irrigation banned would be far more honest and far more realistic because the benefits would not contain wholly unreal benefits of the full value of the surplus feed grain production.

Mr. President, on any basis the amendment certainly makes sense. I recognize that the people of Kansas—and certainly their Senators—should be the authoritative experts in the Senate on the full project and not merely on the flood control aspect of it. But when the farmers whose land would be irrigated do not want the project, have opposed it, and have gone to the trouble of going on record publicly against the project, and when we have a surplus of feed grains

already, it makes no sense for us to increase that surplus.

So, in order that we might save $17 million, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

If any vote this year can be said to be an economy vote, it seems to me that the vote on the amendment will be one. On most of the economy votes, at least spending proponents could show some kind of service of some value to some group. Perhaps it has been a private group or perhaps a group that may or may not deserve the service. But in relation to this particular proposed expenditure of $17 million, service would result to no one.

The people who would presumably benefit would not. The taxpayer would have a triple burden. First, he would have to pay for the irrigation part of the project; second, he would have to pay for the procurement of $1 million a year of additional feed grains, and third, he pays additional storage costs and the interest costs forever.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEARSON. The Senator stated that the adoption of the amendment would not destroy the project. It is my understanding that the appropriation does not include funds for irrigation canals or for an irrigation district, but includes only funds relating to the capacity of the reservoir to handle irrigation demands if and when the need arises.

The question I wish to put to the Senator from Wisconsin is as follows: Although funds would be provided for construction of a reservoir which would have capacity for irrigation purposes, if the language to which the amendment refers is eliminated, would not its elimination conceivably raise a technical and legal point as to the jurisdiction of the bureau to continue work?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the answer would be in the negative. I have talked with Reclamation people and with officials in the Department of the Interior and they indicate that if Congress decided they did not want any money to be provided for irrigation, then there would be no reason why they could not continue the project. The project in the future would be a flood control project almost exclusively. Not exclusively, because there are some other benefits such as the recreational and the wildlife benefit, which are all minor, but the lion's share of the benefit is in flood control, as the Senator knows.

According to the word I have received from the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, there is no reason why the proposed action should in any way inhibit the continuation of the project. Frankly I wish it would, but I am told there is no question that it will not.

Mr. PEARSON. I should like to direct that same question to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the saving would not be $17 million, as the Senator from Wisconsin has stated. My information is that around $6 million would be spent at the damsite to make irrigation possible. If, as, and when an irrigation district is created, then $11 million more would be required in order to build canals and related irrigation facilities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe that what the Senator from Louisiana has said is correct, and I agree. My argument was not that there would be a saving of $17 million in the near future but eventually if we provide that in the future no money should be spent for irrigation, and that were a policy which would be accepted by our Government, then we would save $6 million now and $11 million in the future—a gross saving of $17 million. The $76 million project would be reduced to a $59 million project.

Mr. PEARSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana, whether the irrigation project is not the basis of jurisdiction of the bureau to start and continue work on projects such as the one about which we are speaking?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is; but as I said earlier, most of the money being spent is for flood control.

Mr. PEARSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I advocate preservation of our precious water resources.

This proposal is one way to do it. I believe it would be foolish for the project to continue without placing at the damsite the necessary facilities to provide for irrigation, if, as, and when the people desire them.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have nothing further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] 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 California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is absent on official duty.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 74, as follows:

[No. 265 Leg.]

YEAS—9

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Byrd, Va. | Lausche | Proxmire |
| Dodd | Nelson | Thurmond |
| Gruening | Neuberger | Williams, Del. |

NAYS—74

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Fulbright | McNamara |
| Allott | Goldwater | Metcalf |
| Anderson | Gore | Miller |
| Bartlett | Hart | Monroney |
| Bayh | Hartke | Morse |
| Beall | Hickenlooper | Morton |
| Bennett | Hill | Moss |
| Bible | Holland | Muskie |
| Boggs | Hruska | Pearson |
| Brewster | Inouye | Pell |
| Burdick | Jackson | Prouty |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Johnston | Randolph |
| Cannon | Jordan, N.C. | Ribicoff |
| Carlson | Jordan, Idaho | Saltonstall |
| Case | Keating | Scott |
| Church | Kennedy | Simpson |
| Clark | Kuchel | Smith |
| Cooper | Long, Mo. | Sparkman |
| Cotton | Long, La. | Stennis |
| Curtis | Magnuson | Talmadge |
| Dirksen | Mansfield | Williams, N.J. |
| Edmondson | McCarthy | Yarborough |
| Ellender | McClellan | Young, N. Dak. |
| Ervin | McGovern | Young, Ohio |
| Fong | McIntyre | |

NOT VOTING—17

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dominick | Javits | Russell |
| Douglas | McGee | Smathers |
| Eastland | Mechem | Symington |
| Engle | Mundt | Tower |
| Hayden | Pastore | Walters |
| Humphrey | Robertson | |

So Mr. PROXMIRE'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in a colloquy which occurred a short while ago, by mistake, I made the statement that President Eisenhower recommended

recoupment of expenses incurred in making inland waterways navigable. It was not President Eisenhower; it was President Kennedy, in his message of April 5, 1962. He specifically stated:

The users of the waterways include some of the largest and financially strongest corporations in the United States today, and it is surely feasible and appropriate for them to pay a small share of the Federal Government's cost in providing and maintaining waterway improvements.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a portion of President Kennedy's message of April 5, 1962, on this subject.

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

3. Inland waterways: Also in the interest of equality of treatment and opportunity, the principle of user charges should be extended to the inland waterways. A tax of 2 cents per gallon should be applied to all fuels used in transportation on the waterways. The recommended effective date, January 1, 1963, will alow time for review by the Interstate Commerce Commission of any adjustments that may be necessary in common carrier rates. This deferral is recommended even though the bulk of inland waterways traffic is carried by unregulated rather than regulated carriers.

The new tax should include an exemption similar to the current exemption from taxation accorded to gasoline and ships supplies for vessels employed in the fisheries, foreign trade, or trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States or between the United States and any of its possessions. Vessels in domestic trade using facilities and routes similar to those engaged in foreign trade, and vessels in coastal trade which are too large to use the intercoastal waterways, should also be exempted.

This administration recognizes the responsibility of the Government to maintain and improve our system of inland waterways. Over $2 billion of Federal funds has already been invested in capital improvements. Expenditures for operating and maintaining the waterways are about $70 million annually, even though only a small fraction of the traffic consists of common carriers which serve all shippers and the general public. The users of the waterways include some of the largest and financially strongest corporations in the United States today, and it is surely feasible and appropriate for them to pay a small share of the Federal Government's costs in providing and maintaining waterway improvements.

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

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, title III of H.R. 9140, the public works appropriations bill, 1964, provides appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission. It is noted that our Appropriations Committee recommends restoration of $61,355,000 of cuts made in the bill by the House. Included are $18,500,000 for "reactor development."

The House Appropriations Committee report which accompanied H.R. 9140 noted that it had deleted $33,548,000 of reactor development funds, including $3 million "budgeted for research and development and design assistance to utilities which may wish to construct power reactors."

In a Senate speech November 18, 1963, and in a letter of the same date to the chairman of our Appropriations Committee, I supported the position of the House in accepting the report and recommendations of its Appropriations Committee. I question the advisability of our Government subsidizing the design and construction of investor-owned private nuclear powerplants which actually are commercial ventures.

I emphasize that I am not opposed to experimental work on reactors which the Atomic Energy Commission conducts as part of the valid national research effort.

My objection is to the AEC program of subsidizing the design, construction, and operation of large, nonexperimental identical nuclear powerplants, especially when such plants include already proven water type reactors.

We read in the report of our Appropriations Committee that included in its AEC fund restoration recommendations are:

Three million dollars in operating costs for cooperative arrangements with utilities and equipment manufacturers for the construction of civilian power reactors. In restoring these funds, it is not the intention of the committee that such funds would be used for arrangements under which additional light-water reactors of already proven type could be constructed. On the contrary, the intention of the committee by this restoration, together with $12 million of funds budgeted under the "selected resources" program of the (Atomic Energy) Commission, is to provide an availability of $15 million for the purpose of entering into new cooperative arrangements for development of civilian power reactors of more advanced types.

Perhaps this is justified as research. But the House report stated that these funds had been omitted by the House Committee on Appropriations from H.R. 9140 because—

It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs at least in those areas of high conventional fuel cost.

Our Appropriations Committee not only recommends restoration of $3 million to apply on the operating costs of cooperative arrangements with utilities and equipment manufacturers; it would provide a fund of $15 million in this fiscal year "for the purpose of entering [AEC] into new cooperative arrangements for development of civilian power reactors of more advanced types." Thus it disagrees with the House which took the position that "this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors."

And our Appropriations Committee disagrees with the House position that nuclear power reactors "are now producing electric power at competitive costs, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel cost." In contradiction, the Senate Appropriations Committee report includes this language:

The committee is advised that competitive nuclear power, in any area of the country, is an expectation, rather than a demonstrable fact at this point in time.

The language of the Senate report has been expertly prepared in rebuttal to the House report. Competitive nuclear power may be "an expectation, rather than a demonstrable fact at this point in time." But civilian nuclear power industry spokesmen and those for equipment manufacturers are not as guarded in their evaluations of the competitive "expectation" and the status and future of the nuclear power program. They are ultraoptimistic.

In this connection, Mr. President, I pointed out in my November 18 letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee a position statement by the president of the Pennsylvania Electric Co. He has been quoted as having asserted that two of the large nuclear power plants listed to be built, with the aid of Government subsidies of over $12 million each for design assistance and fuel waiver, "will produce electricity at a lower unit cost than fossil fuel plants in the same location." And he further declared: "On a nonsubsidized basis, nuclear kilowatts will be competitive with fossil kilowatts in approximately one-half of the United States" by the time these subsidized nuclear power plants on the east coast and west coast go into operation in 1967–69.

In light of these conditions, and considering the tremendous potential for change inherent in them, it is distressing that the appropriations committees of the two bodies of Congress apparently are a considerable distance apart in their interpretations of the advice they have received concerning the status of the civilian nuclear power program.

Certainly, Mr. President, we are cognizant of the fact that advances in technology bring changes—sometimes drastic and very far-reaching ones. Perfection of a civilian nuclear power industry would indeed create vast changes in the fundamental fuels and energy fields. In the drive for this perfection, with the Federal Treasury and a Federal agency spearheading the action, it seems to me that we must manifest a keener degree of interest in and understanding of the impacts and changes which will be brought about.

What of the impact on the fossil fuels industries, coal, oil, and gas; on investments in fossil fueled electric generating plants; on the railroad industry; on investments in TVA and numerous public and private hydroelectric facilities; and on millions of citizens and whole regions of our country?

There is an obligation on the part of the Congress to have answers—specific and detailed answers—to these questions while the data would have meaning and applicability.

We are told by some persons when we speak of these conditions that we are talking in terms of the past and not of the future—that we are "against progress." I emphatically disagree.

Mr. President, there is no real progress unless we meet the challenges and side effects of technological changes at each step along the way.

One of the difficulties which has plagued our country has been the inability or unwillingness to identify changes in the offing. Another has been failure to take positive and necessary counteractions after we have identified the problems induced by change. These difficulties and failures have contributed to human misery and economic dislocation in inordinate degree in some regions. Sometimes, as we have noted, a number of areas become so involved that we have recessions. And some of them linger as chronic problems which we often accentuate, rather than solve, by actions on such national legislation as that which embraces the civilian nuclear power activities.

We are at another of the crossroads. In this matter of appropriations for the civilian nuclear power program we find identification difficulties. We must act on the basis of diametrically opposite interpretations of foundation facts and assumptions; one interpretation by the House, a differing one by the Senate as reflected in the Appropriations Committee report.

I am not disposed to complicate this dilemma by offering amendments. There doubtless will be a conference on this measure. I hope the conferees will find answers and provide the Congress with helpful interpretations and guidelines on the issue of Government financing for the civilian nuclear power program.

Frankly, Mr. President, there are far-reaching questions of policy involved which transcend the immediate matter of fiscal year 1964 appropriations now before us.

There is a need in greater degree than ever existed before that there be evolved by the Congress a national fuels and energy policy.

The complication is not merely a matter of divergent efforts involving competition between the fossil fuels for markets, nor is it only a question of private power versus public power forces in contention over where or whether hydroelectric projects shall be authorized and financed by the Congress.

The new force—civilian nuclear power—is coming more prominently and more sharply into focus, and perhaps with far more rapidity than had been anticipated and predicted. This poses problems as well as potential benefits for the Nation and its citizens.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been one of the most outstandingly aggressive, useful, effective and successful instrumentalities of the Congress and, in fact, of the whole of our Government structure, in this century. Its energetic and knowledgeable chairman—the current chairman—the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and its former chairman, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] both have provided positive leadership.

It is a model which I would have had the Congress emulate when I offered on January 9, 1961 a concurrent resolution for the creation of a Joint Committee on National Fuels Study. I regret that the concurrent resolution approach did not endure and that we settled on nothing more than a committee study by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. After a brief flurry, that study seems to have perished.

Now the picture of the need for developing pertinent facts and forecasts on fuels and energy has a new dimension. There is, in my judgment, a real urgency that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy be expanded into or supplemented by a Joint Committee on Fuels and Energy. This is not the time to discuss this subject in detail, but I will do so in the near future.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I would like to thank the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for his kind comments about the work of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

It has always been a cornerstone of Joint Committee policy that the atomic energy program should be viewed objectively and in perspective. In this connection, over the past several months we have received correspondence from Mr. Joseph E. Moody, President of the National Coal Policy Conference. In his letter of August 30, 1963, addressed to the Chairman of the Joint Committee, and in a later letter of September 16, addressed to the Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee, Mr. Moody raised a number of questions concerning the civilian nuclear power program.

In order to obtain a complete picture of the facts, the Joint Committee asked the Atomic Energy Commission to comment on both letters, in the interests of presenting a complete record on this matter.

Again, I commend my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], for his continued attention to this important subject, not only from the standpoint of his State, but in relationship to the country as a whole.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the correspondence received from the National Coal Policy Conference, and the comments of the Atomic Energy Commission on these letters.

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

NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, INC.,
*Washington, D.C., August 30, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: The National Coal Policy Conference speaks for the great industrial federation built around bituminous coal—the coal-producing companies, the United Mine Workers of America, the coal-hauling railroads, coal-consuming electric utilities, and manufacturers of coal mining machines and equipment. Members of this organization have invested more than $32 billion in plants and facilities, and provide a livelihood for more than 2.5 million Americans.

We, as an organization speaking for this vital force in our economy, are deeply concerned over the civilian nuclear power program as it is presently being conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The private electric utility industry is now by far the largest single market for bituminous coal. The AEC program, the heart of which is massive subsidies, is directed toward replacing coal with nuclear power as the major source of the Nation's electric power supply. If all charges of a nuclear plant are fully applied we have reason to believe that the cost of making electricity would still be higher than making it with the basic fuels in spite of Government subsidization.

Therefore, we must speak out in opposition to the expenditure of taxpayers' funds on a program which cannot be justified and which, if not checked, could very well have the ultimate effect of wiping out this great American industry to the detriment of the national security.

For some reason, this massive subsidy program has not received the attention it rightfully deserves. We respectfully ask that you keep these following considerations in mind in connection with legislation which will authorize and appropriate funds for this program:

1. The AEC program no longer is concentrated on research and development work in connection with reactor prototypes. Rather, the chief and almost exclusive emphasis is now upon building large-scale, identical installations in the 400- to 500-megawatt range. The AEC has made clear that without massive Government subsidies for both construction and operations these plants would not be built nor would the electricity they produce come anywhere near being competitive with coal-produced electricity even in the so-called high-fuel-cost areas.

2. There is no present or impending shortage of electric power to justify such massive Government participation in the civilian nuclear power program. True, the consumption of electric power is expected to quadruple by the year 2000, but all evidence proves that there will be sufficient fossil fuels, particularly coal, to meet this vastly expanded need. The Geological Survey has reported that present known reserves of coal, recoverable with present techniques and at approximately present prices, equals more than 200 billion tons, or 500 times current annual consumption. With continued improvement in the technology of coal transportation and even lower costs of production, there is every reason to anticipate that coal will be available to utilities at even lower costs in the years ahead, thus making it an even more attractive fuel. The conclusion is inescapable that what the civilian nuclear power program amounts to is the forced feeding of a new industry to use up the excess capacity developed by AEC over the years and to justify present appropriations and levels of operations.

3. To date, the Government has spent about $1.275 billion on the civilian power program. Its current budget is $216 million annually to further and expand the program of subsidy. Over the assumed life of one large nuclear plant (Connecticut Yankee Atomic) the total Government subsidy will amount to $45.6 million. Obviously, a nuclear plant with a subsidy of this magnitude will enjoy a tremendous advantage over privately built and privately financed coal-fired electric utility plants.

4. There is a matter of safety involved in the construction of nuclear powerplants, particularly in or near centers of population, which has not been settled. The proposals to build nuclear plants in the Borough of Queens in New York; near Atlantic City, N.J.; and in the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas of California have created deep concern for the welfare of the residents of the areas. To quote an eminent scientist, "What is involved in atomic plants is the fact that accidents of one kind or another are an absolute certainty. They are inevitable. The difference here is that an accident associated with atomic power is of an altogether different magnitude than an accident associated with coal-fired generation plants."

The law requires private insurance of up to $60 million must be carried on atomic energy powerplants, depending on the installed capacity. In addition each atomic plant must be indemnified in the amount of $500 million against accidents. The $60 million is the maximum amount that private insurance companies will write. Thus, since it is impossible (for the first time in the history of America) to obtain the enormous amount of insurance considered necessary for an atomic plant the Government supplies the $500 million indemnity at a nominal insurance premium of only $30 per year per thermal megawatt of installed capacity. For a plant of 140,000 electric kilowatts of capacity, this would come to about $12 or $13 thousand per year. This insurance alone proves the colossal danger of an atomic energy plant, particularly one close to centers of habitation.

Thus, it seems to us, in carefully reviewing the nuclear power program that the massive Government subsidies which have been, and are continuing to be spent, on the building of large non-experimental commercial plants cannot be justified.

The umbilical cord between the Government and the civilian nuclear power industry must be severed and this new industry must be made to stand on its own feet in the rough competitive power battle. Under such conditions, if nuclear powerplants are needed and are feasible, they will be built, and without Government subsidy. But it is our belief, based upon a careful study of all relevant economic data, that without Government subsidy these plants would not be built nearly as rapidly and in as great numbers as they will be under the present AEC subsidy program.

We sincerely believe that it is unfair, and in contradiction of our free enterprise system, for the Government to spend the taxpayers' money—including taxes collected from coal and other fuels industries—to encourage through subsidy the construction of plants that threaten to undermine the future growth of—and perhaps eventually to destroy—coal and associated industries upon which so many people depend for a livelihood and which play such a vital role in our economy, and in addition endanger their lives and property.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
*President.*

---

NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, INC.

WASHINGTON, September 10.—Only one of the many forms of subsidy used by the Federal Government to encourage the development of a civilian nuclear power industry could have the effect of wiping out a market for 173 million tons of coal by 1980, a spokesman for the coal industry declared today.

Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, said this one subsidy—the providing of nuclear fuel to private utilities under Government financing rather than requiring the utilities to own, process, and reprocess their own fuel under more expensive investor financing will have a profound effect upon the growth rate of this new industry which will compete with coal as a fuel for the generation of electricity.

"The Atomic Energy Commission has estimated that under the present Government subsidy program, nuclear power will develop to the point where it will be the source for up to 20 percent of the Nation's electricity needs by 1980," Mr. Moody declared.

Dr. Theodore Baumeister, Stevens professor of mechanical engineering at Columbia University, has estimated that this 20-percent share would be reduced to only about 2 percent if Government financing is discontinued and the utilities are required to go into the private money market to provide their own financing.

It is easy to see what this means to the coal industry.

By 1980, it is estimated that total consumption of electricity will amount to 3,000 billion kilowatts.

If Government financing of nuclear fuel is continued and nuclear power meets 20 percent of this expanded requirement, as AEC predicts it will, this means a potential market for 192 million tons of coal will be replaced.

If this Government subsidy in the form of cheap financing is removed and the nuclear power share of the market is held to 2 percent, as Dr. Baumeister believes it would be without the financing subsidy, the replacement of coal markets would be 19 million tons.

Thus, the difference this one Government subsidy for nuclear power would make in the potential market for coal in the electric utility industry by 1980 amounts to 173 million tons.

The president of NCPC, which represents coal-producing companies, the United Mine Workers of America, coal-hauling railroads, coal-consuming electric utilities and manufacturers of coal-mining equipment, also pointed out that other Government subsidies used to encourage development of nuclear power in competition with private industry's fossil-fuel plants include reimbursement by AEC for design costs on large, nonexperimental plants, waiver of all costs for the use of Government-owned fuel during the first 5 years of a plant's life, continued renting of Government-owned fuel at charges far below what it would cost the utility to provide its own fuel, and Government-sponsored indemnity insurance at a fraction of what this insurance would cost if bought from private insurers.

"The Government has spent to date $1.275 billion on its civilian nuclear power program and it is continuing to spend at the rate of $216 million a year," Mr. Moody said.

"The sole purpose of these massive Government subsidies is to try to make nuclear power competitive with coal. We think it is wrong to use taxpayers' funds in this fashion.

"If nuclear power is needed, and if it can be produced economically, the necessary plants will be built by private enterprise without the necessity of vast Government subsidy.

"We have yet to see persuasive evidence that the plants are needed or can be made competitive with coal-fired plants.

"This is one vast Government expenditure that should be ended."

---

NATIONAL COAL
POLICY CONFERENCE, INC.,
*Washington, D.C., September 16, 1963.*

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: A few days ago you received a letter which we addressed to every Member of Congress raising several pertinent questions relative to the wisdom of continued enormous Federal expenditures in an attempt to develop nuclear power to compete with coal. These subsidies become even more inexcusable in view of claims now being made by the industry that plants soon to be built will be competitive even without subsidies.

Naturally, the coal industry, which at present provides more than 200 million tons of coal annually to generate 67 percent of the Nation's steam-generated electricity, is alarmed over the threat posed by this Government subsidy to its future existence and to the 2.5 million persons dependent upon coal and allied industries for a livelihood.

In the beginning, Government subsidy for this new industry was justified on the grounds that only with Federal funds could the development of workable, practical reactors be achieved. Therefore, Congress authorized large appropriations for research and development work on reactor prototypes.

Unfortunately, the nuclear power program now has gone far beyond this original concept. Today the modified "Round Three" of the Atomic Energy Commission's cooperative power reactor demonstration program is concentrated for the most part on subsidizing the building of proven, large-scale projects to produce electricity for commercial sale, and which are economic to build only because of the size and extent of the Government subsidy. New experimental, prototype reactors are now being largely neglected.

This is happening even in the face of claims by a prominent electric utility official that nuclear plants can already compete with conventional fuel plants without subsidy. Mr. Louis H. Roddis, Jr., president of the Pennsylvania Electric Company, has stated that two commercial-size nuclear plants to be built on the east and west coasts "will produce electricity at a lower unit cost than fossil-fuel plants in the same location."

In a speech entitled "Nuclear Kilowatts Become Competitive" before the electric companies' public information program in Chicago recently, Mr. Roddis contended that water-cooled reactors slated for operation in 1967–68 will be "competitive with fossil fuel at 30 cents per million B.t.u.'s, indicating that nuclear kilowatts are competitive with fossil kilowatts in approximately one-half of the United States." He stated that this cost is "on a nonsubsidized basis."

In view of such an assertion by a respected and capable leader in the utility industry, there can certainly be no justification whatsoever for any additional expenditures of Government funds to build nuclear plants to produce power at the expense of a major existing industry.

And yet, even in the face of such claims from the industry that competitiveness has already been reached, the Atomic Energy Commission is pushing ahead with determination to see that additional large capacity nuclear plants, paid for in part by Government money and sustained in operation by Government subsidy, will be built. Dr. Glenn Seaborg, AEC Chairman, in testifying before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy this year, declared that the AEC proposes to "stimulate and support the utility industry in the construcion of 10 to 12 full-scale powerplants during the next dozen years to demonstrate the competitiveness of reactors of increasingly improved design." Please note that these reactors referred to are not experimental prototypes, which have, in the past, been the Government's justification for being in the atomic energy business in competition with private industry, but are merely larger and perhaps more efficient plants of a type already built. The only excuse used for this major continuing program is that the Government wants to prove that they can be competitive with fossil fuels—in other words that they can take over the utility market from coal.

Even if these plants fail to prove themselves competitive, it is important to recognize that they will be actual production plants, and not demonstrations, and will produce power to fill a market need which otherwise would be filled by plants burning fossil fuel. Twelve plants of about 500,000 kilowatts capacity, which is the size contemplated, would burn, during their estimated 20-year lifetime, the equivalent of 280 million tons of coal.

Many experts have predicted that by 1980 as much as 20 percent of the Nation's electric power needs will originate in nuclear plants. As the enclosed press release, which we recently issued, points out, this will be the equivalent of 190 million tons of coal annually.

The present AEC practice of subsidizing large, non-experimental and identical nuclear plants must be ended. The huge Government expenditures involved in the subsidies are not necessary. There is ample coal and other fossil fuels to generate increasing amounts of electricity to meet the Nation's needs for electric power. And certainly, if Mr. Roddis is correct, there can be no further justification for the Government continuing, by financial contributions, to stimulate the building of private nuclear electric plants. On behalf of the coal and allied industries, and the millions of people dependent on them, we earnestly urge you, as Members of Congress, to oppose any further appropriations to provide subsidies for the nuclear power reactor development program, and to reject the AEC's request for an extension of time in which to accept proposals to build plants under its so-called third round program with the help of Government funds.

I would appreciate any comment you might care to make.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH E. MOODY,
*President.*

---

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
*Washington, D.C., November 22, 1963.*

Mr. JOHN T. CONWAY,
*Executive Director, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.*

DEAR MR. CONWAY: In response to your request of October 2, 1963, the following comments are furnished on the points raised by Mr. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., in his letter of August 30, 1963, to Chairman PASTORE, and his letter of September 16, 1963, to Vice Chairman HOLIFIELD.

LETTER TO CHAIRMAN PASTORE

1. "The AEC program no longer is concentrated on research and development work in connection with reactor prototypes. Rather, the chief and almost exclusive emphasis is now upon building large-scale, identical installations in the 400 to 500 megawatt range. The AEC has made clear that without massive Government subsidies for both construction and operations these plants would not be built nor would the electricity they produce come anywhere near being competitive with coal-produced electricity even in the so-called high fuel-cost areas."

Comment: It is assumed that Mr. Moody is referring to the modified third round program which has resulted in assistance agreements with Connecticut Yankee and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. The maximum amount of Government assistance agreed upon for these two project totals $14,050,000 for engineering design (about 8 to 9 percent of the costs to the utilities for plant construction) and $15,345,000 in the form of waiver of the normal AEC charges for the inventory of special nuclear material in the possession of the utilities through 5 years of plant operation. This inventory charge is frequently referred to by the AEC and others as a use charge, but it is important to note that all material used up, or consumed, in the operation is paid for in full by the utility. The inventory charge waiver for a limited period is granted only upon authorization by Congress and on the basis that the Government would obtain valuable information from the licensed activity in terms of research and development data and operating experience. Such information is, of course, made generally available to the public. However, after 5 years the reactor owner begins to pay the lease charge for this material in inventory. In contrast to the scope of the modified third round, the amount specifically directed to central station civilian power development included in the fiscal year 1964 budget requested of the Congress by the President is $153,763,000. (An amount of $244 million included in the President's budget message includes research and development programs contributing technical results to other Commission programs, in addition to the referenced amount of $153,763,000 which is specifically directed to the development of central station civilian power reactors.) A major portion of the Commission's annual expenditures on civilian power has been, and continues to be, devoted to research and development during the successive stages up to and including the design, construction and operation of prototype nuclear powerplants. The relatively small incremental assistance to first, large-scale commercial plants is considered as the last step in the chain of development for the specific reactor type concerned. Commission adoption of the modified third round program was based on the belief that without Government assistance these plants either would not be built or that their construction would be delayed beyond the time considered desirable.

2. "There is no present or impending shortage of electric power to justify such massive Government participation in the civilian nuclear power program. True, the consumption of electric power is expected to quadruple by the year 2000, but all evidence proves that there will be sufficient fossil fuels—particularly coal—to meet this vastly expanded need. The Geological Survey has reported that present known reserves of coal, recoverable with present techniques and at approximately present prices, equals more than 200 billion tons, or 500 times current annual consumption. With continued improvement in the technology of coal transportation and even lower costs of production, there is every reason to anticipate that coal will be available to utilities at even lower costs in the years ahead, thus making it an even more attractive fuel. The conclusion is inescapable that what the civilian nuclear power program amounts to is the forced feeding of a new industry to use up the excess capacity developed by AEC over the years and to justify present appropriations and levels of operations."

Comment: With respect to Mr. Moody's remarks on the availability of coal reserves to meet future growth in power demands, may I refer you to the discussion on this subject beginning on page 16 of the Commission Report to the President on Civilian Nuclear Power. On the basis of data obtained from several authoritative sources, the report concludes that if no supplemental forms of energy are utilized, we will exhaust our readily available, low-cost supplies of fossil fuels in from 75 to 100 years, and total supplies in from 150 to 200 years. However, long before the point of exhaustion of the fossil fuels, we would be obliged to taper off their use.

There are additional significant factors affecting the future use of fossil fuels. For example, as the report points out, fossil hydrocarbons are essential in the iron and steel industry and, furthermore, they represent a priceless heritage of complex molecular substances, the possible uses for which are only beginning to be realized. There is no presently known practical substitute for fossil fuels to power automobiles and aircraft, which will no doubt continue to increase in numbers. For these reasons we conclude that fossil fuels should be conserved. This can best be done through reasonably prompt efforts to supplement the use of fossil fuels in those applications for which technically satisfactory and reasonably economic substitutes can be utilized on a significant scale.

3. "To date, the Government has spent about $1.275 billion on the civilian power program. Its current budget is $216 million annually to further and expand the program of subsidy. Over the assumed life of one large nuclear plant (Connecticut Yankee Atomic) the total Government subsidy will amount to $45.6 million. Obviously, a nuclear plant with a subsidy of this magnitude will enjoy a tremendous advantage over privately built and privately financed coal-fired electric utility plants."

Comment: The maximum Commission assistance agreed upon for the Connecticut Yankee atomic project is actually $13.195 million of which $6.05 million is for design assistance and the balance for waiver of inventory charges on special nuclear materials. Perhaps the higher figure used by Mr. Moody includes an assumption of the difference between what it would cost the utility, over the plant lifetime, to maintain an inventory of special nuclear material under private ownership and the cost under the present system of lease from the Government at an annual inventory charge of 4¾ percent. (The value assigned by the Commission to special nuclear material, and the level of inventory charge, are based on full recovery of costs by the Government.) Lease is presently necessary since the Atomic Energy Act requires Government ownership, but there is legislation recommended by the Commission and now under Congressional consideration which would make private ownership permissible immediately, and mandatory after a transition period.

Incidentally, inventory charges represent only a small portion of the overall nuclear fuel cycle cost. Other items of cost which are borne by the utility include fabrication of fuel elements, burnup of fissionable material, reprocessing of spent fuel, and transportation.

4. "There is a matter of safety involved in the construction of nuclear powerplants, particularly in or near centers of population, which has not been settled. The proposals to build nuclear plants in the Borough of Queens in New York; near Atlantic City, N.J.; and in the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas of California have created deep concern for the welfare of the residents of the areas. To quote an eminent scientist, 'What is involved in atomic plants is the fact that accidents of one kind or another are an absolute certainty. They are inevitable. The difference here is that an accident associated with atomic power is of an altogether different magnitude than an accident associated with coal fired generation plants.' "

Comment: The Atomic Energy Commission is responsible under the law for regulation of the use of atomic energy, including consideration of applications for nuclear powerplant construction permits and operating licenses. Processing of applications involves review by up to as many as three different and independent groups: the AEC's hazards staff, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, and a Safety and Licensing Board which conducts public hearings and is made up of three members, two of whom are technically qualified and one of whom is experienced in administrative proceedings. No such plants may be built or operated until we are convinced, by all the evidence on plant design, site and environs, method of operation, etc., that such construction and operation would not endanger public health and safety. The subject of safety was discussed in considerable detail by Commissioner Haworth in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on April 5, 1963, in the course of its hearings on the development, state and growth of the atomic energy industry. I refer you to his testimony beginning on page 827 of the record of the hearings.

5. "The law requires private insurance of up to $60 million must be carried on atomic energy powerplants, depending on the installed capacity. In addition each atomic plant must be indemnified in the amount of

$500 million against accidents. The $60 million is the maximum amount that private insurance companies will write. Thus, since it is impossible (for the first time in the history of America) to obtain the enormous amount of insurance considered necessary for an atomic plant the Government supplies the $500 million indemnity at a nominal insurance premium of only $30 per year per thermal megawatt of installed capacity. For a plant of 140,000 electric kilowatts of capacity, this would come to about $12,000 or $13,000 per year. This insurance alone proves the colossal danger of an atomic energy plant, particularly one close to centers of habitation."

Comment: The private insurance industry has placed a limit on the amount it will cover per project partly because of the level of coverage but also because it does not have a mass of accumulated statistical data on commercial reactor plant operation comparable to that on which it bases insurance conditions for other industrial activities. It is hoped that, with the growing accumulation of nuclear powerplant operating data, the insurance industry will not only increase its coverage but also reduce rates.

The magnitude of the Government indemnity is not an admission of the "colossal danger" of a nuclear plant. The Price-Anderson Indemnity Act was adopted in order to assure that funds would be available in order to satisfy third party liability claims which might exceed the amount of insurance required in the event of a theoretically possible, but highly unlikely, accident. It is true that there is potential of considerable damage if, in spite of all safeguards and controls, a nuclear plant should suffer a severe accident, but (as mentioned above) the Commission's requirements for safety of plant design, methods of operation and site conditions are designed to render the possibility of such an accident extremely remote. The Commission's accident record over the many years it has built and operated numerous reactors is excellent, better than that of most conventional industries.

6. "The umbilical cord between the Government and the civilian nuclear power industry must be severed and this new industry must be made to stand on its own feet in the rough competitive power battle. Under such conditions, if nuclear powerplants are needed and are feasible, they will be built, and without Government subsidy. But it is our belief, based upon a careful study of all relevant economic data, that without Government subsidy these plants would not be built nearly as rapidly and in as great numbers as they will be under the present AEC subsidy program."

Comment: We agree with Mr. Moody that without Government assistance first-of-a-kind, large-scale commercial nuclear powerplants would probably be constructed less promptly than they would be with such aid. It is because of this that we sought and obtained legislative authorization to proceed with the modified third round program. We believe that the best interests of the American people are served by a continual search for reliable and economical ways to harness energy, and that nuclear power has the potential to meet these criteria.

Although special nuclear material is presently made available to the nuclear power industry through Government lease, legislation has been recommended by the Commission for congressional consideration which would make private ownership permissible immediately, and mandatory after a transition period.

7. "We sincerely believe that it is unfair, and in contradiction of our free enterprise system, for the Government to spend the taxpayers' money—including taxes collected from coal and other fuels industries—to encourage through subsidy the construction of plants that threaten to undermine the future growth of—and perhaps eventually to destroy—coal and associated industries upon which so many people depend for a livelihood and which play such a vital role in our economy, and in addition endanger their lives and property."

Comment: In the process of preparing its Report to the President on Civilian Nuclear Power, the Commission performed a detailed analysis of the projected impact of nuclear power on the potential production and consumption of fossil fuels. The conclusion reached is that, "the projected growth of nuclear power will merely supplement and not supplant coal and other fossil fuels for many decades. The fossil fuel industries and particularly the coal industry can expect a period of continuously expanding production." This forecast is illustrated by the table on page 7 of appendix 5 to the report which shows a rise in energy supplied by coal from the equivalent of 416 million tons in 1960 to 3,343 million tons in the year 2000. During the same period the energy obtained from nuclear sources, expressed in equivalent tons of coal, is estimated to be 15 million in 1970, 100 million in 1980, 410 million in 1990, and 1,260 million in 2000. As a matter of interest, it should be noted that the AEC purchases very substantial quantities of coal and in fact is the coal industry's best single customer.

LETTER TO VICE CHAIRMAN HOLIFIELD

In this letter Mr. Moody again refers to AEC concentration on commercial nuclear powerplants with concurrent neglect of the development of advanced technology, and to the ample reserves of fossil fuels. Please refer to my comments, above, on these points.

Mr. Moody introduces a new argument against further Government assistance to large-scale, proven concept nuclear plants by contending that such plants can already compete with conventional fuel plants without subsidy. He quotes Mr. Louis Roddis in support of this contention. However, in his letter to Chairman PASTORE, Mr. Moody supports his position by stating, "The AEC has made clear that without massive Government subsidies for both construction and operation these plants would not be built nor would the electricity they produce come anywhere near being competitive with coal-produced electricity even with the so-called high fuel-cost areas." It is therefore not clear to us whether Mr. Moody believes that such plants would or would not be competitive. The Commission's position is that large nuclear plants built at this time could produce electricity at costs no greater than those from conventional plants in areas where the delivered cost of fossil fuel is 35 cents per million B.t.u.'s or greater.

I would like to add a final comment regarding Mr. Moody's statement in his letter to Chairman PASTORE that the National Coal Policy Conference speaks for the industrial federation built around bituminous coal, including, "coal-consuming electric utilities." In view of the more than half a billion dollars already spent by the utility industry on nuclear powerplants, plus the commitments for several hundred million dollars more, it is obvious that at least a large segment of the utility industry believes that nuclear energy has the potential to serve as a reliable and economic alternative, supplemental source of electric power.

I trust the above comments will be of assistance to you. We would be pleased to furnish any additional information you may require.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. LUEDECKE,
*General Manager.*

THE PORTSMOUTH, N.H., HARBOR PROJECT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I commend the Committee on Appropriations and the diligent chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works for presenting to the Senate for its approval the first of several appropriations that will be required to complete the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River project. The committee has acted in a most farsighted manner, because the estimates for this work of harbor improvement were made final too late for their inclusion in the budget submitted by the President in January of this year.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the national significance of this project, which testifies to the work of our National Government in creating the basis for economic improvement in every region of our country.

THE PORTSMOUTH PROJECT DEPENDS ON CIVIC IMAGINATION

The city of Portsmouth stands today as a community confirmed in its courage to plan ahead. The proud name of the "Port City," inherited from our oceangoing forefathers, has recently become a touchstone for progress throughout the seacoast region of New Hampshire. A dozen years ago, Portsmouth Harbor handled only 863,000 short tons of ocean cargo. Rapid currents in a tortuous channel bordered with rocks have made entry into the harbor an unacceptable risk for all but the most skilled navigators. The present depth of the channel in its upper reaches prevents the use of large modern tankers, also preventing full use of the harbor. But the obstacles to be overcome in fulfilling the port city's bright future were not those of nature alone. A slumbering tradition had to be revived. Businessmen had to be convinced that the prospects for progress were commercially sound. Public interest had to be awakened. It is a tribute to the city fathers, business and civic leaders of Portsmouth and many farsighted men and women throughout New Hampshire that our State legislature created the New Hampshire State Port Authority in 1957. Our best brains turned to problems of transportation by rail and highway, coordinating harbor improvements with the needs of the military at nearby Pease Air Force Base and the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, and laying plans with interested busines firms. An enlightened local press and radio helped to build a solid public understanding of maritime commerce and the plans for the port. The story is an inspiring one, in which the public-spirited imagination of our whole seacoast region was brought to bear on the needs of the harbor and its commerce. It is now confidently planned that the port will handle almost 2 million tons annually in a few years.

CONVINCING THE CONGRESS

In 1958 and 1959 resolutions were passed in the Public Works Committees of each House of the Congress, asking the Corps of Engineers to explore the desirability of harbor improvements. The report to the chief of the Corps of Engineers was transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Army on July 5, 1962. By summer of 1963, local support for the project had become vir-

tually unanimous. Gov. John W. King drew attention to the State's plans to begin construction of a $3.8 million harbor terminal capable of handling the newest type of container ship and all but the very largest supertankers. Mr. John Rowe, State commissioner of resources and economic development, observed that recent Supreme Court decisions had cleared the way for more competitive overland freight rates to our northern ports and that the new facilities "are believed to be the first in the Nation engineered from the ground up to handle rail and truck tonnage for the new class of container ships." Mayor John J. Wholey stated his belief that the project is "essential to the present and future economic welfare of the city of Portsmouth." The diligent chairman of the New Hampshire State Port Authority, Mr. Eugene P. Soles, wrote as follows:

The fact that larger ships must navigate the harbor and river at partial draft is obviously an economic detriment, which affects not only the ship operators, but the economy of the local area. I firmly believe that the completion of the proposed project will permit the safe and orderly passage of deeper draft vessels, and consider the project to have a vital bearing upon the economic welfare of the State of New Hampshire.

Rear Adm. C. J. Palmer, U.S. Navy, commander of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, stated that "improvements in the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River will substantially improve the facility of handling modern submarines and N..vy tankers in this area." Lt. Col. John S. Robinson, U.S. Air Force, acting commander of Pease Air Force Base pointed out that harbor improvements would "permit fuel delivery by larger tankers and thereby assure an adequate backup supply and flow of aviation fuels for day-to-day operations as well as for unforeseen national emergencies." Mr. Thomas M. Prentiss, president of the Greater Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce, foresaw that the project "would assist such interests as may be desirous of locating in tidewater areas of the State as well as benefiting existing businesses." Such local businesses as the Portsmouth Navigation Corp., C. H. Sprague & Son Co., the Atlantic Terminal Sales Corp., New England Tank Industries of New Hampshire, the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, and the Simplex Wire & Cable Co., presented excellent statements of the benefit the harbor project would provide for their operations. Out-of-State firms such as the Central Maine Power Co., the National Gypsum Co., the Keystone Shipping Co., the Trinidad Corp., and the Socony Mobil Oil Co., welcomed news of the project and most said they would consider expanding their operations into and out of the Portsmouth Harbor.

Mr. President, it was my pleasure to contribute what I could to consideration of this important project in the Congress. On June 13 of this year I testified in its favor before Senator ELLENDER'S subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be reprinted at this point in my remarks.

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

PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER PROJECT

(Statement of Hon. THOMAS J. MCINTYRE before the Public Works Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, June 13, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you and the members of the subcommittee for this opportunity to discuss the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River Navigation project.

The 1962 Rivers and Harbors Act authorizing this project, for which the total estimated cost is $7½ million. Its principal purpose would be the widening of the tortuous channel that winds upstream through Portsmouth Harbor and to extend that channel some 1,700 feet above the Newington dock facilities.

In 1956 several ledges were removed, deepening the present channel to 35 feet, enabling tankers of some 25,000 deadweight tons to reach the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, while the upper reaches of the river remain limited to ships of some 17,000 deadweight tons. The project would widen the channel and eliminate submerged ledges, permitting tankers of up to 35,000 deadweight tons to use the entire channel.

Fast tidal currents, sharp bends, and difficult bridge approaches make the existing channel a hazardous one. The fact that this danger has not led to serious collisions, groundings, and perhaps even fires is a tribute to the skill of the Portsmouth Harbor pilots.

The high cost of petroleum deliveries from smaller, less efficient vessels constitutes a heavy burden upon our State, which must rely upon coastal shipping to neutralize the effect of unreasonably high rail and motor freight rates. These high costs have contributed to the fact that New Hampshire's residential electricity rates are the highest in the Nation. It has been estimated that annual savings of some $600,000 would result from the channel improvements described by the Corps of Engineers.

The project has been assigned a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.1 to 1. The 2-mile extension to Newington and the upper turning basin have been assigned a benefit-to-cost ratio of 6.5 to 1. But in terms of the urgent hopes of the citizens of Portsmouth, I believe this project bears even more significant merit. On the Piscataqua channel the city of Portsmouth, in cooperation with the State Department of Resources and Economic Development, hopes to locate a foreign-trade zone. The University of New Hampshire hopes to develop a deep sea marine science program which would require docking facilities for oceanographic vessels. The Port Authority hopes to develop commercial fishery docking facilities that must await the widening of the channel. So this project, if it is provided, will set off a whole chain reaction of harbor improvements of definite commercial and research significance. In the final analysis, it is for this reason that I strongly urge the members of this subcommittee to approve the expenditure of the first $1½ million for the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River project.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I am a convinced supporter of New Hampshire's booming seacoast region. The proposals for harbor improvements, new port facilities, a foreign-trade zone, and a marine science center have had my full support since I began my service in the Senate. I have joined in offering bills to provide for the development of new stern-ramp trawlers and fishing vessel construction subsidies to help expand our lagging commercial fisheries fleet. I have joined in offering legislation, which has since passed the Senate, to provide for commercial fisheries research and water resources research in our State universities. I have repeatedly stressed the importance of maintaining a strong national establishment of naval shipyards, whose readiness and skills are so essential in times of challenge. I have repeatedly urged that restrictions be lifted from trade in residual fuel oil, the only fuel available in New Hampshire at a nationally competitive price. It would be my conviction that citizens of New Hampshire's seacost region and port city should lend their support to these efforts and to local efforts to make the most of our short but historic seacoast. The recent report of the National Academy of Sciences on marine resources, as well as many studies by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and other farsighted groups remind us that the resources of the sea are truly inexhaustible. They represent a new frontier for our port city in times of constant change and I am fully confident that our citizens will prove more than equal to the challenge.

TEAMWORK FOR PROGRESS

Mr. President, projects such as the Portsmouth Harbor project mean hard work. Hard work by a Senate subcommittee that heard literally hundreds of witnesses. Hard work by Government agencies such as the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Coast Guard, and many others. Hard work by local leaders and State government. Hard work by the New Hampshire State Port Authority.

It has been charged that government funds spent for public works belong to some particularly irresponsible class of public waste. I would not deny the need to obtain full value for such funds, but I wonder if the critics have any idea of the scrutiny that such projects receive. Four committees of the Congress examine them. The Corps of Engineers and all related Federal agencies examine them. The States weigh them with a critical eye. No project is authorized unless benefits outweigh costs. The very best talent that the Nation enjoys helps to plan these projects and helps the Congress enact them into law. The use of public funds for public works constitutes an investment in public progress, not merely for one region or area, but for the country as a whole. Manufacturers all across the Nation will find in Portsmouth a new shipping point for their goods. The beltways of maritime commerce that encircle the Nation will be strengthened. Our foreign trade will be expanded. This is true not just because Uncle Sam lays out funds for harbor improvement, but because local groups and private citizens match these ideas with their own, and make investments which more than match the value of Federal works of improvement. Without such local cooperation, there would be little value in the Federal projects. But planning and building together, our local communities and the Federal Government can each supplement the

strengths of the other and lay the foundation for enduring progress. That is what has happened in the Port City of the Granite State on this occasion and, I am confident, many more to come in the future. I ask unanimous consent that the excellent publication of the New Hampshire State Port Authority entitled "Newest World Port" be reprinted as a conclusion to my remarks.

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

NEWEST WORLD PORT

New Hampshire State Port Authority: Eugene P. Soles, chairman; Carl M. Lougee, vice chairman; Hugh G. Hamilton; Frank W. Fate; John F. Rowe; John E. Seybolt; Ralph T. Harris; Cap. Woodbury S. Adams, director.

AN INVITATION

State construction of modern terminal facilities at Portsmouth Harbor marks the rebirth of one of the Nation's oldest seaports.

Through the efforts and foresight of former Gov. Wesley Powell, and his executive council, this became a reality.

The port and its terminal are being developed to take advantage of the transportation industry's ever increasing growth.

New Hampshire and Portsmouth invite your consideration of the port's ability to meet your requirements, with these new facilities added to other advantages—a deep, 35-foot channel, proximity to principal ocean routes, a growing network of modern highways, adequate rail service, a stable industrial climate, plus thrifty and progressive government.

At Portsmouth, where the first naval vessel to fly the U.S. flag was launched, site of an important naval shipyard since colonial days, for many years one of the Nation's leading ports for merchant shipping, New Hampshire looks forward to renewed maritime activity and welcomes your participation.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. KING,
*Governor.*

A NEW ERA IN NEW HAMPSHIRE COMMERCE

"Portsmouth has the important advantage of being a completely ice-free port. The major program of expansion and improvement now underway clearly indicates that Portsmouth is entering its most successful era in seaborne commerce."—EUGENE P. SOLES, chairman, New Hampshire State Port Authority.

*A new world port for New England*

Portsmouth, N.H., is a completely ice-free year-round port. It is also the only natural deepwater harbor between the ports of Boston and Portland. The modern port and marine terminal at Nobles Island in the Piscataqua River will save money and time—in importing raw materials and exporting finished products—for industrial firms extending outward from the Portsmouth area.

The first stage plans for the marine terminal include the construction of a concrete wharf superstructure and decking, 450 feet in length and 50 feet in width, which will accommodate oceangoing vessels. A 27,000-square-yard reception and storage area adjacent to the wharf will lead to access areas built to tie in with existing roadways.

Second stage plans call for the addition of two more berths, a much enlarged staging and storage area, and a complex of buildings for warehousing, inspection, maintenance, and administrative purposes.

A $7,500,000 Federal project to widen and deepen certain areas of the Piscataqua River is presently being undertaken by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This will facilitate navigation of even larger oceangoing ships in the river.

*The growth of New Hampshire industry*

Manufacturing industry in New Hampshire has grown enormously since 1940. This growth has been carefully programed by the State's department of resources and economic development, the industrial park authority, the New Hampshire Business Development Corp., and a number of regional development corporations.

The results? Today New Hampshire has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the Nation, despite the fact that it ranks second among all the States in the percentage of its population employed in manufacturing industries.

There is still, however, virtually unlimited room for new industry close to the area of the new port and marine terminal. Yours, for example.

*New Hampshire and the world's markets*

The European Common Market is gradually easing tariffs, quotas, and import duties at home and abroad. This is already increasing America's share in world trade. And so Portsmouth becomes an increasingly important link between the commerce of Europe and our northern tier of States.

The new port and marine terminal will make Portsmouth the most convenient shipping and importing point for many companies in New Hampshire, Vermont, Ohio, and northern New York. Completion of New Hampshire's modern and efficient highway system will provide a tie-in with important midwestern ports that are icebound during the winter.

*Foreign trade zone potential*

There is ample available land close to the new port for development of a foreign trade zone. Should any companies settling in the Portmouth area require the benefits of a foreign trading zone, the New Hampshire State Port Authority is authorized to establish such a zone under existing regulations.

THE NEW AND THE TRADITIONAL OF PORTSMOUTH HARBOR

*Birthplace of the American Navy*

Founded in 1623 at the mouth of the Piscataqua River, Portsmouth is one of the oldest cities in the United States. It is New Hampshire's most important seaport. "Birthplace of the American Navy," Portsmouth was a thriving port and shipbuilding center in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. Timber and other goods from inland communities were shipped down river in gundelows to Portsmouth and loaded into oceangoing vessels for shipment abroad. In 1777, the famous *Ranger* was built in Portsmouth for John Paul Jones. In 1782 the first ship of the line built in America, mounting 74 guns, was completed and presented to France by Congress in gratitude for French aid during the American Revolution.

*The clipper ship era*

During the War of 1812, commerce in Portsmouth all but disappeared, but shipbuilding became an important industry once more by 1840. Men of all nations went down to the sea in the famous Portsmouth clipper ships such as the *Typhoon, Chocorua* and *Witch of the Wave.* These ships gained worldwide fame as the fastest vessels afloat in the heyday of the gold, tea, and opium trade. But with the coming of steam and steel ships, Portsmouth's greatest commercial era drew to a close. Even before the arrival of the 20th century, Boston and Portland had surpassed Portsmouth as the centers of seaborne commerce in New England.

*The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard*

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has always been an important Government installation, building warships of all types for the U.S. Navy. But commerce in the port dwindled away during the first 40 years of this century. This very lack of activity finally encouraged private industries to establish loading facilities along the south bank of the Piscataqua for the quick movement of coal and fuel oil to users throughout the State by means of the excellent highway system.

*Increasing commerce*

During the last two decades, this activity has grown considerably. From 1955–60 an average of 1,300,000 short tons of materials have been shipped through the privately owned facilities along the river.

The New Hampshire Port Authority, created by the legislature in 1957, advocated the establishment of a State port and marine terminal to give further stimulus to the New Hampshire economy. In 1962, Gov. Wesley Powell and his council authorized $800,000 toward the first stage of construction of the port.

Located at Nobles Island, adjacent to the Interstate Highway Bridge across the Piscataqua River to Maine, the new port has facilities for handling containerized as well as general cargo. With an authorized $7,500,000 Federal program for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to deepen and widen the river and harbor, oceangoing ships of any size may be accommodated at the new marine terminal.

*A new era dawns*

Thus Portsmouth, a busy seagoing community 300 years ago, looks forward to the revival of her past glory. With industry throughout the State increasing at a rapid rate, the new marine terminal will soon make the waters of the Piscataqua busier than they have been since Portsmouth clipper ships ruled the seven seas.

NEW GATEWAY TO NEW ENGLAND AND THE WEST

*Year-round port service for the Midwest*

Portsmouth is geographically the gateway to northern New England and to many points in the Midwest bordering the Great Lakes. With ports such as Toledo and Cleveland icebound during the winter months, Portsmouth can serve as a shipping point for goods normally sent to and from these ports in warmer weather.

*New highway system*

Serving the State's industry as well as industrial firms in Vermont, New Hampshire's excellent new highway system is rapidly being expanded and soon will be one of the finest in the Nation. Already it provides express connections from Portsmouth north to Portland and Canada and south to Boston, Providence, and New York City. More than 25 major trucking companies serve New Hampshire, assuring direct service to all points within the State.

*Rail connections good and economical*

The Boston & Maine Railroad services New Hampshire with both passenger and freight service. Freight trains leave all principal cities daily for Boston and New York. Connections with Canadian railways via the Boston & Maine Railroad afford New Hampshire shippers the advantage of cheaper differential rates to Canada west of Kingston, Ontario, and to destinations in the United States between central Ohio and the Rocky Mountains, and north of a line through the central part of Kentucky, Missouri, and Kansas.

*Harbor traffic tripled since 1940*

Despite the lack of a State port and terminal facilities in Portsmouth, traffic in the harbor has more than tripled since 1940. In that year, 405,553 short tons of cargo moved through the private docking facilities in the Piscataqua River. By 1955, tonnage had risen to more than 1,200,000 short tons, and from 1956 to 1960, the average yearly tonnage approximated 1,300,000 short tons.

The majority of this tonnage consisted of imports, including petroleum products of all

classes, gypsum or plaster rock, bituminous coal and lignite, electrical machinery and raw salt.

NEW IMPETUS FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE'S STEADILY RISING IMPORT AND EXPORT TRADE

*New Hampshire exports*

Total value of exports from New Hampshire in 1960 is estimated at $54.7 million. Most important exporting industries in the State are nonelectrical machinery, including special industry machinery, primary metals, textile mill products, paper and allied products, leather, and leather products, and electrical machinery. These six industries exported more than 90 percent of the estimated totals of manufactured goods from the State in 1960.

*Imports to New Hampshire*

The nonelectrical machinery industry, largest exporter of manufactured goods (almost 50 percent of the total exported), is also indirectly dependent on imports for its high volume of production. Large quantities of ferroalloys are produced by the primary metals industries from imported ores and concentrates of manganese, chromite, nickel, cobalt, and columbite-tantalite, and tungsten. Other indirect import requirements include nonferrous ores or metals, such as antimony, copper and tin.

The primary metals industry, textile mill products, leather and leather products, electrical machinery, and agriculture in New Hampshire are all steady importers of foreign made products.

A good percentage of these imports, as well as the finished goods in which they are used, will flow through the new State port.

TAKE A NEW HARD LOOK AT THE VITALITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE'S ECONOMIC CLIMATE

*Healthy economic climate*

In addition to the import-export advantages of the new Marine Terminal, the State of New Hampshire offers an economic climate second to none.

*No corporate income tax*

The State has no corporate income tax and no general sales tax. It depends more upon ad valorem property taxes for tax revenue than most other States. Approximately 60 percent of all taxes collected for support of State and local government come from this one source. And industry pays only 13 percent of the total property taxes.

*Large female labor market*

Although New Hampshire has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country, there is a substantial female labor market. Our women are industrious, adaptable, and imbued with the Yankee concept of "an honest day's work for an honest day's pay."

*Loyal, intelligent workers*

The New Hampshire worker is intelligent, loyal, and hard working. Wage rates throughout the State are reasonable by big city standards. Fringe benefits too are well within sensible standards.

*Adequate water supply*

Water supply throughout the State is more than adequate and electric power and fuel rates are reasonable. The Public Service Co. of New Hampshire services about 80 percent of all users of electric power in the State. Fuel oil, brought into Portsmouth by tanker, is naturally cheaper than anywhere else in the State. Natural gas is also available in Portsmouth, brought in by one of the two transmission pipelines running through the State.

*Excellent educational facilities*

New Hampshire has top-notch public schools and colleges ranging from excellent small institutions to nationally famous centers of learning such as the University of New Hampshire and Dartmouth College.

*Enjoyable living*

Executives and workers alike can enjoy living in one of the Nation's finest vacationlands. Skiing, hiking, golf, swimming, boating, camping, hunting, fishing and a host of other outdoor sports can be enjoyed in the most beautiful surroundings in the eastern part of the United States.

*Economic analysis available*

There is a complete analysis of population and labor supply, wage rates, taxes, transportation facilities, and other factors affecting New Hampshire as an industrial location. We would like to place a copy of this study in your hands to convince you that locating your plant in New Hampshire, with the added bonuses of a new port designed to your needs, is worth looking into. Just drop a line to: Director, New Hampshire State Port Authority, Post Office Box 295, Portsmouth, N.H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 9140) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

## TRIBUTE TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I take this occasion to thank the members of the subcommittee and the members of the Appropriations Committee for their assistance in handling the bill. I particularly wish to thank and compliment the competent clerk of the committee, Mr. Kenneth Bousquet, who sits with me here, and who is really and truly my right-hand man in the handling of this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has shown his usual skill in handling legislative matters, whether they be from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the Committee on Appropriations. This has been a most difficult bill to deal with. It is an intricate bill. It is a bill that very few Members of the Senate understand, and understandably so. However, it is a bill which has received the constant attention of the Senator from Louisiana.

I compliment him and the ranking minority member of the committee the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the other members of the committee, and the staff for the outstanding work they have done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join the majority leader in paying respects to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and his colleagues on the committee. As the Senator from Montana knows, public works are of vital importance to my State and to the entire Pacific Northwest. We have never received any gratuity from the Senator from Louisiana, and we would not have deserved it if we had requested it. We always receive a fair hearing from the Senator from Louisiana in making our presentation. On behalf of the people of my State, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for the fairness and justice that he has shown us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana goes infinitely further than merely giving a fair hearing to a Senator who comes before him on this detailed bill. He knows the problem that every Senator faces. He goes over and beyond the call of duty in cooperating with Senators in order to make certain that full justice is done.

Once more, I salute the distinguished and efficient clerk of the subcommittee. I have occasion to know how generous and kind he has been to my own office force and my staff members. I publicly thank Ken Bousquet for his cooperation and his every kindness. This has been a consistent attribute of his over a long period of time, including the years when I served on the Committee on Appropriations. So I salute him and thank him.

Likewise, I thank the minority clerk, who has been a tower of strength in this matter. We salute him, as well.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on behalf of the people of my State of Texas, I desire to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana for his patient hearings. The record shows that nearly 4,500 pages of testimony were taken. I was present this year, as I have been in past years, and I know that every delegation that has appeared has been courteously treated by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. We have waited our turn in line, as have delegations from many other States. All of them, from every State, have received unfailing courtesy. That reflects credit on the Senate and all its committees. The chairman has remained in the committee day after day, and personally knows what the record contains.

Mr. Bousquet and all the other members of the staff who worked with the chairman are diligent in furnishing opportunities for witnesses to be heard. They cooperate by answering correspondence. They are knowledgeable and understand the requests of the people of my State who appear before the committee on matters on which they desire to be heard.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his efficient work.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is due an explanation of the procedure that will be followed this afternoon. It had been anticipated that the conference report on the Independent Offices appropriation bill would be available this afternoon. We find that

this is not so. However, the House has agreed to the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill, and that will be the business following the disposition of the military construction appropriation bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been asked by several Senators to announce what the position will be of Senators who are opposed to the conference report on the foreign aid bill. The House having agreed to the conference report this afternoon by a vote of some 190 to 164, while we cannot move to recommit, we shall move to reject the report and ask for a further conference. We intend to analyze the conference report section by section.

---

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 730, H.R. 9139.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this measure brings before the Senate the military construction appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1964. There are no particular innovations or far-reaching new programs provided in the bill. The program is a continuation of what might be called the regular military construction program.

There is one unusually large item of $185 million for the construction of additional ballistic missile sites. The next largest item is for military housing, which the Senate will remember is now handled by direct appropriations, rather than under the old system of what was called Capehart housing.

I shall give some summary figures in the beginning, and then present a complete statement for the RECORD, covering the entire bill. Then I shall be glad to answer questions that any Senator may wish to ask.

This matter was first considered by the Senate in the authorization act, and considerable reductions were made in the original request for military construction. The total amount that was reduced in the authorization act, itself was for $176,149,000 in the regular construction program. That left an amount authorized for construction in the main military program of $1,055,851,000.

To be added to that amount in the authorization act was $685,312,000 for Defense family housing. Also included in that figure is a sum that the committee will try to have transferred to the other appropriation bill, because it has nothing to do with construction.

The large item in the housing program is for the payment of interest on the old housing program, including Capehart housing; this sum is $167 million. Another large item is for the operation and maintenance of the approximately 200,000 units already completed; this amounts to $306 million. This debt payment and operation maintenance should not be included in this bill, because it is misleading, and will cause Senators and the press to believe that that large amount of military construction is provided in the bill, when it is not construction in any sense of the word.

Returning to the $1,055,851,000 of authorized construction, that amount was decreased to $917,793,000 by the House Appropriations Committee action. The Senate committee reports a figure of $978,083,000.

The bill contains some items that the House deleted and the Senate committee eliminated. There are some items that the House approved that the Senate committee has taken out. There are a few items that came to the Senate committee, not having been submitted to the House, because they were not completed and not ready for submission to the House.

Broadly speaking, we have included four hospitals and have included operating facilities that go with the hospitals, such as nurses' quarters and corpsmen quarters.

Roundly, we have included in the bill money for 7,500 military family housing units. The budget requested 12,100 housing units; authorization action by the Congress reduced the number to 10,140 units. The House allowed 7,755 housing units. The Senate Committee on Appropriations reduced the number to 7,500 and placed money in the bill to build this number.

We included, as eligible for construction, the entire 10,140 unit list as submitted by the Department of Defense, including houses overseas deleted by the House. I shall repeat that for emphasis. All military housing in this budget is included in the bill as being eligible for construction; but the bill provides money to construct only 7,500 of these units. That is exactly the pattern that was followed last year. It has worked very well.

Last year the Senate committee tentatively recommended, and the Senate adopted, a program of military construction of family housing of 7,500 units for a period of a few years at least.

At the end of the fiscal year just closed, 5,000 of those houses were under construction. Now all 7,500 have been started. But all the 7,500 new starts in the bill, plus the 2,500 that have been started since July will total, in round numbers, 10,000 units for the current fiscal year.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], as always, has been very active in the preparation of the bill and in attending the hearings. He has rendered his usual highly valuable service in connection with the bill. He may wish to obtain the floor; and if he wishes to do so, I shall be glad to yield now to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield now to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I merely wish to state that I believe that under his able leadership, this is a good bill; and I believe that the method of allocating the housing is an excellent one, because we included provisions for funds for the 7,500 housing units, but we voted to allow the Department of Defense to decide they shall be built, so the Department can decide on the top priorities—which is very much better than to have Congress decide where and when they shall be built.

As for the general appropriation items for the various services, I believe our subcommittee voted to include the necessary items. We voted to delete some of the items voted by the House, but we voted to include some which the House did not include.

So, in the overall view, I believe the bill as reported by the Senate committee is a good one; and I hope the Senate will support the committee's decisions. Under the leadership of the able Senator from Mississippi, the same conscientious attitude displayed in previous years was again displayed.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Mississippi will recall that when the Secretary of Defense was before the subcommittee, of which I am a member, I raised with him the question of the 200 additional family housing units requested for Malmstrom Air Force Base, at Great Falls, Mont., which at the present time is 1,200 units short. Is the chairman of the subcommittee in a position to explain the situation in regard to Malmstrom Air Force Base and the 200 additional family housing units requested?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. The Senator from Montana made a very strong case for the Malmstrom houses. The housing units for the Malmstrom Air Force Base are included in the bill.

As I have already pointed out, the bill does not provide sufficient funds for the construction of all the housing we have approved for priority allocation by the Department; but the Malmstrom base units are very high on the priority list supplied to the committee; and now it will be up to the Department of Defense and the various services to decide, according to their discretion, where these funds will be spent, within the limits provided by the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Mississippi; that is fair enough.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I also thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his valuable contributions.

In further regard to the housing situation, let me say that the committee followed, in proportion between the various services, the same general percentage proportions which were in the bill to begin with.

Second, the overseas housing is, for the most part, not to be in Western Europe. The only major item in Western Europe is in Spain. The items for oversea housing which are included in the bill will receive consideration and treatment along with the others, but there will be less. The House deleted those items, largely on the ground, so our committee understands, of the balance-of-payments question. We took further proof on that matter, and we have voted to include in the bill the oversea construction items, which we are told will not materially or substantially affect the balance-of-payments problem, because these housing units, or, at least, most of them, are to be prefabricated and built to that extent in the United States, and then shipped in pieces overseas, and put together overseas. At any rate, that item will be worked out in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for the careful attention he has given to the entire field of our defenses and the necessary facilities to be built, particularly in the State which I represent in part.

However, I wish to ask about one item which I understand is in the bill, although not shown as a line item, because it is of the gravest concern in Florida. It has to do with the air defense system extending from the Homestead SAC Base down to Key West. Although it is not a line item, do I correctly understand that it is completely covered by a substantial allowance in the bill?

Mr. STENNIS. That matter is covered in the bill. Incidentally, the Homestead Base was one of the key ones used in the Cuban crisis a little over a year ago, and certainly proved its value.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the Boca Chica Base, which also was used by the Air Force, was the other of the two bases which became so critical at that time; was it not?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Let me say that the matter mentioned by the Senator from Florida is fully taken care of in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the total appropriation recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee amounts to $1,617,489,000. This is an amount of $54,525,000 over allowances provided by the House and $348,911,000 under the budget estimate of $1,966,400,000.

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Army, the committee has approved an amount totaling $207,070,000. This is an increase of over $6,777,000 approved by the House, and a decrease of $42,430,000 from the budget estimate of $249,500,000.

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Navy, the committee has approved an amount totaling $202,223,000. This is an increase of $8,223,000 over the $194 million allowed by the House and a decrease of $67,677,000 from the budget estimate of $269,900,000.

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Air Force, the committee has approved an amount totaling $487,090,000. This is an increase of $36,090,000 over the $451 million allowed by the House, and a decrease of $141,110,000 from the budget estimate of $628,200,000.

For the Reserve forces the committee recommends the budget figure, with the exception of the Army National Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Army Reserve | $4,500,000 |
| Naval Reserve | 6,000,000 |
| Air Force Reserve | 4,000,000 |
| Air National Guard | 16,000,000 |

For the Army National Guard, the committee recommends an appropriation of $5,700,000, which is $2,200,000 more than the House allowance of $3,500,000 and is $2,200,000 more than the budget estimate. Later in my remarks I will explain this increase and the reason therefor.

For the Department of Defense agencies, the committee recommends an appropriation of $50,096,000. This is $2,900,000 below the budget estimate and $9 million over the amount allowed by the House. The appropriation breakdown is as follows:

Defense Atomic Support Agency, $1,861,000; Defense Intelligence Agency, $225,000; Defense Communications Agency, $1,260,000; Defense Supply Agency, $1,035,000 and classified projects, $20 million. This appropriation recognizes a saving of $381,000 from prior years funds for which an adjustment has been made. The committee also recommends for the Department of Defense general support program, including planning, design and minor construction, $3,000,000, and for housing $2,596,000. The committee has approved an appropriation of $20,500,000 for loran stations. This is the same as the budget request.

For the Department of Defense family housing account, the committee recommends an appropriation of $637,406,000. This appropriation consists of the following: For the Army, construction $34,681,000, operations, maintenance, and debt payment $183,396,000; for the Navy, construction $68,248,000, operations, maintenance, and debt payments, $93,944,000; for the Air Force, construction $61,027,000, operations, maintenance, and debt payments $193,514,000; for the Defense Agencies, construction $50,000, operations, maintenance and debt payments, $2,546,000.

The breakdown of construction for housing units on a basis of an allowance of 7,500 units is computed as follows: Army, 1,366 housing units costing $26,664,000; Navy, 3,142, costing $55,649,000; and Air Force, 2,922 costing $53,750,000. This provides a total of $136,063,000 for the construction of 7,500 housing units.

The House allowed $645,171,000 for the Defense housing program. The Senate allowed $637,406,000. This is a reduction of $7,765,000. The Department of Defense requested $685,312,000 of the Senate. Reductions made by the Senate from this request amounted to $47,906,000.

Mr. President, by way of explaining the total reductions made by the committee, included is $225,238,000 made as a result of the reductions in the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1964—Public Law 88-174. The authorization reductions for the services amounted to, and these include the Defense Housing, Army, $47,107,000, Navy, $59,612,000, Air Force, $116,022,000, and Defense Agencies, $2,497,000.

FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. President, a further explanation of the Defense housing section of the bill is needed at this point. One of the complex problems faced by the committee in deciding the appropriations for this bill was the number of family housing units to provide. A very extensive review of the housing was made by the committee. Secretary Robert S. McNamara appeared before our subcommittee accompanied by Gen. Curtis LeMay. We went extensively into service housing requirements for the present and the future.

Within the next 5 years, including fiscal year 1964, the Defense Department expects to request appropriations for 62,100 housing units at a cost of approximately $1,148,000,000. It is the opinion of the committee that such a large program, when taken into consideration with our sharply climbing Federal budget, places a rather heavy fiscal burden on the taxpayer.

The Department of Defense requested approval of a family housing program for fiscal year 1964 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Department of Defense, amounting to 12,100 housing units and costing $734,000,000. This amount was reduced by the Congress in the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1964—Public Law 88-174—to $685,312,000, providing for 10,140 housing units.

House appropriations action approved $645,171,000 for 7,755 housing units, deleting all oversea construction, except Okinawa. This was the situation when the bill came before your committee.

Before describing our recommendations, I would like to review briefly what the committee action was in fiscal 1963. The services had proposed the construction of 14,475 family housing units and the improvement of 2,884 substandard units to public quarters standards, requesting a total of $289,810,000.

The committee conducted a thorough review of family housing for all the services and decided that the 14,475-unit program was too large an undertaking. Accordingly, the program was reduced to 7,500 units, costing a total of $143,742,000. The funds and units were distributed as follows: Department of the

Army, $29,865,000 for 1,600 units; Department of the Navy, $43,880,000 for 2,195 units; Department of the Air Force, $69,997,000 for 3,760 units. The units for each of the services include both housing for the Continental United States and overseas, and the money for improvement of substandard quarters was not disturbed.

Mr. President, the committee has taken similar action this year and recommends that $136,063,000 be appropriated to provide for 7,500 units. However, no specific projects have been deleted from the program. Instead, the Department of Defense is charged with the responsibility of selecting from the authorized 10,140 units, those which they will build on a basis of priority within each of the services. Thus, if the Department deems it necessary to construct authorized houses overseas, it may do so under the provisions of the committee bill, but only within the overall ceiling for each service.

Before I leave the family housing situation, I have one more comment to make. The committee has taken notice that in the fiscal year 1964 military construction budget, the operation, maintenance, and debt payment accounts for housing have become a part of the construction budget request. It is the opinion of the committee that these costs properly should be returned to the Department of Defense appropriation bill. The Department of Defense should give a detailed study to this request and report to the committee its findings. It is to be noted that there is in this bill the amount of $167,000,000 for debt payment service for family housing as well as $306,003,000 for operation and maintenance; making a total of $473,400,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. President, to review briefly, the committee approved an appropriation of $217,270,000 for military construction within the Department of the Army. This represents an appropriation of $207,070,000 for the Active Forces, $4,500,000 for the Army Reserve, and $5,700,000 for the Army National Guard. This is a reduction of $40,230,000 from the budget of $257,500,000.

I would like you to note, regarding construction for Army Active Forces, that almost three-fourths of the appropriation is for construction inside the United States and almost one-half of the total appropriation will be devoted to replacement of deteriorated temporary facilities, mostly World War II mobilization structures. I will elaborate on this in a moment.

The $22.6 million in continental air and missile defense forces will enable the Army Air Defense Command to strengthen our air defense in the Homestead-Miami and Key West, Fla., areas by installation of additional Nike-Hercules and Hawk facilities. The other major expenditure in this program is for protective construction at existing Nike-Hercules sites.

The $35.1 million in general support forces will provide facilities to support general purpose combat units and their direct support elements stationed in the United States or deployed overseas—organized, equipped, and trained for a wide range of potential combat operations. This part of the appropriation will provide significant additions at Fort Carson, Colo.; Fort Hood, Tex.; and additional ammunition storage facilities in Europe.

The $14.5 million in research and development program will provide additional facilities in support of the Army's research and development pogram, notably a laboratory for environmental medicine at Natick, Mass.; and additional facilities at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.; Redstone Arsenal, Ala.; and White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.

The largest program, general support, amounts to $134.9 million, and provides the broad base to meet the Army's training, supply, maintenance, medical services, communications and Army Security Agency requirements. The following are some of the larger items: a special forces complex at Fort Bragg, N.C.; a signal school building at Fort Gordon, Ga.; a hospital at Fort Rucker, Ala.; worldwide communications facilities and troop housing at Fort Dix, N.J.; Fort Jackson, S.C.; Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; and Fort Myers, Va.

Earlier in my remarks, I stated that almost one-half of this appropriation will be devoted to replacement of deteriorated temporary facilities. The Army is energetically pursuing a replacement program aimed at permanent housing for the troops stationed at our permanent stations. Both the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees have endorsed the Army's objective. I am happy to tell you that, within this appropriation, over $28 million will be spent to provide 12,500 permanent barracks spaces and $10 million will be spent to provide almost 1,350 bachelor officer quarters spaces.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The committee has approved $5,700,000 for the Army National Guard. This will enable the National Guard, because of carryover funds of $2,590,000 from prior years, to accomplish 35 armory projects, 3 nonarmory projects, minor construction, advance planning and design. The National Guard with the additional funds will be able to construct in fiscal year 1964, projects that would otherwise have to wait for a period of 1 to 2 years.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The committee recommends an appropriation of $208,223,000 for military construction for the Department of the Navy. This amount is composed of two parts—$202,223,000 for the Active Naval and Marine Corps forces, and $6,000,000 for the Reserve forces. It is $68,667,000 less than the budget estimate of $275,900,000 and $8,223,000 greater than the appropriation approved by the House of Representatives.

This year's program of the Navy is a continuation of a long-rang program for the orderly development and modernization of its shore installations. The primary aim is to improve fleet readiness. This objective will be achieved by providing proper facilities to support modern ships, aircraft and weapons, updated training programs and adequate personnel accommodations.

This Navy program consists of 10 interlocking facilities classes. The first of these is designed to permit the Bureau of Ships to carry out its mission for the construction, repair, and overhaul of modern surface ships and submarines and for general fleet support. The committee recommends an appropriation of $30,306,000 for these purposes. Approximately 40 percent of this amount is required for the nuclear, and, in particular, the Polaris, submarine program. Major improvements at naval shipyards will include, for example, a portal crane at the carrier repair site at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and a classified facility at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. Training facilities for fleet personnel will be provided at Pearl Harbor. Proper living accommodations will be constructed for bachelor officers of Polaris submarine crews home ported at the Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn., and for enlisted men assigned to headquarters of the commander in chief, Atlantic Fleet at Norfolk. A replacement pier will be built at the Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, New London, which is needed for research in sonar and related fields.

The committee recommends $11,546,000 for the second of the facilities classes, fleet base facilities. These funds will be assigned for construction of various structures at naval stations inside the United States. For instance, a barracks is needed to house enlisted men of the alternate crews of Polaris submarines assigned to the Fleet Ballistic Missile Training Center at Charleston. At the Naval Station, San Diego, pier utilities and dredging are required to accommodate the larger, deeper draft ships of the modern fleet.

The third facilities class of the Navy, naval weapons facilities, is the largest. It includes a wide variety of structures for personnel, for training of naval and Marine Corps officers and enlisted men in various aspects of naval aviation, for operation of modern jet fixed wing and helicopter aircraft, and for naval ordnance and for research and development related to aviation and ordnance functions. The committee recommends an appropriation of $65,827,000 for this class. Facilities to be built include target ranges for the Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi; extension of the runway at the Naval Air Station, Key West, Fla., which is needed for safe operation of frontline jet aircraft of the Navy and Air Force operating in the Caribbean area; a helicopter aircraft systems training building at the Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field at Camp Pendleton; an underwater tracking facility at the Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Wash.; a composite propellant facility at the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake; and airfield lighting at the Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland.

For supply facilities, the committee recommends an appropriation of $352,000 for the single project in this class. This will provide administrative space for the Fleet Material Support Office, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Funds in the amount of $9,251,000 are provided for construction of various facilities required for the operational training and readiness of Marine ground forces. These include, for example, combat training support at the Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, and the gamut of facilities, totaling $6,445,000, at Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, ranging from headquarters buildings to barracks, warehouses, shops and training buildings to replace typhoon-damaged tents, quonset huts, and Butler buildings.

The sixth facilities class in the Navy program is service school facilities. These are needed, in general, for the education and training of officer and enlisted personnel of the Navy. This need has been generated by the continuing advancements in science and technology which have considerable impact on naval ships, weapons systems, tactics, and strategy. The committee recommends appropriations of $12,783,000 for this group of facilities. Typical examples of construction for this purpose are an instruction building at the Naval Schools, Mine Warfare at Charleston, and a technical school at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., for training enlisted men in such critical rates as advanced electronics technician.

For the next class, medical facilities, the Navy has included a single project in its program. This is for construction of a barracks to house the corpsmen assigned to duty at the new naval hospital at Long Beach, Calif. This project will cost $336,000.

The Navy requires specialized facilities for reliable, secure, and rapid communication for control of the operating forces, to perform security functions, and to facilitate administration of the Naval Establishment. The projects for communication facilities, the eighth facilities class in the naval program, are reviewed thoroughly by the Defense Communication Agency and are integrated fully with the systems of the other military departments. The amount of $41,602,000 is provided for this group of facilities. Among those approved by the committee are the relocation of radio receiving facilities from Cheltenham, Md., to Sugar Grove, W. Va.; a messhall and sewage treatment plant at the Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine; and a communication center at the Naval Communication Station, Londonderry, North Ireland.

The committee also recommends that $6,730,000 be appropriated for a project at the Naval Research Laboratory in the District of Columbia. This Laboratory is engaged in essential scientific research in the physical sciences and related fields, directed toward improving materials, equipment, techniques, and systems for the Navy. It has, through the years, developed a very high degree of technical competence which can only be maintained by providing modern research tools. One of the three line items included in this project is for a sector focusing cyclotron building. It will be utilized in fields not now covered or planned in the scientific community, such as the simulation of high energy radiation encountered in outer space.

The final Navy facilities class is yards and docks facilities for which the committee has approved an appropriation of $23,490,000. This class provides general, Navy-wide support of the shore establishment. It includes, for example, utility projects at the Navy Public Works Centers at Newport and Norfolk, reconstruction of a World War II-built wharf at the Seabee Center, Port Hueneme, Calif. It is the single Navy source of funds in limited amounts for minor construction which may be urgently needed during the ensuing year at various naval and Marine Corps installations, for access roads, and for preparation of plans for the military construction program.

To the $6,000,000 in new obligational authority which the committee has recommended for the Reserve forces program, the Navy will add $1,069,000 from savings from previously appropriated funds; $2,113,000 of the $7,069,000 program total is for rehabilitation of World War II messhalls, barracks, and bachelor officers' quarters at naval air stations in 7 different areas of the country; $3,232,000 is for training centers at 16 various communities throughout the United States for training officers and enlisted men of the Ready Reserve in ship operation; and $1,304,000 is for construction of training centers for Marine Corps ground forces. Practically all of these activities are used jointly by two or more of the services.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. President, the committee has approved an appropriation of $487,090,000 for the Active Forces, Department of the Air Force. This is an increase of $36,090,000 over the $451,000,000 allowed by the House and a decrease of $141,110,000 from the budget estimate of $628,200,000.

The $487,090,000 program for construction of facilities for the Active Forces includes projects at 58 worldwide major Air Force installations. Of these, 104 are in the 50 States and 54 are elsewhere. In addition, the program provides facilities at a number of other minor sites and locations, including those of the air control and warning networks, communications sites, missile range stations, and sites of classified activities.

A major portion of the Air Force construction program, or 34 percent of the total, provides facilities in direct support of the forces of the Strategic Air Command. This amount consists of facilities for the intercontinental ballistic missiles, for manned bombers and their supporting tanker aircraft, and for control and support.

A total of $155,800,000 is for facilities for the three major intercontinental ballistic missile systems—Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman. Most of the major construction problems associated with the earlier phases of this huge and tremendously complex, first-of-a-kind program have been resolved.

As a note of interest I might say to the Senate that construction of operational facilities to support the 13-squadron Atlas weapon system and the 12-squadron Titan weapon system has been completed. Nineteen of these twenty-five squadrons are operational. Assembly and checkout are in progress on the remaining six Titan II squadrons.

Projects in this bill for Minuteman facilities amount to $145.8 million. Of this total, $140.7 million is for major work on the sixth Minuteman wing of three squadrons to be located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak. This will be the first base for the "improved Minuteman," which has been designated the Minuteman II. The additional $5,100,000 is for test and training facilities to support the Minuteman II.

The major construction projects to initially base the Strategic Air Command bomber and tanker forces have been provided in prior construction programs. However, $18,000,000 is provided in this bill for improvements to these bases. The projects included for this purpose largely involve alterations and additions to existing facilities to provide for increased efficiency and utility.

The appropriation for continental air and missile defense includes $71,700,000 for facilities which will reduce the vulnerability of the defense systems and provide them with increased capabilities.

The major portion of the defense program package consists of projects totaling $41,500,000 which are directly associated with fighter interceptor aircraft. Of this amount $39,000,000 is for construction of a minimum complement of operational facilities at a number of bases to increase survivability of the air defense command fighters by dispersing them in small unit increments.

The other $2,500,000 for interceptors principally provides additional operational and maintenance facilities at certain present locations of fighter units in the United States.

Control and warning are essential elements of the air defense system. To enhance capabilities in these areas, $19,000,000 was requested.

A major project in the control and warning group, at a cost of $6,500,000, is for the North American Air Defense Combat Operations Center, Colorado Springs, Colo. A total of $22,400,000 for construction of the North American Air Defense Combat Operations Center was authorized and financed in fiscal years 1960 and 1962. The excavation work is essentially complete and the contract for the basic interior structure was awarded in February 1963. The additional $6,500,000 in this program is needed to complete this facility. The correction of rock faults discovered during excavation requires additional construction money.

Another major item in the control and warning group is back-up interceptor control—BUIC—and passive detection facilities at a total cost of $4,000,000. These will be at a number of air control and warning sites in the United States.

Various support facilities for the Continental Defense Forces not related to specific defense systems are in this bill in the amount of about $12,400,000. Projects are included at 14 bases of the Air Defense and Alaskan Commands. Of the total, $5,100,000 is for special mission support at Shemya Air Force Station, Alaska.

The increased emphasis on capabilities for conduct of conventional war operations under possible conditions of several simultaneous contingencies is reflected in the Air Force construction request of $69,100,000 for support of the general purpose and airlift forces. The committee has reduced the foregoing overall figure to $55,900,000. A large reduction of $6,000,000 was made in the fighter dispersal program. Of this total, $42,400,000 related to the general purpose forces of the Tactical Air Command and the oversea theater commands. Facilities requested to support the airlift forces of the Tactical Air Command, Military Air Transport Service, and the oversea commands amount to $13,500,000.

Two-fifths of the construction provides for the General Purpose Forces, in direct support of tactical fighter and reconnaissance aircraft units of the Tactical Air Command and the Pacific and European Commands.

The rapidly advancing technology in military systems requires concurrent emphasis and timely provision of supporting facilities. The unique nature and technical requirements of many approved research and development programs necessitates new construction or major alterations of existing facilities. This is particularly true of missile and space applications which today receive a major share of the research and development effort. The committee has approved projects in the amount of $44,000,000 for research and development. Included for research and development are projects supporting specific major missile and space development programs, including missile test ranges, test facilities for the mobile midrange ballistic missile, test complex for support of the Titan III space booster program, and facility expansion and improvement on the Atlantic Missile Range.

Major technical items in the research support package include a high thrust rocket research facility and a toxic research facility at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., in the total amount of $9,400,000; alteration of the hypersonic gas dynamics wind tunnel and construction of a propulsion instrumentation test laboratory, totaling $3,300,000, at Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tenn.; and construction of a vacuum telescope at a cost of $2,900,000 at Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, N.M.

In the area of general support programs the committee has approved $148,000,000. This portion covers general support services and various activities and missions not included in the primary systems and programs previously discussed. As new weapons, aircraft, and equipment enter our inventory, new training programs are developed to support them in an endless evolution brought about by our research and development.

Facilities for flying training and the increasingly important technical training programs constitute the bulk of the training request. The important project in the technical training package is for replacement of World War II mobilization-type dormitories housing 600 airmen at Chanute Air Force Base, Ill. The buildings to be replaced are badly deteriorated and in addition are located in the approach zone of the primary runway.

For various logistic support activities of the Air Force logistics command, and depot maintenance facilities, a number of projects are included. These projects consist almost wholly of alterations to existing buildings to adapt them for maintenance work on new systems and equipment. An additional $2.7 million is included in the program for alteration of existing facilities at five Air Force logistic command bases to house automatic data processing and logistical control functions. The improvements requested are essential for efficient supply and maintenance management of the weapons systems assigned to those bases for logistical support.

Communications facilities, including major system nets, base communications and telephone facilities, and related electric power projects, are included in the bill. Construction supporting six major communications systems amount to $14,600,000 of the $19,900,000 total. These systems are part of the overall defense communications system. They will provide additional capabilities and increased reliability of communications systems in North America and in the Far East, European, and Mediterranean areas.

Appropriations in the amount of $6,100,000 are approved for navigational aids for air traffic control and landing. These projects consist principally of area search radars, radar approach control facilities, runway approach and taxiway lighting, and control towers.

Medical facilities in this Air Force program include hospitals, dispensaries, and dental clinics.

New hospitals are approved at three bases: Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.; Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex.; and Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. A major addition to the existing hospital is approved for Keesler Air Force Base, Miss. A major alteration project also is included for Travis Air Force Base, Calif. The committee also added a hospital at Warren Air Force Base, in the amount of $2,000,000.

The committee has approved $25,000,000 for planning, $15,000,000 for minor construction, and $10,200,000 for access roads, for a total of $50,200,000.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, this concludes my presentation of action on the military construction bill for fiscal year 1964. The Appropriations Committee made a very extensive review of every line item in this bill, both classified and unclassified. The reductions in this bill have, in some instances, been extensive, particularly in regard to the family housing program. However, it is the opinion of the committee that this bill furnishes for the Department of Defense and the services the funds necessary to carry on a successful construction program and to meet all necessary service requirements.

Mr. President, unless there are questions to be asked, I believe that covers my presentation in connection with the bill, except for a comparative statement in regard to the appropriations for the year 1963 and the bill for the fiscal year 1964, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1964*

| Item | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimates, 1964 | Recommended in House bill for 1964 | Amount recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimates, 1964 | House bill |
| MILITARY CONSTRUCTION | | | | | | | |
| Military construction, Army | $181,272,000 | $249,500,000 | $200,293,000 | $207,070,000 | +$25,798,000 | −$42,430,000 | +$6,777,000 |
| Military construction, Navy | 193,355,000 | 269,900,000 | 194,000,000 | 202,223,000 | +8,868,000 | −67,677,000 | +8,223,000 |
| Military construction, Air Force | 847,810,500 | 628,200,000 | 451,000,000 | 487,090,000 | −360,720,500 | −141,110,000 | +36,090,000 |
| Military construction, Defense agencies | 35,677,000 | 29,900,000 | 24,000,000 | 27,000,000 | −8,677,000 | −2,900,000 | +3,000,000 |
| Loran stations, Defense | 20,000,000 | 20,500,000 | 14,500,000 | 20,500,000 | +500,000 | | +6,000,000 |
| Military construction, Army Reserve | 8,000,000 | 4,500,000 | 4,500,000 | 4,500,000 | −3,500,000 | | |
| Military construction, Naval Reserve | 7,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 6,000,000 | −1,000,000 | | |
| Military construction, Air Force Reserve | 5,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | −1,000,000 | | |
| Military construction, Army National Guard | 7,000,000 | 3,500,000 | 3,500,000 | 5,700,000 | −1,300,000 | +2,200,000 | +2,200,000 |
| Military construction, Air Guard | 14,000,000 | 16,000,000 | 16,000,000 | 16,000,000 | +2,000,000 | | |
| Total, military construction | 1,319,114,500 | 1,232,000,000 | 917,793,000 | 980,083,000 | −339,031,500 | −251,917,000 | +62,290,000 |

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1964*—Continued

| Item | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimates, 1964 | Recommended in House bill for 1964 | Amount recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimates, 1964 | House bill |
| FAMILY HOUSING [1] | | | | | | | |
| Family housing, Army: | | | | | | | |
| Construction | (1) | $57,400,000 | $41,364,000 | $34,681,000 | +$34,681,000 | −$22,719,000 | −$6,683,000 |
| Operation, maintenance, and debt payment | (1) | 188,290,000 | 183,396,000 | 183,396,000 | +183,396,000 | −4,894,000 | |
| Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps: | | | | | | | |
| Construction | (1) | 94,700,000 | 80,036,000 | 68,248,000 | +68,248,000 | −26,452,000 | −11,788,000 |
| Operation, maintenance, and debt payment | (1) | 95,981,000 | 93,944,000 | 93,944,000 | +93,944,000 | −2,037,000 | |
| Family housing, Air Force: | | | | | | | |
| Construction | (1) | 97,850,000 | 50,321,000 | 61,027,000 | +61,027,000 | −36,823,000 | +10,706,000 |
| Operation, maintenance, and debt payment | (1) | 197,583,000 | 193,514,000 | 193,514,000 | +193,514,000 | −4,069,000 | |
| Family housing, Defense agencies: | | | | | | | |
| Construction | (1) | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | +50,000 | | |
| Operation, maintenance, and debt payment | (1) | 2,546,000 | 2,546,000 | 2,546,000 | +2,546,000 | | |
| Total, family housing | (1) | 734,400,000 | 645,171,000 | 637,406,000 | [1] +637,406,000 | −96,994,000 | −7,765,000 |
| Total | 1,319,114,500 | 1,966,400,000 | 1,562,964,000 | 1,617,489,000 | +298,374,500 | −348,911,000 | +54,525,000 |

[1] For fiscal year 1963, funds for new construction of housing were included under "Military construction" accounts of the departments. Funds for operation and maintenance were included in the Defense Appropriation Act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to submit a brief statement, following and supplementing the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, once again it is my pleasure to rise in support of the remarks of our subcommittee chairman who has again so ably directed the bill this year. I shall not attempt to make a detailed analysis as he has done but I feel it important to underline some of the things he has said. We recognize that this bill has had careful attention in the Armed Services Committees of both Houses in the authorization process and again in the Committees on Appropriations these items have been combed over and evaluated. It is safe to say that this bill has had at least four detailed hearings and reviews by the time we are through with it today. It is for this reason that I do not feel it necessary for me to go back over what our chairman has said.

Our initial goal was to stay as close to the House figures as we possibly could. This meant that we would of necessity be very strict in our considerations of reclamas, and we only made restorations where the proof was convincing. Let me touch on these in summary form.

First, we restored money which had been cut from the House in unobligated balances. Here the cuts were too deep and to compensate for these the departments would have had to cut approved items. This amounted to $14.7 million.

Next, the services made what we believe to be a valid case for restoration of items such as barracks, messhalls, utility provisions, and the like. I shall not enumerate these items other than to say they were well justified. In some instances, the committee position may not seem consistent where we have denied a wind tunnel to the Navy at White Oak, Md., whereas we grant $2.4 million for a gas dynamic wind tunnel at the Arnold Engineering Center in Tennessee. The need for Navy device was not as critical as the Air Force facility which will have a bearing on our development of advanced military flight vehicles. The Navy tunnel seemed to the committee to duplicate, to some extent, NASA facilities already in operation.

Let me now direct the attention of the Senate to the problem our committee faced in the matter of military hospitals. We were impressed that money should be allowed for construction of three hospitals and in addition $2 million was added for a hospital at Cheyenne, Wyo. It is my feeling that there are firm needs for all of these hospital additions.

The final class of additions I should touch on is for the Army National Guard where we exceeded the House and the budget estimates by adding $2.2 million to raise the total to $5.7 million.

It should be pointed out here that the Senate committee has made some cuts in this bill. These cuts involve for the most part of reduction of some repetitive items such as motor repair shops, air, and naval facilities.

Now, let me recap what Senator STENNIS has said about military housing. Secretary McNamara and General LeMay appeared before our committee and made a strong appeal for additional units of military housing—of the 10,141 requested units, the House allowed 7,755 units. Last year the committee appropriated funds to build 7,500 housing units, and only in the very recent past has this money been committed for the purpose for which it was voted. For this reason it was felt that it would be adequate to fund the construction of the same number of units this year. Our committee felt that it should not state where these should be built, nor did we attempt to say what types of houses should be constructed. The services and the Defense Department have made a strong appeal for transportable or relocatable homes to be used in remote areas or for use overseas. It has been said these can be constructed here and shipped to oversea bases without having a harmful affect on our balance of payments with other nations. In summary, what we have done is to fund the construction of 7,500 housing units without designating which of the 10,141 units requested should be built. This has the effect of putting both the amount and the number of eligible homes in conference with the House.

In closing let me say I feel this bill compares very favorably with the bill we passed last year which I hope will be a high water mark. As has been pointed out, this bill carries the funds for maintenance and operation of these facilities. Last year this item was carried in the defense bill, and we earnestly hope it will be carried in the defense bill in fiscal year 1965. It has had the effect of inflating this bill. The bill we favorably commend to the Senate is still 348.9 million under the budget estimates. The total amount is $1.6 billion.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text, provided that no point of order be considered to have been waived by reason of the agreement to this proposed order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 4, after the word "expended", to strike out "$200,293,000" and insert "$207,070,000".

On page 2, line 14, after the word "expended", to strike out "$194,000,000" and insert "$202,223,000".

On page 2, line 24, after the word "expended", to strike out "$451,000,000" and insert "$487,090,000".

On page 3, line 9, after the word "expended", to strike out "$24,000,000" and insert "$27,000,000".

On page 4, line 21, after the word "expended", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$5,700,000".

On page 5, line 6, after the word "expended", to strike out "$14,500,000" and insert "$20,500,000".

On page 5, line 23, after the word "law", to strike out "$645,171,000" and insert "$637,406,000"; on page 6, line 4, after the word

"Construction", to strike out "$41,364,000" and insert "$34,681,000"; in line 8, after the word "Construction", to strike out "$80,036,000" and insert "$68,248,000", and in line 12, after the word "Construction", to strike out "$50,321,000" and insert "$61,027,000".

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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 9139) was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was pass be reconsidered.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings for today.)

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the report has been taken up at this time merely for the purpose of having it laid before the Senate, so that the conference report will be the business tomorrow.

Unless some Senator desires to proceed to debate the conference report tonight, it will not be debated now.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MORSE. In connection with the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill, I wish to file a caveat with respect to the composition of the Senate conferees, for not one of the Senate conferees was selected from the group of those of us who opposed the bill and not one of the Senate conferees was selected from the group of those of us who advocated various policy changes in the bill.

It is interesting to note that the conference report which has come to the Senate guts the policy changes proposed by those of us who opposed the bill.

So it will be necessary for the American people to be informed of our point of view in opposition; and tomorrow we shall proceed to debate the conference report for such length of time as we believe necessary in order to present our case. We shall point out that the conference report is a shocking one which should be returned to conference. The Senate will have an opportunity to send the report back to conference.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 10, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Matthew 19: 26: *With God all things are possible.*

God of majesty and mercy, in this brief moment of communion with Thee, may we be richly endowed with a greater capacity and ability to discharge faithfully the many duties that confront us.

We acknowledge penitently that at times we are tempted to yield to those debilitating and devastating moods which make us feel that our vision of a better world is merely an illusion.

God forbid that we should allow our faith to become eclipsed by those days of darkness when many nations are still speaking the language of hatred and hostility instead of the language of friendship and fraternity.

Grant that we may go onward and forward with faith and courage, confident in the spiritual ideals and principles, which our Lord proclaimed in the long ago, but which humanity seems so reluctant to accept and still so unwilling to try.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 6, 1963, was read and approved.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 7, 1963, was read.

## 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. 1221. An act for the relief of Nick Masonich;

H.R. 1271. An act for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang;

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jan and Anna Smal (nee Dworzanski);

H.R. 1432. An act for the relief of Pasquale Marrella;

H.R. 1475. An act for the relief of John William Horling;

H.R. 1495. An act for the relief of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen;

H.R. 1542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy;

H.R. 1545. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 1566. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto;

H.R. 2238. An act for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs;

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zoltan Friedmann;

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Hurley Construction Co.;

H.R. 3366. An act for the relief of Ferenc Molnar.

H.R. 3662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett;

H.R. 3908. An act for the relief of Jeung Sing, also known as Chang Sheng and Rafael Chang Sing;

H.R. 4141. An act for the relief of Smith L. Parratt and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents;

H.R. 4288. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden;

H.R. 4507. An act for the relief of Angeliki Devaris;

H.R. 4760. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin;

H.R. 4862. An act for the relief of Tricia Kim;

H.R. 5289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber;

H.R. 5453. An act for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux);

H.R. 5495. An act for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y.;

H.R. 5703. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy;

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;

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Bettey Onken Voegelin;

H.R. 6001. An act to authorize the conveyance to the Waukegan Port District, Illinois, of certain real property of the United States;

H.R. 6038. An act for the relief of Mariano Carrese and Vincenzina Ciavattini Restuccia;

H.R. 6316. An act for the relief of Generoso Bucci Cammisa;

H.R. 6624. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Foto Napoli, Salvatore Napoli, Antonina Napoli, and Michela Napoli.

H.R. 7268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingrid Gudrun Schroder Brown; and

H.R. 7601. An act for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is

requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1289. An act for the relief of Maria Merghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina);

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson;

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;

H.R. 4276. An act to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia; and

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as "Wright Brothers Day."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 633. An act for the relief of Michelle Su Zehr (Lim Myung Im);

S. 689. An act for the relief of Lila Everts Weber;

S. 692. An act to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes;

S. 949. An act to amend the "United Nations Participation Act," as amended (63 Stat. 734–736);

S. 1169. An act to authorize a per capital distribution of $350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation;

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents;

S. 1332. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Leitzel;

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Pietro Maggio;

S. 1466. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies;

S. 1518. An act for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake;

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Hipolito Mora Lorilla;

S. 1757. An act to ratify certain conveyances of land on the Crow Indian Reservation;

S. 1760. An act for the relief of Dr. Margot R. Sobey III;

S. 1781. An act for the relief of Antonio Credenza;

S. 1822. An act for the relief of Apostolos Gerontis and his wife, Anastasia;

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Alva Arlington Garnes;

S. 1943. An act for the relief of Mrs. William H. Quasha;

S. 1951. An act for the relief of George Elias NeJame (Noujaim);

S. 1958. An act for the relief of Ivanka Pekar;

S. 1976. An act for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Antero Sanchez (Hernandez);

S. 2040. An act to amend title 35 of the United States Code to perimt a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes;

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Pietrina Del Frate;

S. 2085. An act for the relief of William Mauer Trayfors;

S. 2100. An act to continue for a certain period certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber;

S. 2213. An act to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency;

S. 2218. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for the purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes; and

S. 2242. An act for the relief of Livia Sernini (Cucciati).

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "an act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 64–7.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I request a point of information for the benefit of the House as to whether or not the House was convened on December 7, 1963, and, if so, assuming the absence of a quorum and knowing the adjournment in face of objections, and parliamentary inquiries, did it constitute a legislative day?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman, in response to the parliamentary inquiry, that last Saturday did constitute a legislative day. The House was called to order at 12 o'clock and adjourned at approximately 2 minutes after 12.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in that event I have two further requests. I ask unanimous consent to insert my own remarks in the RECORD as of that date and, second, I reserve the right to object to the Journal as read today.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has submitted two separate requests. Will the gentleman submit his first request?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include an extension of my remarks in the RECORD as of that date, which did constitute a legislative day.

The SPEAKER. That is, the permanent RECORD of last Saturday?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to the Journal as read for Saturday, December 7.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects to approval of the Journal?

Mr. HALL. I reserve that right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to approve the Journal of last Saturday.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Journal of last Saturday stands approved.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO COMMISSION ON THE DISPOSITION OF ALCATRAZ ISLAND

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 88–138, the Chair appoints as a member of the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island the gentleman from California, Mr. COHELAN.

## CIVIL RIGHTS

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?

Mr. COLMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I am sure the gentleman is going to have some very valuable and wise remarks to make here. There is so much confusion in the well I think the gentleman is entitled to be heard. Therefore I ask that the well of the House be cleared.

The SPEAKER. The Chair might observe that apparently the present Members are attempting to exercise the rights they have under the rules of the House. There is nothing that is taking place that the Chair thinks contravenes the rules of the House.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. Is it in order for a Member of the House, regardless of how humble he may be, to request that the well of the House be cleared at any time?

The SPEAKER. In the event of disorder the Chair would clear the well. As to the question of humbleness, every Member in this body is not only great, but the Chair also knows they are humble.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House is not in order and ask that the well of the House be cleared.

The SPEAKER. The Chair observes no disorder, and the Chair observes only one gentleman in the well at the present time, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, because of the imperative need to pass the civil rights bill, every weapon available must be used. Thus I have filed today a discharge petition, with the hope that a goodly number of Members will sign it immediately. Passage of this bill must be above personality, above any power play, above any solicitude for so-called regular procedure. It must be above partisan advantage, above the charge of infringing upon the prerogative of anyone.

A discharge petition is not ultra vires, it is not something unholy or untouchable. It is part of our rules. It should cause no eyebrow lifting.

Judge SMITH, for whom I have profound regard, has promised a hearing on the bill, but in Delphic language; namely, reasonably soon in January. How soon? Will the hearings be short or long and protracted? We have had 6 months of hearings. All that need be said has been said. If the hearings become a "furtive

filibuster" we shall beat the bushes and secure the required signatures.

President Johnson said the bill is "above all" necessary—"above all" necessary, I will say, in importance and in point of time.

## CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, during the last week, some Members who have said they support the civil rights bill have opposed signing a discharge petition to bring it to the floor.

They have indicated they would prefer to use Calendar Wednesday. For this reason, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] last week objected to the usual unanimous-consent request to dispense with Calendar Wednesday.

I suggest to the House that Calendar Wednesday is an impractical, if not impossible, method by which to consider the civil rights bill.

First, Calendar Wednesday is subject to an abundance of dilatory tactics which give a determined opposition great opportunity for delay. For example, unless unanimous consent is granted, this 72-page bill would be read in full. Furthermore, in 1960, during consideration of the depressed areas bill, nine rollcalls were had before the House began general debate on the bill.

Second, 11 committees must be called before the Committee on the Judiciary is called—a potential 11-week delay.

Third, if the previous question is not ordered on the day on which the bill is brought up, it may not be considered again on Calendar Wednesday until the committee is again called—an additional potential delay of 19 weeks. This is because, under rule XXIV, section 7, no motion for a recess is in order until the last 2 weeks of a session. Since a resolution fixing an adjournment date, and thus determining the last 2 weeks of a session, is subject to a filibuster by Members of the other body, a motion to recess is unlikely ever to be in order.

Finally, the Calendar Wednesday rule provides for only 2 hours' general debate.

By contrast, if a majority of the Members of the House sign the discharge petition before Christmas, they will be assured that the civil rights bill will come to the floor on the second Monday in January, and that an adequate time for debate will be had.

I urge all those who seek prompt consideration of H.R. 7152, without the potential dilatory tactics and extended delay which Calendar Wednesday provides, to sign the discharge petition today.

## SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Select Committee on Small Business may be allowed to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

## PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON: THE FIRST 15 DAYS

Mr. HECHLER. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday marked the 15th day that President Lyndon B. Johnson has been in office.

These 15 days have demonstrated the durable strength of the American system of government. These 15 days have revealed the people of the United States of America in their finest hour, unified and united in the face of the events which so profoundly shocked every human being.

But beyond everything else, these 15 days have shown the qualities of a great and good President. In the entire history of our Nation, no Vice President succeeding to the presidency has so quickly and firmly grasped the reins of leadership, so completely articulated the mood and wishes of the American people, nor so thoroughly demonstrated his high prestige and influence among the leaders of the world. In fact, few Chief Executives in American history elected to office in their own right have accomplished as much in the first 15 days.

Upon the firm foundation of these 15 fabulous days, I am confident that President Lyndon B. Johnson will continue to build the inner strength and spirit, the great resources, the power, and the world leadership of the United States of America.

## CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JOELSON. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been on the line to the right and was No. 33 to sign the discharge petition to get the civil rights bill onto the floor of the House for a vote. I heard the gentleman from Mississippi object to this line on the ground that it created confusion. I just want to assure the gentleman that when I was standing on that line, I was never less confused in my life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

## CIVIL RIGHTS DISCHARGE PETITION

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to sign the civil rights discharge petition today. There is no more important legislation before the Congress than H.R. 7152—the civil rights bill.

President Kennedy told the Nation on June 11 of this year:

> We face, therefore, a moral crisis as a country and as a people. It cannot be met by repressive police action. It cannot be left to increased demonstrations in the streets. It cannot be quieted by token moves or talk. It is time to act in the Congress.

Following this eloquent address, President Kennedy sent to Congress the most comprehensive civil rights bill ever proposed by any administration. That was in June. It is 6 months later; the end of this session is approaching; as a body we have not considered this measure.

After 100 years of emancipation without freedom, American Negroes have a right to question whether redress can be found in the legislative process. Every day of delay strengthens the argument that it is not possible.

The American people have a right to ask whether Congress is obsolete, inherently incapable of meeting the great problems of our times. Every day of delay impairs the confidence of the American people in Congress.

The people of the world have a right to ask whether the United States is sincere in its professed principle of equality for all men. Every day of delay impairs the prestige of the United States around the world.

Mr. Speaker, above all we should ask ourselves whether we can conscientiously permit any further delay.

The American people and people everywhere are looking at the Congress of the United States to see whether or not this institution is capable of constructive action on the great moral issue of our time—equality for all our citizens. Let all of us this morning line up to sign the discharge petition.

## EXTENSION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on my special order on the 12th the time be extended to 30 minutes instead of 15.

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

There was no objection.

## NINE OUT OF TEN FAVOR NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, a recent poll conducted by McCall's magazine reveals that 9 out of 10 Americans favor a national lottery.

The survey, taken of McCall's magazine readers, asked: "Should the Government establish a national lottery?"

The magazine conducted the poll in connection with an article by veteran racket buster, Edwyn Silberling. Mr. Silberling urged a national lottery as the only way to deal organized crime a crushing blow.

The extra heavy gambling activity this past weekend at our New York racetracks provided further proof that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in most human beings.

Over 90,000 persons pushed through the gates to pump almost $8½ million through the windows at Aqueduct racetrack and Roosevelt raceway last Saturday which was the last day of the horseracing season.

This recordbreaking attendance and wagering on the last day helped to bring this year's New York total parimutuel betting to $1,235,404,012, an increase of over $108 million over last year.

What about the billions bet illegally around this country? Who benefits?

As Mr. Silberling said:

> Just as the profits from bootleg liquor financed organized crime back in the days of prohibition, so the profits from illegal gambling are financing it now.

Mr. Silberling, a former head of Attorney General Kennedy's top priority anticrime project, declared attempts to curb gamblers have failed, and that not even the FBI has been able to make a dent in the gambling racket.

Why not be sensible and realistic about this issue? Especially in these days when the gambling problem keeps growing and the Government's need for additional revenue becomes more urgent.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of stating that I was present at the session which was called on Saturday last, December 7. I understand this Saturday session, the first one this year, was called for the purpose of filling the legal requirements for the 7-day notice period having to do with the discharge petition on civil rights. Because no opportunity was afforded those of us who were in attendance to be recorded as being present through a formal rollcall, I wish the fact that I was present to be noted and recorded in this way.

## THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL AND BIPARTISAN ACTION

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it may well be that a discharge petition is the best way to force the Rules Committee into early and positive action on civil rights. That has been true in the past and undoubtedly we should have action in this December and not wait until January.

I have every intention of signing the discharge petition for that reason, but it ought to be remembered that most of the Members on the majority side who have talked rather piously today about signing the discharge petition had nothing to do with putting together and developing a very important bipartisan measure of civil rights, and a very good bill. Most of them sat on the sidelines, and probably most of them to this day have not taken the trouble to read it. It ought to be remembered, too, that, that was a delicate bipartisan coalition that was formed in October and November. It was a very important bipartisan legislative effort and it is entitled to a very high degree of respect. The Republicans who developed this civil rights bill, along with representatives of the Justice Department, were not consulted in advance of the decision by one or more majority Members to use discharge petition procedures. Failure or refusal to consult is a poor way to go about advancing the cause of civil rights in the United States today. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has just spoken in opposition to the use of Calendar Wednesday in order to bring up the civil rights bill next week. Well, is he right? Calendar Wednesday may well be a far better way. It definitely would bring the bill before the House far sooner than any other procedure. We would have the bill passed in the House this year. As I recall, the gentleman from Missouri warmly approved of the use of Calendar Wednesday to bring the education bill to the floor 2 years ago. That, also, was a complicated bill. But the point is, why was not all this discussed across the table? Where is the good faith? Why is it necessary now to go in separate directions? I intend to sign the petition, and I hope other minority Members will sign, but it is time for a warning: either we—those who care about civil rights—stay together on this subject or we will lose. Many majority Members have been charged in the past with preferring an issue to a bill. They should take care lest they give further credence to the charge.

## DEMAGOGUERY ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to a great deal of talk here today about the urgency of the civil rights bill and the discharge petition. But I have been wondering about this matter of urgency in this connection. I have checked the record and I find that on the first day of this session, on January 9, and the days following there were a lot of so-called civil rights bills introduced. What I have been unable to understand is why the chairman of the Judiciary Committee waited until May 8 before he even began hearings, and why he waited until October 29 to steamroller, after 2 minutes of quote debate, unquote, the bill out of committee. If they did it on October 29, they could have done it on January 29.

Then I also note that the report was not made until November 20. In other words 10½ months elapsed between the time that this session convened until the Judiciary Committee filed its report. The same people who reported this bill out at the end of October, could have done it in the same manner last January. The record does not support the claims being made by many, including the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that there is such urgency. If it took the Judiciary Committee 10½ months to report a bill which was not even discussed in the committee, certainly it is not unreasonable to suggest that some responsible group take a few days to learn what is in the bill and to acquaint the public with the issues involved and this should not be done in an atmosphere of emotion. I think there is a lot of demagoguery going on around here that the public ought to know about.

## PENDING RETIREMENT FROM CONGRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN F. SHELLEY

Mr. SHELLEY. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House of Representatives, I thank you for your reception of my request today.

After 14 years of service with you, this will probably be the last time that I shall stand here in the well of the House to address you.

I have been honored by the voters and the people of my native city of San Francisco in having been elected mayor of that city, which office I assume on January 8.

I have enjoyed every minute of my service with each of you. I have enjoyed my committee work. I leave you with a sense of having made friends and established friendships which I know I shall hold forever.

I want you to know that when any of you, either individually or as members of committees, come to San Francisco, you will no longer get the red-carpet treatment. You will get the green-carpet treatment with Irish pipers on each side.

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

Mr. SHELLEY. I shall be very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the majority I should like to express, first, the sincere congratulations of all of us to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Secondly, I wish to express our profound regret over the fact that his success means that he must leave us.

Mr. Speaker, having the gentleman here has been a pleasure to all of us. He has made a great contribution to this body and to our country.

Mr. SHELLEY. May I also say, Mr. Speaker, as one who has sat on this side of the center aisle, I am looking forward with a great deal of pleasure to welcoming the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and his party to their convention in San Francisco next summer.

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

Mr. SHELLEY. I shall be very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman wish us success in electing our candidate after we nominate him at that time in the gentleman's city?

Mr. SHELLEY. I shall wish you all the success in the world in choosing a real good nominee, sir.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that we shall look forward to seeing him out there, as we have always been pleased and happy to be with the gentleman here.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank my friend and colleague, Mr. HALLECK. It has been a pleasure to work with and against my friend, the minority leader, but always on the issue and not on a personal basis. We are *still* friends I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, it is with some heaviness in my heart, even though I was elated at the election, but saddened by what happened 2 weeks later. Nevertheless, even today it is with some hesitancy that I say, Mr. Speaker, goodby, good luck, God bless you and our country.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1964, the great city of San Francisco, Calif., will install the Honorable JOHN F. SHELLEY as mayor. San Francisco is indeed fortunate to have a man of such high caliber and ability to be its chief executive. I congratulate both Congressman SHELLEY and the city of San Francisco, but I cannot completely suppress a twinge of sadness when I contemplate his absence from this body.

I have known JOHN SHELLEY personally since the day he first came here to serve his district in the U.S. House of Representatives. Over the years I have come to appreciate and admire his diligence and dedication with which he has served his district, his State, and our great country. A deep friendship has developed between us, which I greatly value.

JOHN SHELLEY has made his mark here in the Halls of Congress. He has the respect and admiration of all his colleagues for his honor and his talents. The U.S. House of Representatives is a better institution for his having served here.

For myself and indeed for the membership of the House it is evident that we shall miss him. I wish for him every success as mayor of San Francisco, and I congratulate the people of the great city of San Francisco for having elected JOHN SHELLEY as their mayor. They have chosen a man who has every attribute of courage, dedication, and devotion to public service.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, San Francisco, the "jewel of the west coast," will shortly gain a splendid mayor. Congress will shortly lose a splendid champion of human rights. The cause of social justice owes more than we can reckon to JOHN FRANCIS SHELLEY. The establishment of fair labor standards, the organization and improvement of labor-management relations, the enhancement of equal opportunity regardless of race in apprenticeship training, in employment, and in education, employment opportunities and medical care for the aged—these are more of the aims to which JOHN SHELLEY has devoted his mind and heart.

JOHN SHELLEY has always left the impression of a keen, analytical mind in labor and legislative policies. His perceptive intelligence made possible the solution of difficult issues when, as president of the San Francisco Central Labor Council, he helped to forestall 96.4 percent of threatened strikes by labor-management adjustments. The same perceptive intelligence has shown us the way through many problems faced by the Appropriations Committee, and I can witness to this from my own experience of serving with him on this committee.

But even more admirable than his power of analysis is JOHN SHELLEY's utter devotion to objective aims beyond labor union and party. As A.F. of L. leader, he fought long and hard to achieve labor unity and to overcome jurisdictional disputes which weakened labor's effort. As State senator, he helped establish a model of labor-management cooperation in apprenticeship-training programs. His utter devotion to the public interest as a U.S. Congressman is attested by the unusual measure of bipartisan support for his election last November.

I know that I speak for members of both parties when I wish JOHN SHELLEY a brilliant and memorable career as mayor of the city of his birth.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this House, I want to express my deep appreciation for the opportunity to have served with the distinguish gentleman from California, the Honorable JOHN F. SHELLEY, during the past 9 years.

As a representative of an urban community, we have had many common interests in legislation and in legislative programs, such as urban renewal, the mass transit bill, and civil rights legislation.

San Francisco is to be congratulated on its choice of mayor, and the loss of JACK SHELLEY to this body will be to the gain of the city of San Francisco. With his abundant experience, he should be able to provide the city of San Francisco with an aggressive program which will insure its leadership among the truly great American cities.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed an honor and privilege to have served in this body for the past 15 years with the distinguished gentleman from California, the Honorable JOHN F. SHELLEY.

My fellow freshman in the 81st Congress, JOHN SHELLEY rapidly grew in stature as a wise and able legislator. He leaves behind him significant achievements in many areas, particulary in labor-management relations and equality of employment opportunity.

JOHN SHELLEY will long be remembered too for his unfailing courtesy, his happy, engaging personality and his generous spirit. He is a living refutation of that cynical adage that "Nice guys do not win."

Our loss is San Francisco's gain, for there can be no doubt that he will serve that city as mayor with the same ability and high sense of responsibility that he has shown during his years in Congress.

Our best wishes go with you, Mayor JOHN SHELLEY, as you take up your new duties in the "Golden Gate City."

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in connection with the remarks just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

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

There was no objection.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 223]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Albert | Farbstein | Mahon |
| Ayres | Fulton, Tenn. | Mailliard |
| Becker | Gill | Martin, Mass. |
| Bolton, Oliver P. | Grant | Michel |
| Brooks | Gurney | Milliken |
| Brown, Calif. | Hanna | Minshall |
| Buckley | Harding | Monagan |
| Burton | Harvey, Mich. | Montoya |
| Clawson, Del | Hébert | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Corman | Hemphill | O'Hara, Mich. |
| Davis, Ga. | Jarman | Pirnie |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kee | Quie |
| Derounian | Kelly | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Dingell | Kornegay | Rivers, S.C. |
| Edwards | Long, La. | Roberts, Ala. |
| Ellsworth | McDowell | Rooney, Pa. |
| | Macdonald | Roybal |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| St. George | Stinson | Whitten |
| Selden | Stubblefield | Wickersham |
| Senner | Thompson, N.J. | Widnall |
| Sheppard | Thompson, Tex. | Willis |
| Shriver | Trimble | Wilson, Bob |
| Sibal | Tuck | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Sikes | Utt | Wright |
| Stephens | White | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 361 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

---

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman from Pennsylvania plans to take ample time to explain what transpired in the conference. Rather than spending the time on reading the statement, that time could be devoted to a discussion of what happened at the conference.

Mr. MORGAN. I agree with the gentleman. I expect to use the full hour, if necessary.

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

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1006)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Foreign Assistance Act of 1963'.

"PART I

*"Chapter 1—Policy*

"SEC. 101. Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(a) In the chapter heading strike out the words 'SHORT TITLE AND'.

"(b) Section 101, which relates to short title, is repealed.

"(c) Section 102, which relates to statement of policy, is amended as follows:

"(1) Insert between the fourth and fifth paragraphs the following additional paragraph:

"'It is the sense of the Congress that the institution of full investment guaranty programs under title III of chapter 2 of this part with all recipient countries would be regarded as a significant measure of self-help by such countries improving the climate for private investment both domestic and foreign.'.

"(2) In the last sentence of the seventh paragraph, strike out 'should emphasize long-range development assistance' and insert in lieu thereof 'shall emphasize long-range development assistance'.

"(3) Immediately after the tenth paragraph insert the following new paragraph:

"'It is the sense of the Congress that, in the administration of programs of assistance under chapter 2 of this part, every possible precaution should be taken to assure that such assistance is not diverted to short-term emergency purposes (such as budgetary purposes, balance-of-payments purposes, or military purposes) or any other purpose not essential to the long-range economic development of recipient countries.'

"(4) The first sentence of the last paragraph is amended by striking out 'Finally, the' and substituting 'The', and by inserting '(including private enterprise within such countries)' immediately after 'countries'.

"(5) Immediately after the first sentence of the last paragraph insert the following new sentence: 'In particular, the Congress urges that other industrialized free-world countries increase their contributions and improve the forms and terms of their assistance so that the burden of the common undertaking, which is for the benefit of all, shall be equitably borne by all.'

"(6) Immediately after the last paragraph, add the following new paragraph:

"'It is the sense of the Congress that assistance authorized by this Act should be extended to or withheld from the government of South Vietnam, in the discretion of the President, to further the objectives of victory in the war against communism and the return to their homeland of Americans involved in that struggle.'

*"Chapter 2—Development assistance*

"Title I—Development Loan Fund

"SEC. 102. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the development loan fund, is amended as follows:

"(a) Amend section 201, which relates to general authority, as follows:

"(1) In the second sentence of subsection (b), which relates to considerations to be taken into account in making loans from the development loan fund, strike out clauses (1) and (2) and insert in lieu thereof the following: '(1) whether financing could be obtained in whole or in part from other free-world sources on reasonable terms, including private sources within the United States, (2) the economic and technical soundness of the activity to be financed, including the capacity of the recipient country to repay the loan at a reasonable rate of interest,'.

"(2) Subsection (d), which relates to interest rates on development loans, is amended by inserting immediately after 'in no event' the following: 'shall such funds (except funds loaned under section 205 and funds which prior to the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 were authorized or committed to be loaned upon terms which do not meet the minimum terms set forth herein) be loaned at a rate of interest of less than 2 per centum per annum commencing not later than ten years following the date on which the funds are initially made available under the loan, during which ten-year period the rate of interest shall not be lower than three-fourths of 1 per centum per annum, nor'.

"(3) Add the following new subsection (f):

"'(f) No assistance shall be furnished under this title for a project unless the President determines that such project will promote the economic development of the requesting country, taking into account the current human and material resource requirements of that country and the relationship between the ultimate objectives of the project and the overall economic development of the country, and that such project specifically provides for appropriate participation by private enterprise.'

"(b) Amend section 202(a), which relates to authorizations for the development loan fund, as follows:

"(1) Strike out 'and $1,500,000,000 for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years,' and insert in lieu thereof ', $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963, $925,000,000 for the fiscal year 1964, and $1,500,000,000 for each of the next two succeeding fiscal years,'.

"(2) Immediately before the period at the end thereof insert the following: "': *Provided further*, That, in order to effectuate the purposes and provisions of sections 102, 201, 601, and 602 of this Act, not less than 50 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965 and June 30, 1966 respectively shall be available for loans made to encourage economic development through private enterprise'.

"Title II—Development Grants and Technical Cooperation

"SEC. 103. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development grants and technical cooperation, is amended as follows:

"(a) In section 212, which relates to authorization, strike out '1963' and '$300,000,000' and substitute '1964' and '$220,000,000', respectively.

"(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (a) strike out 'use, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, funds made available for the purposes of section 211 for' and substitute the word 'furnish'.

"(2) In subsection (b) strike out 'to use' and 'foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act, for purposes of subsection (a) of this section and for' and substitute 'to furnish' before the word 'assistance'.

"(3) Add the following new subsection:

"'(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, for the fiscal year 1964, $19,000,000, to remain available until expended. Of the sums authorized to be appropriated under this subsection, not to exceed $2,200,000 shall be available for direct dollar costs in carrying out subsection (b) and $4,700,000 shall be available solely for the purchase of foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act.'

"Title III—Investment Guaranties

"SEC. 104. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

"(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

"(1) In the first sentence after 'wholly owned' insert '(determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the parent corporation)'.

"(2) In paragraph (1) strike out '$1,300,000,000' in the proviso and substitute '$2,500,000,000'.

"(3) In paragraph (2) strike out '1964' in the fourth proviso and substitute '1965'.

"(b) Amend section 222(a), which relates to general provisions, by striking out 'section 221(b)' and substituting 'sections 221(b) and 224'.

"(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by striking out 'section 221(b)' in both places it appears and substituting 'sections 221(b) and 224'.

"(d) Amend section 222(d), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

"'(d) Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under sections 221(b) and 224 of this part, sections

202(b) and 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(b)(3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (exclusive of informational media guaranties), shall be paid first out of fees referred to in section 222(b) as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds, if any, realized from the sale of currencies or other assets acquired in connection with any payments made to discharge liabilities under such guaranties as long as such funds are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds heretofore appropriated for the purpose of discharging liabilities under the aforementioned guaranties, and thereafter out of funds realized from the sale of notes issued under section 413(b)(4)(F) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(c)(2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and finally out of funds hereafter made available pursuant to section 222(f).'

"(e) Amend section 222(e), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

"'(e) All guaranties issued prior to July 1, 1956, all guaranties issued under sections 202(b) and 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and all guaranties heretofore or hereafter issued pursuant to this title shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States of America. Funds heretofore obligated under the aforementioned guaranties (exclusive of informational media guaranties) together with the other funds made available for the purposes of this title shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims in accordance with section 222(d) of this part.'

"(f) Amend section 222 by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) In making a determination to issue a guaranty under section 221(b), the President shall consider the possible adverse effect of the dollar investment under such guaranty upon the balance of payments of the United States.'

"(g) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (b) strike out '$60,000,000' and substitute '$150,000,000'.

"(2) Strike out subsection (c).

"Title V—Development Research

"SEC. 105. Section 241 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development research, is amended by inserting '(a)' after the section heading and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into the problems of population growth.'

"Title VI—Alliance for Progress

"SEC. 106. Title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

"(a) Amend section 251, which relates to general authority, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (b), amend the next to the last sentence thereof by inserting immediately after 'reasonable terms' the following: '(including private sources within the United States), the capacity of the recipient country to repay the loan at a reasonable rate of interest,'.

"(2) In subsection (e) strike out 'economical' and substitute 'economically'.

"(3) In subsection (f) strike out 'Agency for International Development' and substitute 'agency primarily responsible for administering part I'.

"(4) Add the following new subsection (g):

"'(g) In order to carry out the policies of this Act, the President shall, when appropriate, assist in promoting the organization, implementation, and growth of the cooperative movement in Latin America as a fundamental measure toward the strengthening of democratic institutions and practices and economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress.'

"(b) Amend section 252, which relates to authorization, as follows:

"(1) In the first sentence, strike out 'fiscal years 1963 through 1966, not to exceed $600,000,000 for each such fiscal year' and insert in lieu thereof 'fiscal years 1963, 1965, and 1966, not to exceed $600,000,000 for each such fiscal year, and for use beginning in the fiscal year 1964, not to exceed $525,000,000'.

"(2) Immediately after '1963' the second time it appears therein, insert the following: 'and not to exceed $100,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for us beginning in fiscal year 1964.'.

"(3) At the end thereof add the following new sentence: 'In order to effectuate the purposes and provisions of sections 102, 251, 601, and 602 of this Act, not less than 50 per centum of the loan funds appropriated pursuant to this section for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965 and June 30, 1966, respectively, shall be available for loans made to encourage economic development through private enterprise.'

"(c) Amend section 253, which relates to fiscal provisions, by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'All receipts in foreign currencies from loans made under this title or for nonmilitary assistance purposes under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or any Act repealed thereby, shall be available, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, for loans on such terms and conditions as the President may specify to carry out the purposes of subsection (g) of section 251 of this title, and the President may, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, reserve such currencies in such amounts (not to exceed $25,000,000) as he shall determine to be necessary to provide for the programs authorized by said subsection (g).'

"Title VII—Evaluation of Programs

"SEC. 107. Chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new title as follows:

"'Title VII—Evaluation of Programs

"'SEC. 261. The President may appoint a committee to review and evaluate the economic development program under this Act, and to report to the President and to the Congress its findings.'

*"Chapter 3—International organizations and programs*

"SEC. 108. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended by striking out '1963' and '$148,900,000' and substituting '1964' and '$136,050,000', respectively.

*"Chapter 4—Supporting assistance*

"SEC. 109. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out '1963' and '$415,000,000' and substituting '1964' and '$380,000,000', respectively.

*"Chapter 5—Contingency fund*

"SEC. 110. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended by striking out '1963' and '$300,000,000' and substituting '1964' and '$160,000,000', respectively.

"PART II

*"Chapter 1—Policy*

"SEC. 201. Chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(a) In the chapter heading strike out the words 'SHORT TITLE AND'.

"(b) Section 501, which relates to short title, is repealed.

*"Chapter 2—Military assistance*

SEC. 202. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

"(a) In section 504(a), which relates to authorization, strike out 'the fiscal years 1962 and 1963' and '$1,700,000,000 for each such fiscal year, which sums' and substitute 'fiscal year 1964' and '$1,000,000,000, which', respectively.

"(b) In section 505(a), which relates to utilization of assistance, change the period at the end thereof to a colon and add the following proviso: *'Provided,* That, except (1) to the extent necessary to fulfill prior commitments or (2) to the extent that the President finds, with respect to any Latin American country, that the furnishing of military assistance under this Act is necessary to safeguard the security of the United States or to safeguard the security of a country associated with the United States in the Alliance for Progress against overthrow of a duly constituted government, and so informs the Congress, no further military assistance under any provision of this Act shall be furnished to any Latin American country.'

"(c) In section 510(a), which relates to special authority, strike out '1963' in the first and second sentences and substitute '1964'.

"(d) In section 511, which relates to restrictions on military aid to Latin America, strike out '$57,500,000' and substitute '$55,000,000, of which a part may be used during each fiscal year for assistance in implementing a feasible plan for regional defense'.

"(e) Add the following new section:

"'SEC. 512. RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO AFRICA.—No military assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis to any country in Africa, except for internal security requirements or for programs described in section 505(b) of this chapter, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The value of grant programs of defense articles for African countries in fiscal year 1964, pursuant to any authority contained in this part other than section 507, shall not exceed $25,000,000.'

"PART III

*"Chapter 1—General provisions*

"SEC. 301. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 601(b), which relates to encouragement of private enterprise, is amended as follows:

"(1) At the end of paragraph (3), strike out 'and'.

"(2) In paragraph (4), strike out 'wherever appropriate' and insert in lieu thereof 'to the maximum extent practicable'. and strike out the period at the end thereof and substitute a semicolon.

"(3) Add the following new paragraphs at the end thereof:

"'(5) take appropriate steps to discourage nationalization, expropriation, confiscation, seizure of ownership or control, of private investment and discriminatory or other actions having the effect thereof, undertaken by countries receiving assistance under this Act, which divert available resources essential to create new wealth, employment, and productivity in those countries and otherwise impair the climate for new private investment essential to the stable economic growth and development of those countries; and

"'(6) utilize wherever practicable the services of United States private enterprise (including, but not limited to, the services of experts and consultants in technical fields such as engineering).'

"(b) At the end of section 601 add the following new subsection:

"'(c) (1) There is hereby established an Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. The Advisory Committee shall carry out studies and make recommendations for achieving the most effective utilization of the private enterprise provisions of this Act to the head of the agency charged with administering the program under part I of this Act, who shall appoint the Committee.

"'(2) Members of the Advisory Committee shall represent the public interest and shall be selected from the business, labor and professional world, from the universities and foundations, and from among persons with extensive experience in government. The Advisory Committee shall consist of not more than nine members, and one of the members shall be designated as chairman.

"'(3) Members of the Advisory Committee shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be entitled to reimbursement in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for travel and other expenses incurred in attending meetings of the Advisory Committee.

"'(4) The Advisory Committee shall, if possible, meet not less frequently than once each month, shall submit such interim reports as the Committee finds advisable, and shall submit a final report not later than December 31, 1964, whereupon the Committee shall cease to exist. Such reports shall be made available to the public and to the Congress.

"'(5) The expenses of the Committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from funds otherwise available under this Act.'

"(c) Section 611(b), which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended by striking out 'circular A-47 of the Bureau of the Budget' and substituting 'the Memorandum of the President dated May 15, 1962,'.

"(d) Section 612, which relates to use of foreign currencies, is amended as follows:

"(1) Insert '(a)' after the section heading.

"(2) Add the following new subsection (b):

"'(b) In order to provide for the foreign currency needs of United States citizens for travel or other purposes, the Secretary of the Treasury may make available for sale for United States dollars to such citizens, at United States embassies or other convenient locations, foreign currencies acquired by the United States through operations under this Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or any Act repealed thereby, or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, which (1) he determines to be in excess of the needs of departments and agencies of the United States for such currencies, and (2) are not prohibited from such use or committed to other uses by agreement heretofore entered into with another country. United States dollars received from the sale of foreign currencies under this subsection shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.'

"(e) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba and certain other countries, is amended as follows:

"(1) Subsection (a) is amended as follows:

"(A) Insert '(1)' immediately after '(a)'.

"(B) At end thereof add the following new paragraphs:

"'(2) Except as may be deemed necessary by the President in the interest of the United States, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any government of Cuba, nor shall Cuba be entitled to receive any quota authorizing the importation of Cuban sugar into the United States or to receive any other benefit under any law of the United States, until the President determines that such government has taken appropriate steps according to international law standards to return to United States citizens, and to entities not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or to provide equitable compensation to such citizens and entities for property taken from such citizens and entities on or after January 1, 1959, by the Government of Cuba.

"'(3) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

"'(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

"'(i) any items of economic assistance,

"'(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

"'(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities,

so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime; and

"'(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.'

"(2) Subsection (e) is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) The President shall suspend assistance to the government of any country to which assistance is provided under this or any other Act when the government of such country or any government agency or subdivision within such country on or after January 1, 1962—

"'(1) has nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

"'(2) has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

"'(3) has imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned,

and such country, government agency, or government subdivision fails within a reasonable time (not more than six months after such action, or, in the event of a referral to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States within such period as provided herein, not more than twenty days after the report of the Commission is received) to take appropriate steps, which may include arbitration, to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange, equivalent to the full value thereof, as required by international law, or fails to take steps designed to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, or conditions, as the case may be; and such suspension shall continue until the President is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken, and no other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

"'Upon request of the President (within seventy days after such action referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States (established pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1954, 68 Stat. 1279) is hereby authorized to evaluate expropriated property, determining the full value of any property nationalized, expropriated, or seized, or subjected to discriminatory or other actions as aforesaid, for purposes of this subsection and to render an advisory report to the President within ninety days after such request. Unless authorized by the President, the Commission shall not publish its advisory report except to the citizen or entity owning such property. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amount, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Commission to carry out expeditiously its functions under this subsection.'

"(3) Add the following new subsections:

"'(i) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

"'(1) the United States,

"'(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

"'(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954,

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

"'(j) No assistance under this Act shall be furnished to Indonesia unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States. The President shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed of any assistance furnished to Indonesia under this Act.

"'(k) Until the enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 or other general legislation, during the calendar year 1964, authorizing additional appropriations to carry out programs of assistance under this Act, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise with respect to which the aggregate value of such assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed $100,000,000. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

"'(l) No assistance shall be provided under this Act after December 31, 1965, to the government of any less developed country which has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221(b)(1) of this Act, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b)(1).

"'(m) No assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis under this Act to any economically developed nation capable of sustaining its own defense burden and economic growth, except (1) to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963, or (2) additional orientation and training expenses under part II hereof during fiscal year 1964 in an amount not to exceed $1,000,000.'

*"Chapter 2—Administrative provisions*

"SEC. 302. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

"(a) Amend section 621, which relates to exercise of functions, by striking out the last sentence thereof and substituting the following: 'In providing technical assistance under this Act, the head of any such agency or such officer shall utilize, to the fullest extent practicable, goods and professional and other services from private enterprise on a contract basis. In such fields as education, health, housing, or agriculture, the facilities and resources of other Federal agencies shall be utilized when such facilities are particularly or uniquely suitable for technical assistance, are not competitive with private enterprise, and can be made available without interfering unduly with domestic programs.'

"(b) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (a)(2) strike out 'two shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretaries' and substitute 'one shall have the rank of a Deputy Under Secretary'.

"(2) In subsection (a)(3) strike out 'nine' and substitute 'ten'.

"(3) In subsection (b) strike out 'paragraphs (2) and' and substitute 'paragraph'.

"(4) In subsection (d)(1) after the words 'Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance,' where they first appear insert 'who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,', and strike out '$19,500' and substitute '$20,000'.

"(c) Amend section 626(b), which relates to experts, consultants, and retired officers, as follows:

"(1) Strike out the entire first sentence.

"(2) In the second sentence strike out 'Nor shall such service' and substitute 'Service of an individual as an expert or consultant under subsection (a) of this section shall not'.

"(d) Amend section 631, which relates to missions and staffs abroad, by adding the following new subsection (c):

"'(c) The President may appoint any United States citizen who is not an employee of the United States Government or may assign any United States citizen who is a United States Government employee to serve as Chairman of the Development Assistance Committee or any successor committee thereto of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development upon election thereto by members of said Committee, and, in his discretion, may terminate such appointment or assignment, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Such person may receive such compensation and allowances as are authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, not to exceed those authorized for a chief of mission, class 2, within the meaning of said Act, as the President may determine. Such person may also, in the President's discretion, receive any other benefits and perquisites available under this Act to chiefs of special missions or staffs outside the United States established under this section.'

"(e) Amend section 635, which relates to general authorities, by adding the following new subsection (k):

"'(k) Any cost-type contract or agreement (including grants) entered into with a university, college, or other educational institution for the purpose of carrying out programs authorized by part I may provide for the payment of the reimbursable indirect costs of said university, college, or other educational institution on the basis of predetermined fixed-percentage rates applied to the total, or an element thereof, of the reimbursable direct costs incurred.'

"(f) Amend section 636, which relates to provisions on uses of funds, by adding the following new subsection (h):

"'(h) In carrying out programs under this Act, the President shall take all appropriate steps to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, (1) countries receiving assistance under this Act contribute local currencies to meet the cost of contractual and other services rendered in conjunction with such programs, and (2) foreign currencies owned by the United States are utilized to meet the costs of such contractual and other services.'

"(g) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out '1963' and '$53,000,000' and substituting '1964' and '$54,000,000', respectively.

"(h) After section 637 add the following new section:

"'SEC. 638. PEACE CORPS ASSISTANCE.—No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country pursuant to the Peace Corps Act, as amended; the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended; or the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; or famine or disaster relief, including such relief through voluntary agencies, under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended.'

*"Chapter 3—Miscellaneous provisions*

"SEC. 303. Section 644(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to definition of defense services, is amended by inserting 'including orientation' after 'training' the first time it appears.

"SEC. 304. Section 645 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to unexpected balances, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 645. UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Unexpended balances of funds made available pursuant to this Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or Public Law 86–735 are hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated, and may at any time be consolidated, and, in addition, may be consolidated with appropriations made available for the same general purposes under the authority of this Act.'

"PART IV—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

"SEC. 401. The Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes (Public Law 86–735, 22 U.S.C. 1942 et seq.), is amended as follows:

"(a) Insert following the enacting clause 'That this Act may be cited as the "Latin American Development Act"'.

"(b) In section 2 strike out '$500,000,000' and substitute '$680,000,000'.

"SEC. 402. Section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–794, approved October 11, 1962) is amended as follows:

"(a) Insert '(a)' before the words 'The President shall'.

"(b) Add the following new subsection:

"'(b) The President may extend the benefits of trade agreement concessions made by the United States to products, whether imported directly or indirectly, of a country or area within the purview of subsection (a) which, at the time of enactment of this subsection, was receiving trade concessions, when he determines that such treatment would be important to the national interest and would promote the independence of such country or area from domination or control by international communism, and reports this determination and the reasons therefor to the Congress.'

"SEC. 403. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 101(f) is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) obtain rates of exchange applicable to the sale of commodities under such agreements which are not less favorable than the highest of exchange rates legally obtainable from the Government or agencies thereof in the respective countries.'

"(b) Section 105 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The President shall utilize foreign currencies received pursuant to this title in such manner as will, to the maximum extent possible, reduce any deficit in the balance of payments of the United States.'

"(c)(1) Section 106 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'For the purposes of this title and title IV, the term "surplus agricultural commodity" shall include any domestically produced fishery product (not including fish flour until approved by the Food and Drug Administration) if the Secretary of the Interior has determined that such product is at the time of exportation in excess of domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars.'

"(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not be effective for purposes of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, until January 1, 1965.

"(d) Section 202 is amended by striking out 'economic development' and inserting in lieu thereof 'economic and community development'.

"SEC. 404. (a) Section 571(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by changing the final period to a colon and adding the following: '*Provided*, That in individual cases when personally approved by the Secretary further extension may be made.'

"(b) Section 911(2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after 'on authorized home leave;' the following: 'accompanying him for representational purposes on authorized travel within the country of his assignment or, at the discretion of the Secretary, outside the country of his assignment, but in no case to exceed one member of his family;'.

"(c) Title IX of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; as amended, is amended by striking out section 921(d), relating to use of Government vehicles, and by inserting immediately after section 913 the following new section:

"'USE OF GOVERNMENT OWNED OR LEASED VEHICLES

"'SEC. 914. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U.S.C. 78), the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government owned or leased vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees and their dependents when public transportation is unsafe or not available.'

"(d) Title X of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'PART I—EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

"'SEC. 1081. Whenever the Secretary determines that educational facilities are not available, or that existing educational facilities are inadequate, to meet the needs of children of American citizens stationed outside the United States engaged in carrying out Government activities, he is authorized, in such manner as he deems appropriate and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to establish, operate, and maintain primary schools, and school dormitories and related educational facilities for primary and secondary schools, outside the United States, or to make grants of funds for such purposes, or otherwise provide for such educational facilities. The provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended, and of paragraphs (h) and (i) of section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State", approved August 1, 1956 (5 U.S.C. 170h(h) and 170h(i)), may be utilized by the Secretary

in providing assistance for educational facilities. Assistance may include, but shall not be limited to, hiring, transporting, and payment of teachers and other necessary personnel.'

"SEC. 405. The Act entitled 'An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State', approved August 1, 1956 (5 U.S.C. 170f–170t), is amended by inserting immediately after section 12 the following new section:

"'SEC. 13. There is hereby established a working capital fund for the Department of State, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses (including those authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended) and equipment, necessary for maintenance and operation in the city of Washington and elsewhere of (1) central reproduction, editorial, data processing, audiovisual, library, and administrative support services; (2) central supply services for supplies and equipment (including repairs), and (3) such other administrative services as the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, determines may be performed more advantageously and more economically as central services. The capital of the fund shall consist of the amount of the fair and reasonable value of such supply inventories, equipment, and other assets and inventories on order, pertaining to the services to be carried on by the fund, as the Secretary may transfer to the fund, less the related liabilities and unpaid obligations, together with any appropriations made for the purpose of providing capital. Not to exceed $750,000 in net assets shall be transferred to the fund for purposes of providing capital. The fund shall be reimbursed, or credited with advance payments, from applicable appropriations and funds of the Department of State, other Federal agencies, and other sources authorized by law, for supplies and services at rates which will approximate the expense of operations, including accrual of annual leave and depreciation of plant and equipment of the fund. The fund shall also be credited with other receipts from sale or exchange of property or in payment for loss or damage to property held by the fund. There shall be transferred into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as of the close of each fiscal year, earnings which the Secretary determines to be excess to the needs of the fund. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to provide capital for the fund.'

"SEC. 406. The first sentence of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization', approved July 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 523), is amended to read as follows: 'That not to exceed eighteen Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly and annually with representative parliamentary groups from other NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) members, for discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
(P.N.H.)
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of th · House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for clarifying clerical, and necessary conforming changes, the differences are noted below:

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

*Introduction*

The House bill (H.R. 7885) contained an authorization of $3,499,050,000, excluding certain administrative expenses for the Department of State for fiscal year 1964. This included a reduction in amounts previously authorized for fiscal year 1964 as follows: (1) for the Alliance for Progress, a reduction from $600 million to $450 million, and (2) for the Development Loan Fund, from $1.5 billion to $900 million. The House bill also included a new authorization of an additional $200 million for the Social Progress Trust Fund (Public Law 86–735).

The Senate amendment to the bill contained an authorization of $3,699,340,000, excluding such administrative expenses for fiscal 1964, which included a reduction in the amount previously authorized for the Development Loan Fund for fiscal year 1964 from $1.5 billion to $950 million and deleted the authorization in existing law for the Fund for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966. It did not reduce, as the House did, the amount previously authorized for the Alliance for Progress, and included a new authorization of an additional $155 million for the Social Progress Trust Fund (Public Law 86–735).

Neither the House nor the Senate made any change in existing law for Department of State administrative expenses, which is for "such amounts as may be necessary from time to time." The Executive appropriation request includes an amount of $3,025,000 for this purpose.

The difference between the amount in the House bill and in the Senate amendment is $200,290,000. The committee of conference adjusted the differences in amounts as shown in the following table and agreed on a total authorization of $3,599,050,000. This total is a reduction by the Senate of $100,290,000 and an increase by the House of $100,000,000.

| Section | Executive appropriation request (1) | House bill (2) | Senate amendment (3) | Conference agreement (4) | Adjustment against House bill (5) | Adjustment against Senate amendment (6) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 202(a). Development Loan Fund | [1] $1,060,000,000 | [1] $900,000,000 | [1] $950,000,000 | $925,000,000 | +$25,000,000 | −$25,000,000 |
| 212. Development grants | 257,000,000 | 217,000,000 | 225,000,000 | [3] 220,000,000 | +3,000,000 | −5,000,000 |
| 214. American schools and hospitals abroad | 22,000,000 | [2] 12,000,000 | [2] 26,290,000 | [3] 19,000,000 | +7,000,000 | −7,290,000 |
| | [2] [26,290,000] | | | | | |
| 252. Alliance for Progress | [4] 600,000,000 | [4] 45,000,000 | [4] 600,000,000 | 525,000,000 | +75,000,000 | −75,000,000 |
| | [5] 50,000,000 | (5) | (5) | (5) | (5) | (5) |
| 302. International organizations | 136,050,000 | 136,050,000 | 136,050,000 | 136,050,000 | | |
| 402. Supporting assistance | 435,000,000 | 380,000,000 | 380,000,000 | 380,000,000 | | |
| 451. Contingency fund | 300,000,000 | 150,000,000 | 175,000,000 | 160,000,000 | +10,000,000 | −15,000,000 |
| 504. Military assistance | 1,405,000,000 | 1,000,000,000 | 1,000,000,000 | 1,000,000,000 | | |
| 637. Administrative expenses: | | | | | | |
| (a) AID | 57,250,000 | 54,000,000 | 52,000,000 | 54,000,000 | | +2,000,000 |
| (b) State | [6] 3,025,000 | (6) | (6) | (6) | (6) | (6) |
| Public Law 86-735, sec. 2, Social Progress Trust Fund | 200,000,000 | 200,000,000 | 155,000,000 | 180,000,000 | −20,000,000 | +25,000,000 |
| Total | 4,525,325,000 | [6] 3,499,050,000 | [6] [7] 3,699,340,000 | 3,599,050,000 | +100,000,000 | −100,290,000 |
| | [7] [4,529,615,000] | | | | | |

[1] The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provides authorization of $1,500,000,000 for fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966 for the Development Loan Fund. The House bill cut the fiscal year 1964 authorization to $900,000,000 (col. 2); the Senate amendment cut the fiscal year 1964 authorization to $950,000,000 and deleted the authorizations for fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

[2] The Executive communicated additional estimated requirements for American schools and hospitals abroad and increased the original request for $22,000,000 to $26,290,000. House consideration was based on the $22,000,000 figure.

[3] Of this sum, not to exceed $2,200,000 is available for direct dollar costs in connection with U.S. founded or sponsored hospitals abroad and $4,700,000 is available solely for the purchase of U.S.-owned foreign currencies.

[4] The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provides an authorization of $600,000,000 for fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966. The House reduced the fiscal year 1964 authorization (col. 2); the Senate made no change.

[5] The Executive proposed an amendment authorizing the appropriation in any fiscal year 1963 through 1966 of the unappropriated balance of the authorization for any prior fiscal year during that period. The appropriation request for fiscal year 1964 for this unappropriated balance was $50,000,000, which neither the House nor the Senate approved.

[6] The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provides for State Department administrative expenses "such amounts as may be necessary from time to time." The amount requested to be appropriated is only included in col. (1) because neither the House nor the Senate took any action to change the continuing authorization.

[7] This total (col. 1) includes the larger amount requested for American schools and hospitals abroad, which is also included in the total amount of the Senate amendment (col. 3).

*Investment guaranty agreements (Sec. 101 (c) (1) and Sec. 301(e) (3))*

The House bill prohibited assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act after December 31, 1964, to the government of any less developed country which failed to enter into an agreement to institute an investment guaranty program providing protection against inconvertibility and expropriation or confiscation.

The Senate amendment stated the sense of Congress that institution of the full investment guaranty program under the Foreign Assistance Act would be regarded as a significant measure of self-help of an aid recipient country, improving the climate for private investment, both domestic and foreign.

The committee of conference agreed to the provision of the House bill with an amendment, changing the date on which this provision would go into effect from December 31, 1964, to December 31, 1965. The managers on the part of the House also accepted the provision of the Senate as constituting a statement of policy entirely consistent with the requirements of the House bill.

In agreeing to the postponement of the effective date of the House provision from December 31, 1964, to December 31, 1965, the managers on the part of the House accepted the argument that giving 2 years' notice would provide ample time for the completion or the initiation of the negotiation of investment guaranty agreements with governments interested in receiving U.S. aid in the future, as well as permit an orderly closing out of U.S. assistance to governments unwilling to enter into such agreements.

*Purposes, objectives, and priorities*

The House bill contained a congressional declaration that the authorization requests for funds to carry out economic assistance programs shall be accompanied by a detailed statement setting forth the purposes, the objectives, and the priorities of such programs.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to the elimination of the House provision. The committee of conference recognized that the executive branch presentation of proposals for foreign assistance is made on a country basis. The material so presented includes in each instance on a country basis the items listed in the amendment, including consideration of our foreign policy objectives.

*Consideration to countries which do not divert their own resources to military or propaganda efforts*

The House bill amended paragraph 8 of section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act to state that it is the sense of the Congress that in the administration of funds under the act great attention and consideration should be given to those countries (1) which share the view of the United States on the world crisis and (2) which do not, as a result of U.S. assistance, divert their own economic resources to military or propaganda efforts directed against the United States or against other countries receiving aid under the act whether or not supported by the Soviet Union or Communist China.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to the elimination of this provision of the House bill. The House bill (sec. 307) and the Senate amendment (sec. 301) had identical language related to this subject. Since this language was not in conference, the managers on the part of the House recognized that this new language of the bill, plus the provisions of existing law, adequately reflected the views of the House.

*Short-term emergency assistance (sec. 101(c)(3))*

The House bill added after the 10th paragraph in section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act a statement of the sense of Congress that in the administration of development assistance every precaution should be taken to avoid diversion of assistance to short-term emergency purposes or other purposes not essential to long-range economic development. The House bill also expressed the sense of Congress that short-term emergency purposes should be met to the extent possible through international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund which are equipped to condition assistance "on immediate economic and monetary reform."

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the Senate accepted the House language with an amendment deleting the reference to meeting short-term emergencies through international institutions. The committee of conference believed it was not desirable to specify the alternative sources which might be available for these purposes.

*Aid to South Vietnam (sec. 101(c)(6))*

The Senate amendment expressed the sense of the Congress that assistance authorized by this act should be extended to or withheld from the Government of Vietnam at the discretion of the President to further the objectives of victory in the war against communism and the return to their homeland of Americans involved in that struggle.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House, recognizing the fluid situation in Vietnam, accepted the Senate language which provides the President with flexibility in order to achieve our national objectives.

*Interest rates (sec. 102(a)(2))*

The House bill amended section 201(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act to provide that in no event should development loans be made at interest rates less than 2 percent per annum. By reason of section 251(b) of the act, this provision also applied to Alliance for Progress loans.

The Senate amendment amended section 635(g) of the act, which relates to general authorities, by adding a new paragraph (6) requiring that the President in making any loan under part I of the act (i.e., an economic assistance loan), except a loan to the International Development Association under section 205, establish an interest rate of 2 percent or more, except during an initial grace period on principal repayments which could not exceed 5 years. During the grace period, interest could be as low as three-fourths of 1 percent. The Senate amendment also placed a maximum term on loans of 35 years.

The committee of conference accepted the language of the House bill with two modifications: (1) authorizing a grace period of not to exceed 10 years during which the rate of interest is not permitted to be lower than three-fourths of 1 percent per annum, and (2) exempting loans of developing assistance funds made available to the International Development Association from the requirements of this section as to interest rates and also exempting from the requirements of this section loans authorized or committed prior to the effective date of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

*Private enterprise participation in economic planning (sec. 102(a)(3))*

The House bill added a new clause (7) to section 201(b) of the act. The new language required the President to take account of the economic development plans of the requesting country. Such plans should specifically provide for appropriate participation by private enterprise and include an analysis of current human and material resources and a projection of ultimate objectives of the plans with respect to overall economic development.

The Senate amendment added a new subsection (f) to section 201, prohibiting assistance under the development loan title unless the President determines that the project for which assistance is requested is taken into account in the country's economic development, including analysis of current human and material resources and a projection of the ultimate project objectives with respect to the country's overall economic development, and specifically providing for appropriate participation by private enterprise.

The committee of conference agreed to an amended version of the Senate language. The new subsection (f) added to section 201 by the substitute agreed to in conference prohibits the furnishing of assistance for a project from the Development Loan Fund unless the President determines that such project will promote the economic development of the borrowing country and only after account is taken of the relation of the project to the country's resources and overall economic development, as well as specifically provides for appropriate participation by private enterprise in the project.

*Additional development grant criteria*

The House bill amended section 211(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act to require the President, in furnishing assistance in the form of development grants and technical cooperation to take account of whether the activity could be financed through a development loan.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the elimination of this provision of the House bill. They accepted the argument that section 635(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act already gives emphasis and direction to the making of loans rather than grants wherever possible, and that since most of the development grant funds would be used for technical assistance, loan financing would not be feasible in most instances.

*Population problems (sec. 105)*

The Senate amendment included a provision that "funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into the problems of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control."

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to a modification of the Senate provision so that it provides that "funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into the problems of population growth."

The managers on the part of the House accepted the language as modified in the belief that in view of the population problems in the less developed countries, research on such problems appears to be warranted.

*Extended risk guaranties*

The House bill authorized an increase in the ceiling from $180 million to $300 million for the general extended risk guaranty program. (A separate authorization for extended risk guaranties of housing projects in Latin American countries was not affected by this provision.)

The Senate contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the elimination of this increase in the ceilings. The slow progress which has been made in the issuing of guaranties under the existing ceiling of $180 million indicates that there is no immediate need for an increase in the ceiling, and, should such an increase become necessary, legislative action should be possible during the next session of the Congress.

The managers on the part of the House are convinced that the general extended risk investment guaranty program should be expanded and want to make clear that the action of the committee of conference should not result in any diminution of effort in pushing this program.

*Fifty percent of development loans for development through private enterprise (sec. 102(b)(2) and sec. 106(b)(3))*

The House bill added to sections 202(a) and 252 of the Foreign Assistance Act identical provisions requiring that not less than 50 percent of the funds appropriated for development lending for fiscal years 1965 and 1966 should be available only for loans

made for economic development through private enterprise.

The Senate amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The committee of conference accepted the House provision with an amendment, substituting for the words "for purposes of" the words "to encourage" and eliminating the word "only."

The managers on the part of the House regard this amendment as in no way diminishing the significance of the House provision as a policy directive. They accepted the argument that the revised language would impose fewer administrative problems on the Agency for International Development than would the provision of the House bill.

*Encouragement of the cooperative movement in Latin America (sec. 106(a)(4))*

Section 106(a)(3) of the Senate amendment contained language directing the President, when appropriate, to assist in promoting the organization, implementation, and growth of the cooperative movement in Latin America as a fundamental measure toward strengthening the Alliance for Progress.

The House bill did not include a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate provision. The development in Latin America of a cooperative movement comparable in scope to that which has emerged in the United States could make a major contribution to the attainment of the objectives of the Alliance for Progress and should be encouraged.

*Reservation of loan repayments for cooperative movement (sec. 106(c))*

The Senate amendment provided that the President might use foreign currency receipts from loans under the Alliance for Progress title or from nonmilitary assistance loans under the Mutual Security Act or predecessor legislation for the promotion of cooperatives in Latin America. The authority was also provided to reserve up to $25 million of local currencies for such purposes.

The House bill did not contain a similar provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate provision with an amendment to establish the fact that the $25 million ceiling was cumulative relating to the aggregate amount which could be reserved for this purpose rather than authorizing an annual reservation of $25 million. It was the understanding of the committee of conference that none of the foreign currencies made available under this authority, including any amounts reserved for future years, may be expended unless specifically appropriated for this purpose. The committee of conference was informed that there is no excess currency available in any Latin American country at present and none is likely to become excess in the foreseeable future.

The House managers believe that if excess currencies become available in Latin America in some subsequent period in significant amounts, the reservation of such currencies authorized by this provision, as well as any other reservation of foreign currencies for future use, should be reexamined in order to evaluate the relationship of such reserved currencies to current U.S. requirements.

*Evaluation of programs (sec. 107)*

The Senate amendment added a new title VII to chapter 2, part I, of the Foreign Assistance Act requiring the President to appoint such committees as are necessary to review and evaluate the economic aid program in each country, receiving economic aid in fiscal year 1963. Such committees, except those for Latin America, are to be composed of three to five members, a majority of whom would be representatives of the public and report to the President and the Congress their findings with respect to:

1. The performance of the recipient country in working out a development program and in carrying out self-help and reform measures;

2. Whether specific projects are contributing to the development of the recipient country and to the purposes of this program; and

3. Such other matters as the committees believe may be of use to Congress in its consideration of the fiscal year 1965 foreign aid legislation.

In addition, the President was to appoint such committees of such size as he might find necessary to review, in accordance with the above criteria, the economic assistance programs for the countries in the Alliance for Progress.

Advisory committees were first to be appointed to review the Alliance for Progress and the programs in those countries which received one-half of the total assistance extended by the United States in fiscal year 1963. These committees were to report not later than January 1, 1965. Reports of committees for other countries were to be made not later than June 1, 1965.

The provision also prohibited any legislation authorizing or appropriating funds to carry out economic development programs for fiscal year 1966 and subsequent years, until Congress received and considered the above-mentioned reports. The amendment also provided for reimbursement of public members for travel and other expenses incurred in carrying out their functions and for the diversion of program funds to meet such expenses.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment. In lieu of specifying the organization, operations and organization of the committees provided for in the Senate amendment, the new language permits the President to appoint a committee to review and evaluate economic development programs carried out under the Foreign Assistance Act and to report to the President and to the Congress its findings. The language is permissive. It is not a directive to the President that he must appoint a committee. The managers on the part of the House are not convinced that a study by such a committee would serve any useful purpose at present. While the committee of conference recognized that evaluation of the aid program by individuals outside the executive branch might contribute to the improvement of such programs, it was felt that detailed and specific language on the scope of their work would deny them the flexibility necessary to achieve the objectives sought by an independent assessment.

*Restrictions on military assistance to Latin America (sec. 202(b) and sec. 202(d))*

The Senate amendment reduced the ceiling on grant programs of defense articles for the American Republics from $57.5 to $50 million and provided that $25 million of such amount may be available during each fiscal year for assistance to an international military force under the control of the Organization of American States. The amendment also provided that military assistance could be made available to American Republics only (1) to the extent necessary to fulfill prior commitments or (2) to safeguard the security of the United States or to safeguard the security of a country associated with the United States in the Alliance for Progress against military overthrow of a duly constituted government.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to an amended version of the Senate amendment, eliminating the word "military" in reference to the overthrow of a duly constituted government so as to provide that military assistance could be made available to safeguard a duly constituted government against overthrow, whether by military or by other means (as distinguished from a change in government by constitutional process). The committee of conference recognized that a large part of the military assistance program to Latin America is directed toward (1) internal security projects to combat Castro-Communist inspired subversion and (2) civic action projects that promote stability and strengthen national economies. It regarded a continuation of these programs as important to the stability of the hemisphere and, therefore, increased the figure recommended by the Senate to $55 million, a reduction of $2,500,000 from that previously authorized. Should the American Republics devise a regional program of defense, the United States may contribute to the implementation of such a program from the funds made available under this section.

*Restrictions on military assistance to African countries (sec. 202(e))*

The House bill prohibited grant military assistance to African countries except for (1) internal security requirements or (2) civic action programs authorized by section 505(b) of the act.

The Senate amendment placed an annual ceiling of $25 million on grant programs of defense articles for African countries. It also prohibited assistance for internal security requirements unless the President determined otherwise.

The committee of conference accepted a compromise between the two versions. Grant programs of defense articles for African countries for fiscal year 1964 shall not exceed $25 million. This ceiling does not apply to any defense articles that may be sold to such countries pursuant to the authority contained in section 507 of the act. Grant military assistance may be furnished to African countries only for internal security or for civic action programs unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Speaker of the House and to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Encouragement of free enterprise and private participation (sec. 301(a)(2))*

The Senate amendment amended section 601(b)(4) of the act by deleting the words "wherever appropriate" and substituting the words "to the maximum extent practicable".

The House bill contained no comparable change.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate language as more expressive of the intent of the section.

*Advisory committee on private enterprise in foreign aid (sec. 301(b))*

The Senate amendment provided for a 9-man Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid to make studies and recommendations to the Administrator of the foreign aid program for achieving the most effective utilization of the private enterprise provisions of the act. Members would be selected from the business, labor, and professional world, universities, and foundations, as well as from among persons with extensive experience in government. They would receive only necessary expenses. The Committee would submit its final report no later than December 31, 1964, after which it would cease to function. Provision was made for an authorization for an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to permit the Committee to carry out its responsibilities.

The House bill had no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment that limits the expenses of the Committee to a maximum of $50,000 which

sum shall be derived from funds appropriated for other parts of the act. It is not an additional authorization.

*Application of Federal standards to construction contracts*

The House bill added a new subsection (c) to section 611, relating to completion of plans and cost estimates, requiring the President to establish such procedures as he determines necessary to assure that to the maximum extent practicable all contracts for construction outside the United States made in connection with any agreement or grant subject to the requirements of section 611(a) shall be made in accordance with the same standards applicable to the contracts made by the Federal Government for similar construction within the United States.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the elimination of this provision. They accepted the argument that the present bill emphasizes greater use of U.S. consultants and engineers in providing assistance to other governments and that the attainment of the objectives of U.S. standards with respect to construction contractions can and will be attained without imposing the rigid requirement contained in the House bill.

*Sale of foreign currencies to U.S. citizens (sec. 301(d))*

The Senate amendment added a new subsection (b) to section 612 of the Foreign Assistance Act which would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell U.S.-owned foreign currencies to U.S. citizens for travel or other purposes.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate language.

The currencies authorized to be sold are those acquired through operations under the Foreign Assistance Act, the Mutual Security Act, and any act repealed thereby, or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480). In order to be available for such sale, the currencies must be in excess of the needs of U.S. Government agencies and departments and not prohibited from such use or committed to other uses by agreements heretofore entered into with another country. The dollars received from the sale of the foreign currencies under this subsection would be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The House managers accepted the Senate provision in the belief that every effort should be made to find uses for excess foreign currencies owned by the United States, which cannot be used to alleviate the burden on the U.S. taxpayers, whenever such use might diminish the drain on the U.S. balance of payments.

The committee of the conference recognized that the sale to U.S. citizens of excess currencies for tourist and other expenditures under this provision is not likely to be large in view of the fact that there are only a few countries where currencies in excess of U.S. requirements are available and, in addition, there are limitations imposed on the use of such currencies, contained in Public Law 480 sales agreements from which most U.S.-owned foreign currencies are currently derived.

It is understood that the term "U.S. citizens" as used in this provision includes U.S. corporations operating abroad and U.S. voluntary agencies (such as CARE), as well as U.S. religious groups.

It is the understanding of the committee of conference that this provision does not require the unilateral abrogation of existing agreements with countries concerning the use of currencies derived from them. In view of the unforeseen difficulties in negotiations, the managers on the part of the House note that Public Law 480 expires next year. Should any problems arise in carrying out operations under that act or should difficulty be encountered in making sales of surplus agricultural commodities because countries fear that such sales might reduce their income from U.S. tourists, necessary corrective action may then be possible.

*Restriction on assistance for projects in Cuba through international organizations*

The House bill contained an amendment to section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act requiring that no funds provided under the act be used to make any voluntary contributions to any international organization or program for financing projects of economic or technical assistance to the present Government of Cuba.

The Senate amendment had no comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to the elimination of this provision of the House bill. The committee of conference recognized that in many international organizations there is no authority to accept contributions subject to political restrictions on the countries for which they may be used. U.S. policy has been directed toward stimulating other nations to increase their contributions through multilateral channels for programs in the less developed countries. The attachment of political conditions by the United States to such contributions would serve as a precedent for other countries to follow a similar policy in making their contributions, whether assessed or voluntary. Further, the Communist countries contribute more to such international programs than they receive in the form of assistance. For these reasons, the managers on the part of the House receded.

*Nullification of contracts (secs. 301(e)(2) and 302(h))*

The Senate amendment included a requirement that assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act or of any other act be suspended if a foreign government take steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with U.S. citizens and fails to take appropriate steps to discharge its obligations under international law to such citizens.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate provision with an amendment to the language of the Senate amendment specifically excepting assistance to any country through the Export-Import Bank in addition to the Peace Corps, and assistance under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and famine or disaster relief under Public Law 480 from the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act.

The managers on the part of the House considered that this was a matter of principle to be followed.

One of the factors which the administrators of foreign assistance are required to consider before aiding other countries in their economic development is the self-help measures which the recipients of our aid undertake. No government can expect private investment, either from abroad or on the part of its own citizens, if it fails to show its respect for property rights and contract obligations.

Unless a country recognizes the importance of private investment to its economic development and is prepared to maintain policies favorable to such investment, it should not be regarded as having taken adequate self-help measures. Furthermore, U.S. loans or grants to promote economic development will fail to achieve their purpose under such circumstances.

The continuation of U.S. development assistance to a government which is unwilling to face fundamental issues is unfair both to the U.S. taxpayer and to those leaders of recipient nations who commit their own careers, as well as the future well-being of their countries, to the success of economic development programs which we help to finance.

*Valuation of expropriated property (sec. 301(e)(2))*

The Senate amendment authorized the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, upon request of the President, to determine the value of property taken by a foreign government for the purpose of administering section 620(e). Referral to the Commission, if any, had to be within 70 days of the country's action, and the Commission was required to report within 90 days of referral. The Senate version provided also that in the event of referral to the Commission, the country must take appropriate steps to discharge its obligations to U.S. citizens within 20 days after issuance of the Commission's report.

The House bill did not include a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate provision.

H.R. 7885 as approved by both the House and Senate amends existing law, requiring termination of assistance to countries expropriating property owned by U.S. citizens by adding an additional provision that compensation for expropriated property must be "equivalent to the full value thereof."

The Senate provision authorizes, but does not require, the President to use the services of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to advise him on the value of expropriated property.

Because the question of the valuation of expropriated property is important to the proper administration of section 620(e), expert advice on valuation, in appropriate cases, can measurably assist the parties in settling their difference and also assist the Department of State in the effective use of section 620(e) to protect the legitimate interests of U.S. investors. For these reasons, the managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment, noting that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has a skilled staff, experienced in the valuation of foreign property, and apparently is better equipped to advise the President on property valuations than any other agency. Should the President prefer to have some other agency assume this function, he is free to do so.

The managers on the part of the House recognize that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is not a permanent agency of the Government and that it exists only to settle certain claims assigned to it by law. They do not want the assignment of this responsibility under the Foreign Assistance Act to serve as justification for keeping the Commission in business after its other functions expire.

Consideration must be given, however, to the fact that the valuation services called for by this provision will impose a cost on the Federal Government regardless of the agency that does the job. Whenever the other work assigned to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission comes to an end, the managers on the part of the House recommend that the President determine what agency can most effectively and economically assume this responsibility and submit his recommendation to the Congress.

*Restrictions on assistance to Communist countries*

The House bill included an amendment to section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act by redefining the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the list of Communist countries to include the captive constituent countries thereof.

The Senate amendment did not include this provision.

It was recognized that the language of existing law was sufficiently inclusive to encompass the amendment proposed in the House bill. For this reason the managers on the part of the House receded.

*Assistance to Indonesia (sec. 301(e)(3))*

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act that prohibits the furnishing of assistance under the act to Indonesia except pursuant to a Presidential determination and notification to the House and Senate of such assistance.

The House bill made a Presidential determination to furnish assistance contingent upon a finding that it was in the national interest, whereas the Senate amendment made such a determination contingent upon a finding that it was essential to the national interest.

The committee of conference accepted the Senate version as more restrictive in its application. Hence the managers on the part of the House receded.

*Assistance to productive enterprises competing with U.S. enterprises in world markets*

The House bill added a new subsection (m) to section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act providing that no assistance should be furnished under that act for the construction or operation of any productive enterprise abroad unless the President determined that similar productive enterprises within the United States were operating at a substantial portion of their capacity and such assistance would not result in depriving such U.S. enterprises of their reasonable share of world markets.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the elimination of this provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the arguments (1) that section 620 (d) of existing law already requires the administrators of the foreign assistance program to make arrangements with countries where U.S. assistance is provided for the construction or operation of productive enterprises to limit the competition of such enterprises with U.S. industry and (2) that the House provision would seriously impede the administration of foreign aid without being of significant benefit to U.S. industry.

*Review, inspection and audit*

The House bill prohibited development loans, grants, and Alliance for Progress loans and grants to the government of any country which does not permit such reviews, inspections, and audits by the United States as are required to determine whether assistance is being administered to carry out the purposes for which it is furnished.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The committee of conference was advised that the standard form of loan agreements and of grant project agreements includes an explicit statement that the United States may make such reviews, inspections, and audits as it deems necessary. For this reason the managers on the part of the House receded.

*Limitation on grant assistance (sec. 301(e)(3))*

The Senate amendment added a subsection to section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act that prohibited the furnishing of assistance on a grant basis under that act to any economically developed nation capable of sustaining its own defense burdens and economic growth except (1) to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963, or (2) additional orientation and training expenses under part II of the act not amounting to more than $1 million during fiscal year 1964. The term "economically developed nation" included, but was not limited to, any nation listed as an exception to the definition of "economically developed nation" contained in the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1875 of June 28, 1963, plus Switzerland and the German Federal Republic.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate provision with an amendment deleting the definition of "economically less developed nation." The committee of conference believes such a determination is one of reasonable judgment. It is intended that the countries of Western Europe, among others, will be included. In view of the specific U.S. base rights in Spain and Portugal, the committee of conference does not intend that the amendment will be immediately applicable to those two countries. Nor is it intended to apply to NATO cooperative enterprises involving the furnishing of military and technological information, licenses of Government owned and controlled inventions, and liaison by members of the Armed Forces.

*Use of private enterprise for technical assistance (sec. 302(a))*

The Senate amendment contained a provision that in providing technical assistance under this act, the head of any such agency or such officer shall utilize, to the fullest extent practicable, goods and professional and other services from private enterprise on a contract basis, and that in such fields as education, health, housing, or agriculture, the facilities and resources of other Federal agencies should be utilized when such facilities were particularly or uniquely suitable for technical assistance, were not competitive with private enterprise, and could be made available without interfering unduly with domestic programs.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate provision in the belief that it clarified the language in existing law, requiring that in providing technical assistance the facilities of Federal agencies equipped to give technical assistance should be used to the fullest extent practicable, by indicating that Federal agencies should be used in rendering technical assistance only when their facilities are particularly or uniquely suitable for a particular purpose, are not competition with private enterprise and can be made available without interfering unduly with domestic programs.

*Deputy inspector general (sec. 302(b)(4))*

The Senate amendment added to existing law the requirement that the Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, authorized by section 624 of the act, should be subject to Senate confirmation and increased his salary from $19,500 to $20,000 per year.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the argument that the duties and responsibilities of the Deputy Inspector General justified the requirement for Senate confirmation and the small increase in salary.

*Exceptions of certain acts from the prohibition of assistance (sec. 302(h))*

The Senate amendment added a new section 638 to the Foreign Assistance Act stating that no provision of the act should be construed to prohibit the carrying out of programs under the Peace Corps Act or the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, as respectively amended.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment that added to the two acts cited above, programs under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 as amended and foodstuffs supplied under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480). In the case of the latter act, the exception is limited to those programs of famine or disaster relief carried out under title II of Public Law 480 since some of those programs might be considered programs of assistance to countries. This exception does not preclude programs to meet famine, disaster relief or other extraordinary relief requirements or feeding programs carried out by registered voluntary agencies.

These four acts have been separately authorized by Congress as instruments of foreign policy, as well as to serve other U.S. objectives. Such assistance as they provide is of a kind different from that envisioned by the Foreign Assistance Act. Hence prohibitions on assistance provided for in the latter act should not embrace assistance that is different in character and has different objectives. Nor was it the intent of the committee of conference to preclude programs of the USIA, U.S. oversea defense activities, research or other programs undertaken primarily to serve nonforeign policy objectives of the United States but which may have an ancillary benefit for a foreign country.

*Title of Latin American Development Act (sec. 401(a))*

The House bill gave to Public Law 86-735 the short statutory title "the Latin American Development and Chilean Reconstruction Act."

The Senate amendment titled that law "The Latin American Development Act."

In view of the fact that the Chilean reconstruction phase of our assistance has been completed, the act is more properly designated the "Latin American Development Act." For this reason the managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment.

*Presidential discretion to place trade with certain Communist countries on nondiscriminatory basis (sec. 402)*

The Senate amendment amended section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to authorize the President to extend to certain Communist countries trade agreement concessions on a nondiscriminatory basis. The exercise of this authority would have been permitted only upon the President's determination and report to Congress that extending such treatment to a country (1) was important to the national interest and (2) would promote the independence of such country or area from domination or control by international communism.

The House bill did not contain a corresponding provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to an amended version of the Senate provision which continues the prohibition in existing law against extending most-favored-nation treatment to Communist-dominated countries with the exception of those countries under Communist control which received such favored treatment prior to the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The effect of the agreed language is to authorize extension of most-favored-nation treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia but to no other Communist-dominated countries.

The committee of conference was convinced that major issues dealt with by this amendment are related to foreign policy rather than to the impact on the U.S. economy or the Federal revenue.

The managers on the part of the House regard the opportunity to continue most-favored-nation treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia as of fundamental importance to the United States in its effort to encourage the trend already manifest among the countries of Eastern Europe to maintain their

national identity and assert, to a limited degree at least, attributes of national sovereignty.

The liberation of the countries of Eastern Europe from Soviet domination has the overwhelming support of the American people and of their elected representatives. We cannot avoid facing the problem of what action it is possible for the United States to take today that will contribute to the attainment of the desired objective.

The new administration regards the authority contained in the bill agreed to by the conference committee as vital to the implementation of its efforts to bring about the liberation of the countries of Eastern Europe.

The managers on the part of the House are convinced that this is a fundamental issue which cannot be avoided and that delay would be contrary to the best interests of the United States.

*Inclusion of domestically produced fishery products under Public Law 480 (sec. 403 (c))*

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 106 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) to include in title I and title IV programs any domestically produced fishery product if the Secretary of Interior determines that the product at the time of export is excess of domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars. The amendment was not effective with respect to title I until January 1, 1965.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

There have been occasions when foreign governments have asked for canned fish products under the food-for-peace program to supply protein deficiencies. This amendment will make it possible to meet those requests to the extent that fishery products may be in surplus. The amendment will put fish on the same basis as frozen beef, canned pork, canned hams, variety meats, and fruit. The effective date for purposes of title I is January 1, 1965, because the present authority under that title extends through December 31, 1964, and was intended to include only surplus agricultural products at the time it was enacted. For these reasons the managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, the conference report and statement are printed above. I ask unanimous consent that further reading thereof be dispensed with at this time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House report today the results of a long and difficult conference, and I am sure that no one is satisfied with our work.

A reading of the press would seem to indicate that there are only a few major and relatively simple issues involved. Let me point out that there were 80 points of difference between the House and Senate bills to be resolved and that most of these had an important bearing on our foreign policy or overseas operations in some part of the world.

While I say that I am sure no one is satisfied, I am convinced that the House conferees have brought back a report which represents the best we could do under the circumstances and which preserves as much of the House bill as possible.

In one respect, the conference on the foreign aid bill this year has been different than any other conference in which I have ever participated. Most of the pressure brought to bear on me by my House colleagues has not been pressure to defend provisions of the House bill to the last ditch but has, instead, taken the form of arguments to accept various provisions of the Senate bill.

Now, I am sure that the House realizes that we had to go to conference to defend the House bill and that our primary concern throughout our negotiations with the representatives of the other body was to maintain the position of the House. There was no way that we could do anything else. I would like to point out that the statistics show that the Senate receded on a substantially larger number of items of difference than the House.

With respect to money, we succeeded in splitting the difference between the House and the Senate bill. The bill as it passed the House authorized $3,499,050,000, and the Senate bill authorized $3,699,340,000—a figure $200,000,000 higher than that in the House bill. We bring back a bill which authorizes $3,599,050,000; the House went up $100,000,000, and the Senate went down $100,290,000.

The details with respect to money are shown in a table on page 22607 of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and on page 17 of the conference report.

Some of the newspaper reports that I have seen make it appear that the conference devoted itself primarily to eliminating restrictions on the administration of the foreign assistance program. Anyone who examines the facts will see that this has not been the case.

Let me cite major provisions of the House bill which are still in the bill as reported by the conference.

The House language restricting aid to countries permitting their ships to carry cargoes to or from Cuba has been retained without change. The Senate bill had a somewhat similar provision which was not quite as restrictive and which was preferred by the Department of State, but the House conferees fought for the House language and prevailed.

The bill as it passed the House included a provision putting not only the Castro government, but any future government of Cuba, on notice that the United States would not give assistance to Cuba or grant a quota authorizing the importation of Cuban sugar until appropriate steps had been taken to compensate American citizens for property taken by the Castro regime. There was no such provision in the Senate bill, and the language of the House bill has been preserved without change.

The conference also approved without change the provision of the House bill which prevents the construction of the Indian steel plant without congressional approval.

The House conferees were able to retain in the bill also the House language requiring that no assistance may be given to the government of any less developed country unless that country is willing to agree to institute an investment guaranty program, although the conference postponed the effective date of this requirement from December 31, 1964, as provided in the House bill to December 31, 1965. It was our belief that those foreign governments who were sincerely interested in economic development should be willing to enter into investment guaranty agreements and that a 2-year period would provide ample time for them to make up their minds and take necessary preliminary action. We felt also that countries which were unwilling to enter into investment guaranty agreements should be put on notice of our intention to cut off aid and that a 2-year period would be ample for the closing out of our programs in such countries.

I would like to mention also one major provision of the Senate bill which we did not accept. The Senate bill included language requiring the President to appoint a series of committees to evaluate the economic program in each country which received economic aid during fiscal year 1963. These committees were given rather detailed guidance as to how they should carry on their work.

The House conferees were convinced that the last thing the foreign aid program needs is additional studies by distinguished citizens. It was our feeling that what the foreign aid program needs is to have the Secretary of State himself and those primarily responsible for our foreign policy take a new look at foreign aid as a tool for the attainment of our foreign policy objectives and decide whether we are really getting our money's worth and whether it is really producing the intended results. We see no point in sending a lot of people traveling around the world to produce a series of reports which will be scanned by the Executive to find comments favorable to foreign aid and which will be ignored in other respects.

We accepted language which merely says that the President can appoint one committee to study foreign aid if he wants to.

I want to take time to deal with one more matter before making myself available for questions. This is the acceptance by the House of a restricted version of the provision in the Senate bill authorizing the President to continue most-favored-nation treatment to Communist-dominated countries.

The foreign aid message sent to the Congress last spring, requesting an authorization for fiscal 1964, included a request for an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 which would, in effect, repeal the provision included in that act as originally passed requiring the termination of most-favored-nation treatment to Communist-dominated countries.

After consultation with the leadership of the House and with the chairman of

the Ways and Means Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee eliminated this provision from the bill, and the House bill contained no language dealing with this matter. The bill which passed the Senate included language authorizing the granting of most-favored-nation treatment to Communist-dominated countries at the discretion of the President.

Now, I feel that I, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and my fellow House conferees owe the House an explanation as to why we have changed our position and have brought back to the House legislation dealing with this matter, even though the provision we have accepted is much more restrictive than that contained in the Senate bill and is not what the Executive asked for.

In the first place, let me point out that a lot has happened since the President sent his foreign aid message to the House on April 2, 1963, and even since the House passed the foreign aid bill on August 23, 1963. Among the things that have happened has been the accession of a new President. We find ourselves in the closing days of the 1st session of the 88th Congress when it is clearly too late to initiate new legislation, and we are told by the new President that the continuation of most-favored nation treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia is the very foundation of our policy toward the Communist-dominated countries of Eastern Europe and that the President regards this particular legislation as of vital importance.

The managers on the part of the House do not go to conference as representatives of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, they go to conference as representatives of the House of Representatives. In the conference they found themselves in this position.

The Senate had passed a bill giving the President the authority he regarded as essential for the conduct of his policy for dealing with the nations of Eastern Europe. They recognized that there was no possibility of obtaining House action on this matter unless they agreed to bring a provision dealing with this subject back from conference. We fully recognized the position taken by the House in 1962, and because of that fact, we insisted on a modification of the broad discretion authorized by the Senate language. The provision we have brought to the House today gives the President discretion to grant most-favored-nation treatment to only two Communist-dominated countries—Poland and Yugoslavia.

The issues involved are primarily those of foreign policy and not economics. Whether we increase or decrease our trade with Poland and Yugoslavia, although it undoubtedly would affect a number of individuals, would have very little impact on the economy of the United States as a whole.

I am sure that every Member of the House believes that we ought to assist in the liberation of the Communist-dominated countries of Eastern Europe. I doubt if there is any Member of the House who believes that we should go to war with the Soviet Union today in order to attain that objective, and I doubt that the enslaved peoples of these countries, when they think of the devastation which atomic war would involve, want us to do so.

We are faced with the situation then of doing the unspectacular things which apply pressures in various ways to bring freedom to these people. It is the judgment of the present administration, just as it was the judgment of President Kennedy and of President Eisenhower, that the best thing we can do is to encourage the people of the Communist-dominated countries to maintain their national identities and to develop their economic independence from the Soviet Union. This is the basis of our policy, and this is why this legislation is needed.

I urge the House not to forget the basic issue involved and its importance to our foreign policy.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The thing that disturbs me is that in acceding to the Senate amendment, although you made changes in it, was not so much a matter of policy involved as it was a matter of the jurisdiction of the committee.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means made a representation, as I understand it, to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman now in the well of the House, as you point out, and it was on that basis, I understand, your committee did not ask, even though it was requested to do so in the first authorization, this further authority. I am concerned not so much about the merits of whether we extend the most-favored-nation treatment to the two countries involved, Poland and Yugoslavia, but the issue of whether or not we are going to use the foreign aid bill to usurp jurisdiction of other committees. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has no jurisdiction in this area whatever. I think the gentleman recognizes that. Yet we went along, even after representations were made by the chairman of our committee, the Ways and Means Committee of the House, in accepting the amendment. I would like to have some explanation as to why that was done.

Mr. MORGAN. The statement of the gentleman is basically correct. The provision was in the original foreign aid bill sent up to Congress in April. After the foreign aid bill had been under consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs for several weeks, I received a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means requesting jurisdiction over this section 402 in the foreign aid bill. The Committee on Foreign Affairs immediately conceded jurisdiction to the great Committee on Ways and Means.

When we went to conference, since the other body operates under a different system of parliamentary rules, the most-favored-nation provision was inserted in the foreign aid bill in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. When this arrived on the floor, not one single question was raised about this by any Member of the Senate, including the members of the Senate Finance Committee who had jurisdiction over this item. This, of course, was a strong argument used by the Senate conferees, plus the fact that the new administration urgently requested this authority. The House conferees were convinced that the right thing to do under the circumstances was to accept the provision as modified in conference.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I think it is fair to point out also, Mr. Chairman, while there is no argument about the jurisdiction under the rules of the House a broad general argument can be raised that this is not only a matter for the Ways and Means Committee but also a matter of foreign policy in the application. As the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee pointed out, this matter was brought up in the Senate and there was no objection over there. If I recall correctly, in the conference committee we were told they had a letter from the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee saying he had no objection to putting it in. So we were relying upon that particular phase of the question, and we stood firm as long as we could, and finally got some modification, but we did feel that was the best we could do under the circumstances.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I do not think the argument that the House Foreign Affairs Committee is entitled to deal with most-favored-nations clause simply because it affects foreign policy is valid because the same thing could be said for the whole Trade Agreements Act; that it affects foreign policy. Yet the Trade Agreements Act was and is properly within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. The Foreign Affairs Committee should never, as in this case, attempt to usurp the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. I do not see how you can differentiate between the line of action now being taken in this bill with respect to Yugoslavia and Poland and still divorce that action from the exclusive jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As one of the House conferees, I might point out that this discussion demonstrates the difficulties we had on a number of points with our colleagues in the other body. Of course there are foreign policy implications about this provision. No one can argue that. Nor can anyone argue that there is sometimes competing jurisdiction between committees. However, as a matter of fact the Senate conferees pointed out there had been no disagreement on their side, and they made a very good case for the language as it was

incorporated in the Senate bill. We finally accepted their provision, but we tightened it up very considerably by extending the most-favored-nations clause to these two countries only. Admittedly there was originally some argument, and then agreement, in the House as to where the jurisdiction lay. But this did not mean we did not have a problem which had to be solved. I hope the House will accept this as a reasonable compromise. It is only one of several. It is one on which Members may disagree, but I think we had no choice but to come up with language along these lines.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. First, I would like to compliment the gentleman on his excellent statement. Second, I would like to ask this: The gentleman from Pennsylvania has quoted indirectly the new President, President Johnson, in stating that this particular provision is vital to U.S. foreign policy and the favored-nation treatment for Poland and Yugoslavia. Could you tell us how the word was received and give us a direct quote on it rather than an indirect statement?

Mr. MORGAN. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was not called directly by the President. I did, however, receive an urgent communication that he regarded this legislation as of greatest importance.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Do you not think, if we are going to have the administration behind this and have unidentified members of the executive department quoted, that we should have a direct quote from the President because I feel this is something of vital interest, too.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we do have a direct quote from the President on this very subject in his speech to the Congress in which he asked for early enactment of this authorization without crippling amendments which would destroy his flexibility. I would point out to the House that there is nothing in this language which says he has to give the most-favored-nation treatment to either one of these nations, but he does have the flexibility to do so, if it is in the national interest of the United States to do it. So I think you cannot have a much more direct quote from the President than you have right there in that statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this conference report. That is not by any means to be taken as an indication that I think the conferees have been less than diligent in their efforts. On the contrary, I would say they have worked hard and effectively. The conferees made a real effort, with considerable success, to represent the position of the House. I think the efforts of the conferees, with the exception of the present speaker, in this case are to be commended.

On balance I would feel that the position of the House was represented more successfully than was the position of the other body. My objection to this report is rather a basic and longstanding one to the aid programs themselves and for that reason as I said I shall vote against the report.

There are some figures that might helpfully be kept in mind, and I shall speak in round numbers only. Members will recall that when the proposal on this year's bill was first brought to the Congress, the request was for $4.9 billion. After the report of the Clay Committee, the late President Kennedy reduced the request to $4.5 billion.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported out a bill carrying approximately $4.1 billion. Then on the floor of the House this body reduced the authorization to $3.5 billion. Thereafter the other body brought out a bill which provided about $4.2 billion in authorization. The other body on the floor reduced its figure to $3.7 billion. In the Committee of Conference the conferees split almost exactly those two figures to bring before you now a bill at $3.6 billion or very slightly thereunder. It is $3.6 billion on authorization.

Upon the matter of dollars and cents your conferees had little trouble. I think anyone who studies the table to which reference has been made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or in the conference report will observe that there was a very real give and take.

As I said a few moments ago, the division was almost directly down the middle. Dollarwise, therefore, there is little to be said.

Reference has been made, heretofore, to the matter of the amendment of the Trade Agreements Act of 1962. Unless Members have questions upon that, it is not my intention to go further into it at this time.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. On that point—and I think the record has been made, but I do want to express my concern that this conference report should contain an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act. The most-favored-nations treatment is peculiarily a part and a basic part of our trade negotiations. It contains a great deal beyond just the relationship that might exist between countries such as Poland and Yugoslavia. It relates to our entire trade relationships. I trust that the Senate went in depth into the subject matter as it would bear on the possible trade negotiations act.

I think this is a very bad procedure, but if the majority party which, after all, controls this wants to vote that kind of procedure, there is very little that the minority can do other than to register an objection. However, I would remind everyone that the only way to preserve government by law is by following correct procedures or, if you think the procedures are wrong, then change the procedures. Do not, just in order to get through some substantive matter—and the administration felt substantively that they wanted to change our attitude toward Yugoslavia and Poland in this respect—do not violate good procedures for this momentary benefit. We are seeing entirely too much of this in these days, and I am afraid we are undermining our entire system of government in this kind of irregular process.

I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Another point on which there was considerable controversy, and I believe a great amount of concern in this Chamber, is the question of the interest to be charged upon loans. Members will recall that by amendment on the floor of this House we established a 2-percent rate on interest. The other body established also a 2-percent rate on interest with certain additional modifications. First, it provided a 5-year grace period. Secondly, it provided that there should be a limitation of 35 years with respect to any loan. Out of these two provisions the conferees bring in today a proposal which gives a 10-year grace period with interest during that period at the rate of three-quarters of 1 percent and then thereafter a rate of 2 percent, excepting matters already now negotiated, with no time limit at all upon loans. Therefore, Members will immediately see that upon this rather important point there was a very great relaxation over the position which had been taken previously by this House.

Next there was a group of amendments relating generally to the area of private enterprise and its encouragement. Some of those had been added on the floor, some of them had been added in the committee. As to those, generally, there was not much controversy. Some rather small modifications were made but by and large I think it can be said that the conference report treats rather well the private enterprise sector of our economy and notes by its action in presenting this report that we do have a concern not only for the private sector of our economy but also for the fact that if such programs as the Alliance for Progress are to be successful great reliance must be placed upon the participation of the private sector. Government alone cannot carry the burden which will be required there.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the conferees for accepting the Senate provision for an Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in foreign economic development.

I remind the gentleman that during the consideration of the bill on the floor of the House I offered an amendment to

establish a commission with that same general purpose.

I hope this Advisory Committee will be able to make some recommendations which will move us in the direction of having economic development abroad carried on by private capital investment rather than Government grants and loans.

Mr. ADAIR. There were certain amendments which have had, again, a wide interest, which were put in by the other body. I know that some Members in this House have a concern over those. There were two which were sponsored by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. These amendments relate to the use of funds derived from repayment of Alliance for Progress loans and of development loans—these amendments did go out. They are not now in the bill.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding on this point because, as he knows, I have been urging the House conferees to accept the Senate amendments which would have eliminated these back-door spending revolving funds and place them on an annual appropriation basis.

Mr. ADAIR. I am aware of the efforts of the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. There were two amendments by the Senator from Colorado in this regard. I was very hopeful from conversations I had had that the House conferees would see their way clear to accepting them. I want to say that by the deletion of these amendments I think that the independence and integrity of the legislative branch of the Government has suffered greatly, and I regret it deeply.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, then there was an amendment relating to the freedom of the seas or, as some say, the "fisheries amendment." This concerned some of our west coast colleagues particularly and related to our relations with certain of our Latin American neighbors. Under it aid would have been denied to countries that extended their jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond that recognized by the United States. After a great deal of consideration that amendment which was placed in the bill by the other body was removed in its entirety. So there is no provision of that sort in the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. I associate myself with the constructive comments of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] in describing the weakening of the 2-percent interest rate amendment, which the House vigorously adopted. I feel retreat on this principle one of the basic weaknesses of the bill as approved by the conferees. However, since emphasis has been placed on this section by previous speakers, I direct my most extensive remarks to the restoration of the favored-nation tariff treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia.

First, to clarify the issue, one must remember that in 1962 under the Tariff Act this favored-nation treatment was removed but never implemented by the Executive Branch of the Government. Actually, in complete defiance of the 1962 Tariff Act, steps were never taken to remove this favored-nation treatment and, as a result, preferential tariff treatment has continued to be extended to Poland and Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that the favored-nation clause extends preferential tariff treatment, and this is the issue.

The language which appears on page 32 of the conference report discussing this section is, I believe, an insult to the intelligence of the Members of the House and the American public. It refers to liberation:

> The liberation of the countries of Eastern Europe from Soviet domination has the overwhelming support of the American people and their elected representatives.

However, the report cannot say that it has the support of the State Department and the support of anyone in the executive branch of the Government. The foreign policy in the last 3 years has been to repudiate the desire for freedom evidenced by the captive nations under communism, and the insistence of the administration to give preferential tariff treatment to Yugoslavia and Poland is dramatic proof.

Mr. Speaker, the granting of preferential tariff treatment to Communist countries merely maintains the status quo of Communist control over Eastern Europe. It does not aid the liberation of these countries.

When we extend this favored tariff treatment to these countries, we are perpetuating communism, not fighting or defeating communism.

Why Poland and Yugoslavia? If one has read the newspapers during the last month, they will find in Poland that the recent trend has not been toward liberation or moving toward a pro-Western position. It has been a trend of increased persecution of religion, increased persecution of the economy of the country and increased persecution of the people.

Mr. Speaker, at the very time when the Polish Communist government is persecuting the people of that country, we are going to give it the benefit of the favored-nation tariff treatment, while at the same time the Communist government of Yugoslavia is directly participating in subversive activities in Latin America, Asia, and Africa in the Communist international conspiracy, we are extending preferential tariff treatment to them.

Incidentally, Marshal Tito is not a mild, nonalined Communist. He has been part of the Communist conspiracy since 1917. He fought in the Spanish Civil War on the side of the Communists.

Also, during the war years of 1942 to 1945 he spent more time eliminating political opposition than he did fighting the Nazis who controlled his country.

Mr. Speaker, Marshal Tito is about as free from the Communist conspiracy as is Gus Hall.

There is no logic to justify providing preferential tariff treatment to any Communist country.

I would suggest to the House that the very acquiescence of the conference committee to this clause is enough evidence to reject this entire conference report. I urge that we reject the conference report on the basis of respecting the Committee on Ways and Means, or on what I consider a more effective argument, that we have no business whatsoever in extending preferential tariff treatment to any Communist country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the conference report on this basic issue, as well as on the valid objection to the retreat the House conferees made on the 2 percent interest rate amendment.

The authorization bill must be stronger in expressing public views concerning the inadequate and dangerous administration of the foreign aid program.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the 2 minutes allotted to me, let me say that I am opposed to this conference report on the foreign handout bill, first because it is $100 million more than was authorized by the House of Representatives. I am also opposed to it because of its emasculation of the 2-percent interest rate on foreign loans, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] has just pointed out. That provision, wisely written into the authorization bill by the House, has been mangled to the point that it is of no effect. I am opposed to the conference report because it wipes out the prohibition to give the most-favored-nations trade treatment to Yugoslavia and Poland. I am opposed to it because it does not deal realistically with the expropriation of American investments, particularly in South America. The Congress of the United States will one of these days have to come to grips w'th this situation. It does not mean very much in the matter of halting expropriations to say to a foreign government that "you must indemnify American investors," then use money appropriated for foreign aid so that they can go through the motions of paying for the properties they have stolen. That is what is happening today, and it is a shameless use of our taxpayers' money.

I know of no reason for the creation of an advisory committee on foreign aid and private investment. We have had the Grace report and all kinds of other reports dealing with the matter of private investments in foreign countries. I see no reason for spending more money for another advisory committee or commission.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending conference report, and I join our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

in assuring Members that the House conferees worked to the fullest extent possible to maintain the House version.

I want to commend our chairman, Dr. MORGAN, as he has shown in this conference unusual forcefulness and determination. His efforts are reflected in the fact that of the 80 points of difference between the House and Senate versions the House conferees come back with nearly 75 percent of the differences resolved in favor of the House.

This record speaks very well of the efforts of the House conferees led by our able chairman.

Further, I do want to comment on the most-favored-nations treatment provision. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], I, and all of us want to see countries under Soviet domination liberated. There may be several ways of accomplishing this development. No one advocates war. In my opinion a desirable way is to prevent their dependence on the Kremlin. One way of liberating them, is to bring the satellite countries on a trade basis closer to the free world. The discretionary authority provided in the conference report is vital to the implementation of the efforts to bring about the liberation of the countries of Eastern Europe. That is the reason the House conferees acceded to the Senate version as amended by the House conferees to limit trade concessions to Poland and Yugoslavia.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, it has been urged that the House vote against this conference report because there is an increase of $100 million. I should like to point out that the money difference amounted to $200,290,000. The Senate receded in an amount of $100,290,000. Thus the House conferees have done better than splitting the difference 50-50. Therefore, the House conferees, as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, the House conferees have done very well.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the conference report be adopted.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to request of the conferees clarification and definition of the language of the report dealing with title 5 of the bill, and the commitment of funds thereunder for research and development on the question of population growth. It is my understanding the language replaced dealt with the matter of population control. The new language deals with research. I am anxious to get a clarification of that statement.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The Senate version included a provision that—

> Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research in the problems of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control.

The House conferees were adamant in their opposition. After much debate the managers on the part of the House agreed to a modification of the Senate provision so that it provides that—

> Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into problems of population growth.

We are all concerned with the problems of population growth. The conferees, however, did not want this House or the Congress to go on record favoring disseminating information and the means of controlling population.

Mr. CAREY. Then we are not going into propaganda for dissemination of information or devices in this field? It is restricted to research into problems of population growth?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is right. The gentleman's understanding is absolutely accurate.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the discussion we have had up to now indicates at least one area of fairly general agreement. I refer to the amounts under discussion in this bill. I think the agreement on the dollar figures between the House and the Senate is a reasonable one. It represents a very substantial reduction from what the executive branch suggested, and deems of great significance to this country. I hope it will not again be cut substantially when the appriation committee starts to operate on this program.

As has been said, the House receded on 21 items out of a total of 80, the Senate on 36, and 23 of the differences between the two bodies were modified in the course of the discussion.

The gentleman from Iowa has suggested that we have not been specific enough with respect to expropriation. May I point out that the language on the bottom of page 9 and at the top of page 10, of the conference report indicates very clearly our efforts to tighten up the existing language. It makes clear provision against what is known as creeping expropriation. This language should certainly provide additional weapons to fight against actions of the sort described by the countries which are receiving our assistance.

For reasons already mentioned by the chairman of the committee, the Peace Corps was specifically excluded from this flat prohibition. The language with respect to this appears on page 12 of the conference report; also excluded are the cultural exchange program, the Export-Import Bank, and famine and disaster relief provided under Public Law 480. All these exceptions seem to me to be reasonable. Even with these exceptions there is no question but that the program is very significantly tightened.

Mention has been made of the modification in the interest rates which recipient countries must meet. I should like to point out that the compromise which was reached provides for a 10-year grace period after which there is the imposition of a 2-percent floor. The executive branch pointed out to the conferees the very real importance of conducting this kind of operation with the abilities of the recipient countries in mind. They pointed out that development loans are repayable in dollars. Because most less developed countries are short of foreign exchange, their capacity to service their debt obligations to the United States will depend on their achieving an improvement in their foreign exchange earning capabilities.

Therefore, a most important feature in any loan repayment obligation of a recipient country is the grace period on principal repayments. It is because we do not wish to unduly burden these countries with unrealistic interest rates that we have felt it wise to continue a grace period for 10 years.

This is the principle we have been trying to get other lending countries to accept. It seemed to us wise to authorize this amount of grace period, rather than to have a rigid prohibition, and a requirement of the immediate installation of a 2-percent-interest floor.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of any other foreign nation that is making loans at less than 2 percent? Is it not true that other nations, if they make foreign loans, charge the Treasury rates of their particular governments plus a premium, if there is any significant risk involved?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Of course, the countries that are involved in various consortium agreements are obliged to go along with the terms agreed upon. That is one reason we have the provision saying that existing agreements cannot be tampered with.

To answer the gentleman, there are other countries that are lending money on terms comparable to ours. It is not that we are seeking to provide unrealistic terms for repayment. However, if we provide assistance to these countries, I think we must recognize we must give them some time to put their own house in order. Only by giving them a grace period can they generate enough from the loans to provide them with the wherewithal to meet these payments. Otherwise, we might just as well say we are not going to provide assistance of any kind. I recognize, of course, there are some who feel that we should not.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Was the point ever considered in conference that, perhaps, a slightly more practical return might permit us to stimulate the additional investments or even additional aid to those countries, if for no other reason than that we would be revolving our fund with greater money?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman, we were not in a position to look into anything beyond the scope of what was in disagreement between the House and Senate, so there was no possibility of considering any new arrangement. Perhaps the gentleman feels higher interest rates are more practical, but if they kept underdeveloped countries from making arrangements with us, or increased the likelihood of their defaulting on obligations assumed, no one would be helped.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I favor this conference report. I sat on the committee, and I want to say that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, was adamant in maintaining the position of the House. I think the fact that when you go into conference with as many items in disagreement as were in disagreement between this body and the other body, and with the House maintaining its position on almost a 2 to 1 ratio, it speaks well for the conferees and especially for the chairman whose leadership we follow.

There were some objections made to the money items. But, it has been my observation here that when money items are in disagreement between the two bodies, the usual procedure is to split the difference 50–50. We did a little better than that and the other body came a little farther our way than we went theirs. Again I think that speaks well for the chairman because he did endeavor at all times to maintain the position of the House.

The other area in which there has been some controversy is the most-favored-nation matter. I did point out that we agree this, under the rules of the House, belongs to the Committee on Ways and Means. But it was put in by the other body under their rules and it had to be disposed of.

I think it is fair to point out too, Mr. Speaker, although it has been said here that Yugoslavia is part of the monolithic Communist conspiracy that this is a debatable question. Just because it was said on the floor does not necessarily make it so. I think it is also fair to point out that the Communists in Russia have never felt quite sure of this themselves. I think that the advantage to our side has been that they have never known quite where Tito has stood. I have never thought that he was particularly our friend, but it has been worth something through the years to us to keep the Communists in Moscow in doubt as to where Tito and his numerous military divisions stood.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. I want to say that I am not a member of the conference committee, but I followed almost daily the accomplishments of the committee and I wish to commend the House conferees for the excellent job that they did. I feel that the will of the House has prevailed in the conference report and we should be proud indeed to vote for final passage of this bill.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, although I did not support this legislation in its final passage by the House earlier this year, I feel strongly that it was much more desirable than the compromise legislation presented to us today as a result of the conference with the Senate.

In its present form, H.R. 7885 abandons many of the long-overdue reforms called for in the bill as it originally passed the House. In fact, much of the original insistence by the House that the foreign aid program be tightened up has been watered down. There is little or no hope in this bill that meaningful congressional control will be reasserted.

Basically, the broad powers of the administrators of the foreign aid program, which were under such deserved attack on this floor, are now quietly sustained. The old arguments that "flexibility of policy" is required, have been used to cover a complexity of maladministration in the past. In acceding to the Senate's larger grant of authority and discretion to the White House and the administrators of this program, we are perpetuating the same powers which have existed so long. I still believe the Congress should demand reasonable standards of administration and that the discretionary powers should be sharply limited. These restrictions should certainly include a statement of congressional policy with respect to trade and aid with and to Communist countries. The compromise which perpetuates most-favored-nation treatment to Communist Poland and Yugoslavia is, in my opinion, unsupportable.

This bill adds $100 million to the funds originally authorized by the House. Important as this issue is, of even greater importance is the fact that in so many of its details, the bill concedes too much and recedes too far from the principles that guided the House a few months ago. If we agree to this report, we will be evading again the responsibilities that are clearly ours to force the reforms in foreign aid that we know must be made and which we know the American people are demanding.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, careful study of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 reveals the compelling need for extensive reevaluation and revision of the use of these concepts by the United States as an instrument of foreign policy. Historically, I have generally supported our mutual security programs, although I have consistently voted to strip from these measures many of the wasteful and fiscally unsound features which have plagued these plans, particularly in recent years. It is readily apparent that many of my colleagues share this concern in that both Houses of this Congress have seen fit to sharply curtail certain aspects of the program originally sent up by the administration.

It is my opinion, however, that these revisions are somewhat random in nature and strike only at the most flagrant and obvious abuses that have perverted the intent of Congress in this respect. These revisions have been aimed at the symptomatic manifestations of the problem and not at the core or cause of the trouble.

Since the inception of the foreign assistance program, following the Second World War, the United States has undertaken to assist some 110 countries and territories. Eighteen years later we are presently assisting some 95 countries and territories. It therefore seems obvious, this aid must of necessity be thinly spread and increasingly dilute. How long can we continue to subsidize a majority of the nations on the face of the globe, regardless of our strength and wealth?

I believe that we must survey each recipient of our aid, nation by nation, program by program. Guidelines must be layed out and qualifying requirements should be rigidly established. Goals and objectives should be spelled out carefully and progress reports to the Congress should determine whether or not a nation should continue as a recipient of our aid.

I feel that we would be far wiser to concentrate our efforts toward realistic and practical goals involving fewer countries, than continuing to compound the evils of the scatter-gun techniques we continue to employ.

The military assistance aspect of this program should be thoroughly reappraised. The objectives of this undertaking should be redefined and the capabilities of such alinements weighed against the costs. The United States provides, in my opinion, a completely disproportionate share of the security requirements of our prosperous allies. The time has come to reassess these alinements.

In other instances these funds have been needed to build up military establishments in countries whose leaders have used such forces to perpetuate their own undemocratic regimes. Some of these governments have been frankly communistic and frequently antagonistic to the Govenrment of the United States. I seriously question the wisdom of continuing such programs until completely reevaluated.

The foreign assistance program is fraught with excessively poor administrative practices. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs reports that in some instances funds obligated for projects were subsequently diverted to other uses when the projects did not materialize. This practice circumvents congressional control and should be terminated at once.

The committee declares that it is impossible to determine the true extent of foreign aid personnel costs because they are obscured by the diversity of sources from which they are paid and the practices of AID charging some employees to program costs. There are references by the committee to the expanding practice of "contract foreign aid" indicating that in excess of $435 million is administered under contract to AID. These private concerns in essence provide aid to various nations for a fee and in many instances this fee has been exorbitant. The cost for administration of some such contracts has exceeded $50,000 per man per year. I feel these practices demand a complete investigation and revision.

It should be emphasized the executive branch has participated in a number of additional administrative practices which are extremely reprehensible. Among these are the commitment of the

United States to future programs without the consent or approval of the Congress, misuse of our aid dollars to create government-owned installations to compete with free enterprise in various nations.

These practices must be halted.

In conclusion, I subscribe to the views of those members of the House Committee on Foreign Aid when they signed the minority views on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963:

We believe it is high time for the Congress to pause and take a hard, realistic look at this entire program. We must put away the carrot and lay the facts of life before our allies. We must enunciate specific objectives which are within our means to achieve through foreign aid. And we must concentrate and sharpen our effort to secure those objectives.

Most of all, we must not fool ourselves that the bill accompanying this report will accomplish any of these long overdue reforms.

In the public interest, this is the course which we should follow. Until we do, the public interest demands that this legislation be defeated.

To sum up—

The aid program must be completely revised.

The aid program must be brought, in all its financial aspects, under the unfettered control of the Congress.

The aid program must be limited to the actual amount which the recipient countries can absorb effectively, and deobligated funds must immediately revert to the Treasury.

The aid program must be withheld from countries which use it for the purpose of territorial expansion.

The aid program must have stricter administrative supervision, and all "featherbedding" practices must be terminated.

The aid program must require specific congressional authorization for each project exceeding $50 million.

The aid program must be limited exclusive to non-Communist countries.

The aid program must contain stronger safeguards to prohibit the use of our aid to finance government-owned productive facilities which compete with private enterprise in the recipient countries.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 164, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—195

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Addabbo | Bass | Broomfield |
| Albert | Bates | Burke |
| Arends | Beckworth | Burkhalter |
| Ashley | Blatnik | Byrne, Pa. |
| Aspinall | Boggs | Byrnes, Wis. |
| Auchincloss | Boland | Cahill |
| Baldwin | Bolton, Frances P. | Cameron |
| Barrett | Brademas | Carey |
| Barry | | Celler |
| Chelf | Holland | Perkins |
| Clark | Hosmer | Philbin |
| Cleveland | Joelson | Pike |
| Cohelan | Johnson, Calif. | Pilcher |
| Conte | Johnson, Wis. | Pirnie |
| Daddario | Jones, Ala. | Powell |
| Daniels | Karsten | Price |
| Dawson | Karth | Pucinski |
| Delaney | Kastenmeier | Purcell |
| Dent | Keith | Rains |
| Denton | Keogh | Randall |
| Diggs | King, Calif. | Reid, N.Y. |
| Donohue | Kirwan | Reuss |
| Dulski | Kluczynski | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Duncan | Kunkel | Riehlman |
| Dwyer | Lankford | Rivers, Alaska |
| Edmondson | Leggett | Robison |
| Elliott | Lesinski | Rodino |
| Everett | Libonati | Rogers, Colo. |
| Evins | Lindsay | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Fallon | Lloyd | Roosevelt |
| Fascell | Long, Md. | Rosenthal |
| Feighan | McDade | Rostenkowski |
| Finnegan | McFall | Ryan, Mich. |
| Fino | McIntire | Ryan, N.Y. |
| Flood | MacGregor | St. Onge |
| Fogarty | Madden | Schweiker |
| Ford | Mahon | Schwengel |
| Fraser | Mathias | Selden |
| Frelinghuysen | Matsunaga | Shipley |
| Friedel | Matthews | Sickles |
| Fulton, Pa. | Meader | Sisk |
| Fulton, Tenn. | Miller, Calif. | Slack |
| Gallagher | Miller, N.Y. | Smith, Iowa |
| Garmatz | Minish | Springer |
| Gary | Montoya | Staebler |
| Giaimo | Moorhead | Stafford |
| Gibbons | Morgan | Staggers |
| Gilbert | Morse | Steed |
| Gonzalez | Morton | Stratton |
| Grabowski | Moss | Sullivan |
| Gray | Multer | Thornberry |
| Green, Oreg. | Murphy, Ill. | Toll |
| Griffin | Murphy, N.Y. | Tupper |
| Griffiths | Natcher | Udall |
| Gubser | Nedzi | Ullman |
| Hagen, Calif. | Nix | Van Deerlin |
| Halleck | O'Brien, N.Y. | Vanik |
| Halpern | O'Hara, Ill. | Wallhauser |
| Hansen | Olsen, Mont. | Watts |
| Harding | Olson, Minn. | Weltner |
| Hardy | O'Neill | Whalley |
| Hawkins | Osmers | Wydler |
| Hays | Ostertag | Young |
| Healey | Patman | Zablocki |
| Hechler | Patten | |
| Holifield | Pepper | |

NAYS—164

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Dague | Laird |
| Abele | Derwinski | Landrum |
| Abernethy | Devine | Langen |
| Adair | Dole | Latta |
| Alger | Dorn | Lennon |
| Anderson | Dowdy | Lipscomb |
| Andrews, Ala. | Downing | McClory |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Findley | McCulloch |
| Ashbrook | Fisher | McLoskey |
| Ashmore | Flynt | McMillan |
| Avery | Foreman | Marsh |
| Baker | Forrester | Martin, Calif. |
| Baring | Fountain | Martin, Nebr. |
| Battin | Fuqua | May |
| Becker | Gathings | Mills |
| Beermann | Glenn | Moore |
| Belcher | Goodell | Morris |
| Bennett, Fla. | Goodling | Mosher |
| Bennett, Mich. | Gross | Murray |
| Berry | Grover | Nelsen |
| Betts | Hagan, Ga. | Norblad |
| Bonner | Haley | O'Konski |
| Bow | Hall | Passman |
| Bray | Harris | Pelly |
| Brock | Harrison | Pillion |
| Bromwell | Harsha | Poage |
| Brotzman | Harvey, Ind. | Poff |
| Brown, Ohio | Henderson | Pool |
| Broyhill, N C. | Herlong | Quillen |
| Broyhill, Va. | Hoeven | Reid, Ill. |
| Bruce | Hoffman | Reifel |
| Burleson | Horan | Rich |
| Cannon | Horton | Roberts, Tex. |
| Casey | Huddleston | Rogers, Fla. |
| Cederberg | Hull | Rogers, Tex. |
| Chamberlain | Hutchinson | Roudebush |
| Chenoweth | Ichord | Roush |
| Clancy | Jennings | Rumsfeld |
| Clausen, Don H. | Jensen | Saylor |
| Collier | Johansen | Schadeberg |
| Colmer | Johnson, Pa. | Schenck |
| Corbett | Jonas | Schneebeli |
| Cramer | Jones, Mo. | Scott |
| Cunningham | Kilburn | Secrest |
| Curtin | Kilgore | Short |
| Curtis | King, N.Y. | Siler |
| | Knox | Skubitz |
| | Kyl | Smith, Calif. |
| Smith, Va. | Tollefson | Whitener |
| Snyder | Tuten | Williams |
| Taft | Van Pelt | Wilson, Ind. |
| Talcott | Waggonner | Winstead |
| Taylor | Watson | Wyman |
| Teague, Calif. | Weaver | Younger |
| Teague, Tex. | Westland | |
| Thomson, Wis. | Wharton | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bell

NOT VOTING—74

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ayres | Jarman | Sheppard |
| Bolling | Kee | Shriver |
| Bolton, Oliver P. | Kelly | Sibal |
| Brooks | Kornegay | Sikes |
| Brown, Calif. | Long, La. | Stephens |
| Buckley | McDowell | Stinson |
| Burton | Macdonald | Stubblefield |
| Clawson, Del | Mailliard | Thomas |
| Cooley | Martin, Mass. | Thompson, La. |
| Corman | Michel | Thompson, N.J. |
| Davis, Ga. | Milliken | Thompson, Tex. |
| Davis, Tenn. | Minshall | Trimble |
| Derounian | Monagan | Tuck |
| Dingell | Morrison | Utt |
| Edwards | O'Brien, Ill. | Vinson |
| Ellsworth | O'Hara, Mich. | White |
| Farbstein | Quie | Whitten |
| Gill | Rhodes, Ariz. | Wickersham |
| Grant | Rivers, S.C. | Widnall |
| Green, Pa. | Roberts, Ala. | Willis |
| Gurney | Rooney, Pa. | Wilson, Bob |
| Hanna | Roybal | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Harvey, Mich. | St. George | Wright |
| Hébert | St Germain | |
| Hemphill | Senner | |
| | Shelley | |

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Hemphill against.

Mr. Quie for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Edwards for, with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Shriver against.

Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Minshall against.

Mr. St Germain for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Sibal for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan for, with Mr. Burton against.

Mr. White for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Stubblefield for, with Mr. Tuck against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Grant against.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Kornegay against.

Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. Jarman against.

Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Stinson against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Thomas against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Michel against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Gill with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Senner.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I am recorded as voting "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN]. Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] for the purpose of calling up two bills.

## MAINTENANCE OF PERPETUAL ACCOUNTS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 2054) to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That in any case in which any money has been held in trust for, or for the account of, any person by the government of the District of Columbia pursuant to statute or otherwise, and no communication, in writing or otherwise as indicated by a written memorandum, has been received by the government of the District of Columbia concerning such money from the person entitled thereto, for a period of not less than ten years, the Commissioners shall send notice by registered or certified mail to the last known address of the person for whom such money is being held. Such mailed notice shall contain a statement that money is being held for such person and if no written claim for the return thereof is submitted to the Commissioners within sixty days of the date such notice is mailed, any future claim therefor will, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this Act, be forever barred.

SEC. 2. (a) Not less than sixty days after the mailing of any notice pursuant to the first section of this Act the Commissioners shall publish notice once each week for two successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the District of Columbia. Such published notice shall be entitled "Notice of Names of Persons Appearing to be Owners of Unclaimed Money Held by the District of Columbia" and shall contain:

(1) The names and the last known addresses, if any, of the persons for whom moneys are being held (listed in alphabetical order of their surnames).

(2) A statement setting forth the substance of subsection (b) of this section.

(b) If no written claim for the return of any such money is submitted to the Commissioners by the date specified in the published notices, which date shall be not less than ninety days from the date of publication of the second notice, such money shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia and all claims for such money shall be forever barred.

SEC. 3. In any case where any money held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia for the period of time and under the same circumstances as specified in the first section of this Act is in an amount less than the cost, as estimated by the Commissioners, of giving notice as required by the first two sections of this Act, such money may be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia without the necessity of complying with the notice requirements of sections 1 and 2 hereof, and after such deposit all claims for such money shall be forever barred.

SEC. 4. Upon the return of any money deposited with the government of the District of Columbia to the person making such deposit after notice has been given such person pursuant to this Act, the Commissioners are authorized to deduct from such returned money the costs of mailing and publishing notices required by this Act, and shall deposit the amount so deducted in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. As used in this Act, the word "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

May we have just a brief explanation of this bill?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under existing law, the District of Columbia is required to hold in perpetuity funds paid into certain accounts under the custody of the District of Columbia. These include the juvenile court, the Highway Department, and other departments. This legislation will merely require that the District of Columbia hold these balances for a period of 10 years before they are covered into the general treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Since the funds for automobile insurance go into a specific fund—and I realize it is a comparatively small amount—but since this is an earmarked fund, would it not have been better to have provided that the unclaimed funds which have been paid in for the purpose of providing auto insurance should go to this earmarked fund? Does the gentleman agree that the funds that are paid in for a special and particular purpose, which are unclaimed, should go to the fund for which they were collected rather than into the general fund of the treasury or the general funds of the District of Columbia?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I would say to the gentleman that the average amount of these funds is only $20.

Mr. GROSS. But what is the total amount?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The funds involved amount to only $30,000.

Mr. GROSS. The average is not in excess of $20 in each account?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The average amount is only $20.

Mr. GROSS. That may be, but the cumulative amount of the funds is in excess of $20. If I remember correctly the unclaimed auto insurance funds total some $7,000. This would pay the damages in a number of accidents.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. There would be a few items that would be in excess of it. The average is only about $20 and the total amount is only $30,000 in all of the various accounts.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, S. 2054, as set forth in the report—House Report No. 1001—is to provide procedures whereby the District of Columbia government can be relieved after a period of 10 years of the administrative burden of maintaining unclaimed accounts of money that have been deposited in trust with an agency or department of the District government.

Examples of such unclaimed accounts are moneys received from inmates of the Department of Corrections, juvenile court, patient coming under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Health and the Department of Public Welfare, and money on deposit in the motor vehicle owners' and operators' financial responsibility fund.

The vast majority of these accounts are for small amounts, averaging less than $20 per account. However, we are advised that there are presently more than 1,000 such dormant accounts, totaling some $25,000. Following is a letter from Hon. Walter Tobriner, President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, addressed to Chairman JOHN L. MCMILLAN under date of September 30, 1963, itemizing these accounts of unclaimed moneys.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
*Washington, D.C., September 30, 1963.*

Re H.R. 8377, a bill to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
*Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: With further reference to your letter dated September 11, 1963, there is shown below an itemization listing the various types of deposits of unclaimed moneys. This listing is based on a study of the past 3 years.

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of Highways and Traffic; unclaimed funds deposited for driveway construction, crossing sidewalk with trucks, tree removal, driveway construction | $2,422.35 |
| Department of Highways and Traffic, unclaimed funds deposited for plumber's guarantees | 1,331.97 |
| Department of Highways and Traffic; unclaimed funds deposited for building operations, damage to curb, sidewalk, roadway, and property damage, heavy hauling | 2,321.04 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of Corrections; unclaimed funds of inmates released or deceased, District of Columbia jail and Lorton, Va. | $1,141.81 |
| Juvenile court; unclaimed funds, support and restitution | 4,341.45 |
| Bond deductions of employees separated from the service of the District of Columbia and could not be located | 291.25 |
| District of Columbia Court of General Sessions (formerly municipal court), Civil Division; unclaimed funds over 6 years old, received by the court for cash bond, security cost, and deposits in the registry of the court | 4,543.26 |
| District of Columbia Court of General Sessions (formerly municipal court), Civil Division; unclaimed funds over 6 years old deposited for civil and landlord and tenant cases | 724.42 |
| Department of Motor Vehicles, Safety Responsibility Division, motor vehicle owners and operators financial responsibility fund, District of Columbia; moneys deposited by uninsured drivers or owners who were involved in accidents and being held by the District for the benefit of other parties involved in accidents for the period August 1955 to September 1963 and depositors cannot now be located | 7,748.93 |

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
*President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.*

Under the terms of the bill, it is provided that after 10 years from the date of deposit of the money with the District government, or after 10 years from the date of the last communications received about such deposit, the money will be transferred to the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia, and all claims shall be forever barred where the persons entitled to the return of such money have failed to submit a written claim for such return after having been afforded notice by registered or certified mail, and newspaper publication of their right of reclaim.

The bill also provides that the costs incident to notification by mail and publication would be deducted from any amount claimed by a depositor. In instances of where the costs of notification exceeds the amount on deposit, then notification would not be required and the amount could be immediately transferred to the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

The actual saving to the District of Columbia in terms of man-hours and of space is difficult to estimate, but according to District officials it would be substantial.

A public hearing was held on October 4, 1963, on H.R. 8377, a bill which is identical to S. 2054. At this time, a representative of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and an official from the District of Columbia Finance Office testified in support of this legislation. No opposition to its passage was expressed.

The following letter was addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, requesting this legislation:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
*Washington, August 7, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to relieve the District of Columbia of the administrative burden of maintaining from year to year indefinitely accounts of money deposited in trust with the District but not reclaimed by the persons depositing it. Examples of this type of account are unclaimed moneys in the dormant acounts kept in juvenile court, in the Department of Corrections (funds of inmates), in the Departments of Public Health and Public Welfare (funds of patients), and moneys in the motor vehicle owners' and operators' financial responsibility fund. The bulk of these accounts are for small amounts averaging less than $20 per account. Since the District of Columbia may have had no inquiries or claims concerning them for at least 10 years, the presumption is strong that the depositors who have not completely forgotten about their deposits have moved away, died, or otherwise abandoned all claims to the funds. However, audits of these accounts are made each year and records relating to the moneys must be maintained. Conceivably, the expense of maintaining any such record could, over the years, exceed the amount of money being held.

The bill provides that after 10 years from the date of the last communication received about any such unclaimed moneys held by the District of Columbia, they will be transferred to the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District, after the persons entitled to the return of such moneys are afforded notice, either by publication or by registered or certified mail sent to them at their last known address, of their right of reclaim. The costs of such notification would be deducted from any amount claimed by a depositor. In cases where the costs of notification would be more than the amount on deposit, such notification would not be required and the amount could immediately be transferred to the Treasury to the credit of the District. Currently, the cost of publishing notice is approximately $1.40 per name and address listed and the cost of sending a registered or certified letter is 25 and 65 cents, respectively.

It is estimated that more than 1,000 accounts could be closed out if this legislation were enacted. The saving to the District in man-hours and space in the maintenance of these accounts in the future is difficult to estimate, but undoubtedly would be substantial. Therefore, the Commissioners strongly urge the enactment of this legislation.

Legislation somewhat similar to that proposed by the Commissioners is in effect in other jurisdictions, and, to a certain extent, in the District of Columbia, in that under existing District law the property clerk of the Police Department is authorized to dispose of unclaimed personal property which he has held for at least 6 months (R.S.D.C., sec. 417, as amended; District of Columbia Code, 1961 ed., sec. 4–160).

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Yours very sincerely,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
*President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.*

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to relieve the District of Columbia of the necessity of maintaining indefinitely accounts of money deposited in trust with the District but not reclaimed by the depositors. Such moneys accumulate in dormant accounts kept in the juvenile court, funds of inmates in the Department of Corrections, patients' money in the possession of the Department of Public Health and Public Welfare, and funds in the Motor Vehicle Owners' and Operators' Financial Responsibility Fund.

The vast majority of such accounts are in small amounts, less than $20, and although no inquiries or claims may be made for many years and it may reasonably be presumed in such cases that the depositors have forgotten about their deposits, died, or moved away and that no claim will ever be made, yet the District is required to make annual audits and maintain records of these accounts.

This bill would alleviate this situation by providing that when 10 years have elapsed since the last communication received about any such unclaimed moneys, such funds shall accrue to the credit of the District. Prior to this transfer of such funds, however, a final effort must be made to notify the persons entitled to the return of these moneys.

It is estimated that approximately 1,000 such accounts, totaling in the aggregate some $25,000, could be closed out immediately if this legislation is enacted, with a substantial saving in man-hours of clerical work and badly needed recordkeeping space.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## D.C. TRANSIT FRANCHISE ACT, DETERMINATION OF NET PROFITS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1533) to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc., and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That part 1, title I of the Act entitled "An Act to grant

a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc., and for other purposes", approved July 24, 1956, is amended by striking therefrom "Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia", and inserting in lieu thereof "Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission".

Mr. HUDDLESTON. 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 gentlemen from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, S. 1533, as set forth in the report—House Report No. 1000—is to amend existing law—act of July 24, 1956, 70 Statutes at Large 598—so as to authorize the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, in lieu of the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission, to make an annual determination of the D.C. Transit System's net operating income, and to certify the same to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners for the purpose of computing exemptions from the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel and real estate taxes. Under the terms of D.C. Transit System's franchise, it is exempt from payment of these taxes to the District of Columbia, to the extent that its net earnings are less than 6½ percent of its gross operating revenues.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission was created by an interstate compact between Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and approved by Congress on September 15, 1960 (Public Law 86-794, 74 Stat. 1031), for the purpose of regulating mass transportation within the Washington metropolitan area. With the exception of the District of Columbia fuel and real estate tax exemption certification, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission has assumed all the regulatory functions pertaining to the D.C. Transit System which were originally performed by the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission. The authority to perform this audit function was granted to the Public Utilities Commission by the act of 1956, which granted to the D.C. Transit System, Inc., a franchise to operate a public transportation system in the District of Columbia.

Subsequently, the Congress, in enacting legislation relating to school fare subsidization to transit companies transporting schoolchildren within the District of Columbia—act of June 28, 1962, Public Law 87-507, 76 Stat. 113—imposed upon the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission the audit function of certifying to the District of Columbia Commissioners annually, the earnings of transit companies for purposes of computing school fare subsidies. Basically, this audit process is comparable to that used in arriving at a certification to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners required by fuel and real estate tax computations. Thus, under existing law, both the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission and the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission are required to make separate, yet duplicating audits. Enactment of this bill would eliminate such duplication and provide the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission with authority to make certification of the net operating income of D.C. Transit System, Inc., on the basis of data acquired through its overall regulatory operations and functions.

Under the terms of the compact which created the Transit Commission, the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia each have one member. The compact provides also that the member representing the District of Columbia—presently the Engineer Commissioner—maintains a veto authority over all decisions relating solely to the District of Columbia. Inasmuch as the certification of net operating income of the D.C. Transit System for the purpose of determining exemptions from the several District of Columbia taxes would affect only the District of Columbia, the concurrence of the District's representative on the Transit Commission would be required. Your committee is of the opinion that this provision in the compact is sufficient to assure that the interests of the District of Columbia will be adequately considered and protected, and that the enactment of this bill will in no way jeopardize those interests.

Our Subcommittee No. 5 held a public hearing on this bill on December 3, 1963, at which time enactment of the bill was recommended by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, and the D.C. Transit System, Inc. Opposition to its enactment was expressed by the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission.

The passage of this legislation will involve no additional expense to the government of the District of Columbia.

The letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives under date of May 7, 1963, requesting this legislation, follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
*Washington, May 7, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.

The public transportation of passengers within the District of Columbia historically was regulated by the Public Utilities Commission (title 43, District of Columbia Code). In 1956 the Congress granted a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc., to operate a system of mass transportation of passengers for hire within the metropolitan area (Public Law 757, 84th Cong., 70 Stat. 598 et seq.). Section 9 of the franchise act grants certain tax exemption to D.C. Transit System, Inc., and requires the Public Utilities Commission to make an annual determination of the company's net operating income and to certify the same to the District Commissioners for purposes of computing exemptions from taxes.

Section 12 contemplates the possible future transfer to another agency of any of the functions granted to or imposed on the Public Utilities Commission by the franchise act.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission was created by an interstate compact between Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and approved by the Congress (Public Law 86-794, 74 Stat. 1031, Sept. 15, 1960), to regulate mass transportation of passengers for hire within the Washington metropolitan area. All of the regulatory functions of the Public Utilities Commission over D.C. Transit System, Inc., were transferred to the Transit Commission. The tax exemption certification was the only major function which was not transferred.

Legislation relating to school fare subsidization to transit companies transporting schoolchildren within the District of Columbia, was approved on June 28, 1962 (Public Law 87-507). It imposed on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission responsibility for the required certification incident to the computation of the amounts of the subsidies.

At the present time the Transit Commission is engaged in continuous regulation of D.C. Transit System and the WMA Transit Co., the only carriers presently transporting schoolchildren within the District of Columbia. The books of account of the companies are required to be kept according to the rules and regulations prescribed by the Transit Commission. Their fares are regulated by the Transit Commission. As noted above, the school fare subsidy certification is made by the Transit Commission. To carry out its functions, the Transit Commission must make detailed audits of the records of the companies. Under the terms of the compact, the District of Columbia representative on the Transit Commission has a veto over all matters relating solely to the District of Columbia. Thus, the interests of the District of Columbia are adequately considered and protected. It is presently necessary for the Public Utilities Commission to make an independent audit of D.C. Transit System, Inc., in order that it may lawfully render its own certification as to the motor vehicle fuel tax exemption. Thus, two Commissions are to this extent performing the same function.

The Commissioners recommend the enactment of this legislation which would transfer from the Public Utilities Commission to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission the function of making the annual determination of the net operating income of the D.C. Transit System, Inc., and certifying the same to the District Commissioners.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
*President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.*

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the act of July 24, 1956, which granted a franchise to the D.C. Transit System, Inc., specified that this company should be exempted from payment of District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel and real estate taxes to the extent that its annual net operating income does not exceed 6½ percent of its total gross operating revenues. All regulatory functions governing the operation of the D.C.

Transit System, including the annual determination of the company's net operating income and the certifying of the same to the District of Columbia Commissioners for the purpose of computing the above-mentioned tax exemptions, were of course vested in the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, created by a compact between Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, was approved by act of Congress on September 15, 1960, for the purpose of regulating mass transportation within the Washington metropolitan area. This Transit Commission then assumed all the regulatory functions pertaining to the operation of the D.C. Transit System, except for the annual certification of net operating income as a basis for computing exemption from the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel and real estate taxes, which has remained the responsibility of the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission.

Public Law 87-507, approved June 28, 1962, granted a school fare subsidization to transit companies transporting school, children within the District of Columbia, and imposed upon the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission the function of certifying annually to the District of Columbia Commisioners the net earnings of such transit companies for the purpose of computing the school fare subsidies.

Thus, at present both the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission are required to determine and certify to the District of Columbia Commissioners annually the net operating income of the D.C. Transit System—one for the purpose of computing the company's exemption from District of Columbia fuel and real estate taxes, and the other to determine the amount of the school fare subsidy.

S. 1533 would eliminate this duplication of time, effort, and expense by transferring from the Public Utilities Commission to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission the audit function of certifying the D.C. Transit System's net annual earnings to the District of Columbia Commissioners for the purpose of determining the company's exemption from motor vehicle fuel and real estate taxes.

This transfer of function is logical also because the Transit Commission, by virtue of its responsibility for regulating the fares charged by D.C. Transit, is obliged to audit the financial operations of the company in detail and on a continuing basis.

The District of Columbia's representative on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, who at present is the District of Columbia Engineer Commissioner, is provided by the terms of the compact with a veto authority over all decisions of the Commission which relate solely to the District of Columbia. This veto power would extend, of course, to the certification of net earnings for the purpose of computing the D.C. Transit System's exemption from District of Columbia taxes; and thus, there appears to be ample assurance that the interests of the District of Columbia in this respect will be adequately protected.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8929) to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that debate may be limited to 2 hours, that time to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

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 consideration of the bill H.R. 8929, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Under the unanimous-consent agreement the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 8929, which we have before us today has elicited a great deal of comment on the floor already. I have observed that there is a great deal of misunderstanding about some of the content of this legislation, as well as the effect of some of the amendments which I understand will be offered.

Mr. Chairman, in the time that I shall take, I would like to complete my statement and then if anyone desires to have me yield to them, I shall be happy to do so at that time.

I strongly urge passage of H.R. 8929, a bill authorizing the construction of a rapid transit system for Washington. This program was originally initiated by President Eisenhower. The present bill was supported by President Kennedy and is supported by President Johnson. It has the overwhelming support of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and it has the backing of every Federal agency concerned and of hundreds of citizens groups throughout the National Capital region.

At the outset, I would like to commend the members of Subcommittee No. 6 of the House District Committee for their careful consideration of the program and for their patient efforts to improve the transportation situation in Washington. They have devoted a great amount of their time to the problem and have given it a good deal of consideration.

Mr. Chairman, while sitting as a member of the House District Committee over the past several years, and listening to the statements of residents of the Nation's Capital about their problems, I have come to realize that this is a program of tremendous importance to Washington. The issue is a very simple one. Are we going to permit the National Capital to be engulfed in the growing congestion that pours more and more automobiles into the downtown area each day? Or will we take the step that must be taken, the step that the Congress had been leading up to for over 10 years now, to insure that our Nation's Capital will continue to be an attractive, vital city of which all our citizens can be proud. I say, our committee says, and three Presidents have said, that as the legislative body for the District of Columbia, we owe it to the people of the District and the people of our Nation to take that step—to authorize the construction of the rapid transit system that is essential if we are to solve the traffic congestion crisis in the Nation's Capital.

All of us are aware of the transportation problems of the Nation's Capital. Every day we see additional evidence of the wave of new development taking place throughout the northern Virginia and Maryland suburbs and in downtown Washington. The forecasts show that this growth will steadily continue. Each day we experience the inevitable product of this growth—the steady increase in traffic congestion brought about by more and more people making more and more trips in the metropolitan area.

It is plain to all that an expanded system of highways is necessary to help ease this congestion. And it is just as plain that new highways alone will not answer the problem. The conclusion is inescapable: we need a rapid transit system which can transport thousands of people into the city each morning and evening underground, free of surface congestion. With a rapid transit system we can solve the congestion problem; without one, there can be no hope for solution of this problem.

Our committee and the Congress have been very conscious of this problem for many years and we have taken a long series of steps leading toward the development of a rapid transit program. Some of the best engineering firms in the country, and a number of outstanding men in the transit field, have helped prepare the necessary plans. Experts in finance, and a committee composed of some of the Nation's leading businessmen, have assisted in the development of the proposed financing program for the rapid transit system. All that could be done to develop a sound and economic

rapid transit system has been done. The work has been carefully scrutinized by the Bureau of the Budget and by our committee. We have every reason to believe that the rapid transit system that would be authorized by H.R. 8929 is an excellent one, that it is economically sound and that it will do the job that is needed.

H.R. 8929 would authorize construction of a 23-mile rapid transit system including a subway in downtown Washington that will connect the Capital with the major employment and commercial centers within the city. Modern, attractive, high-speed trains will provide fast service within the downtown area and from the downtown area to several points immediately outside the physical borders of the District of Columbia.

The system will provide the dramatic improvement in public transportation in Washington that is needed if we are to encourage additional people to use public transportation and thus free our streets and highways of the present congestion. For example, during the rush hour it takes 23 minutes to travel by bus from the State Department to the Capitol. That trip could be made in 5½ minutes by rapid transit. The rapid transit running time between Takoma Park and downtown Washington will be approximately 14 minutes whereas it takes three-quarters of an hour to make the trip by bus today.

It is important to emphasize that the rapid transit system that would be authorized by H.R. 8929 is not designed to supplant highways, nor is it designed to replace bus operations. Its purpose is to complement these other facilities so that Washington will have a carefully balanced system of highway, bus, and rail rapid transit facilities. Large-scale bus operations provided by private enterprise will continue to be an important part of the region's transportation network.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the system is needed and our committee feels very strongly that the system that would be authorized by H.R. 8929 is the best answer.

Furthermore, the financing program appears to be a sound one, placing the main burden of paying for the system on the rider and not on the Federal Government. Over 3 years ago, when our committee and the Congress were considering legislation to establish the National Capital Transportation Agency to prepare plans for a rapid transit system, we felt that such a system could be financially sound. Accordingly, the National Capital Transportation Act instructed the Agency to prepare a financing plan which would provide as far as possible for the payment of the capital and operating costs of the system by the users—with as little burden as possible upon Federal and local taxpayers. We believe the Agency did just that.

The system that would be authorized by H.R. 8929 will be financed in major part by the sale of revenue bonds. The forecasts are that revenues of the system will meet all operating costs and approximately 65 percent of the capital costs. The total Federal grant contribution to the system will be $120 million, and the contribution of the District of Columbia $21.7 million. The rest will be raised by the sale of revenue bonds underwritten as to principal and interest by the Federal Government. When you consider the fact that the Federal Government is spending in the neighborhood of $75 million a year on highway construction in this region alone, and that without a rapid transit system more highways will have to be built—for the most part with Federal dollars—than the highway departments of the region want to build, and that these additional highways still won't provide the answer, it seems clear to me that the proposed Federal contribution to the rapid transit system is entirely reasonable. To put it another way, the cost to the Federal Government of not building a rapid transit system will be greater than the cost of building one. And again I want to say that it will be the riders of the system—the people of the National Capital region—who will bear the heaviest part of the cost of the system.

I want to make one point clear. I regard this bill as entirely unrelated to the Urban Transportation Act of 1963, the presently pending bill to provide Federal matching grants to cities throughout the country for the construction of mass transportation systems. The bill before you today applies solely to the District of Columbia and it is before you solely because of the unique Federal interest in the District and the fact that the Congress is the District's legislative body. Without our action and support no rapid transit system can be built in the District. I, for one, consider the national mass transit bill to raise issues of Federal financial and administrative involvement in local matters that are completely unrelated to the issue at hand. In contrast, under the Constitution, the Federal Government is very deeply involved in the affairs of the Nation's Capital, for these affairs were rightly considered by the framers of the Constitution to be matters of national concern. It is for these reasons that I support the bill presently before you. The national mass transit bill is a completely different question that must be decided on its merits at another time.

The committee has faced two issues which I believe require comment.

First, there has been a proposal that the present legislation include the provision that private enterprise would construct and operate the rapid transit system. Insofar as construction is concerned, our committee feels very strongly that a public works program of this magnitude requires the constant scrutiny of the Congress and I believe it should be undertaken by the responsible Federal agency that is already charged with this task. Insofar as the question of operation of the system is concerned, it is the view of our committee that this is an issue that requires further attention and study before a decision can be made. The system will not begin to operate for at least another 4 or 5 years and while construction goes forward the Congress will have ample opportunity to consider the question of how the system should be operated. There is no reason to consider this matter now or to delay construction of the system while the matter is being decided.

Second, it has been proposed that the present bill include a rather complicated labor relations policy covering such matters as collective bargaining, arbitration of disputes and protection of job rights. A very similar provision was proposed 3 years ago when the Congress was considering the legislation establishing the National Capital Transportation Agency and the Congress included in the act a provision stating in the clearest of terms that before an operation could begin, Congress would enact a bill establishing such a labor relations policy. It was the feeling of the committee that a bill establishing a labor relations policy at the present time would be premature and that this matter should be considered at a later date when we consider the matter of who should operate the system. The key point is that in the interim, labor will be completely protected by the present provision of the National Capital Transportation Act, which remains in force; that no operation can begin until a bill setting forth a labor relations policy for the Agency has been enacted.

Mr. Chairman, many people, including the members of our committee, have spent much of their time and energy for over 10 years to develop this program. In the meantime, the very problem that this program is designed to solve—the traffic congestion problem in our Nation's Capital—has grown worse and worse. The time for action to solve the problem has arrived, if it is not in fact overdue.

I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 8929.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. As a member of the subcommittee, and I attended most of the hearings of the subcommittee, I do not recall that there was any testimony that private interests would construct this proposed subway system. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITENER. I remember no such testimony and I can say the gentleman from New York was present faithfully and I am sure that one of us would have heard it if it had been said.

Mr. HORTON. The question has been asked of me, whether or not private interests or private enterprise would construct this system, and I have made the statement no such interest has been shown even in such construction and I also think it should appear in the RECORD that this proposal is only for the authorization of construction and does not pertain to the operation of the system as such.

Mr. WHITENER. That is correct. May I say in response to what the gentleman has just said that I understand this so-called private enterprise proposition that will be offered merely means the taxpayers of the United States and of the District of Columbia will still do what this bill requires and turn it over to some nameless individuals who want

to take the taxpayers' money and try to build the system.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the House now has before it for action H.R. 8929, a bill to authorize the construction of a rail rapid transit system in the District of Columbia and, to a limited extent, to its immediate environs. It comes to the floor with the approval of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and against a background of some 10 years of careful study and preparation.

Passage of the bill is absolutely essential to the health, well-being, and beauty of our Nation's Capital.

During the 10 years that have gone into the development of this program, the efforts of the Congress to improve transportation in Washington have been entirely bipartisan. The program was begun during President Eisenhower's administration, it was continued during the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy, and it has the strong support of President Johnson.

As the representative of the 10th District of Virginia, and as the ranking minority member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I, for one, have devoted much of my time and effort during my 11 years in the Congress to this program. I have done so because I know that an improved transportation system is of vital importance to the many thousands of people in northern Virginia who have to cross the Potomac River each morning and evening on their way to or from work and to the millions of citizens in our country who take pride in our Nation's Capital. I believe, therefore, that passage of this bill is of the greatest importance.

The bill before us calls for a major innovation in National Capital transportation, the introduction in Washington of a modern, high-speed, high-capacity rail rapid transit system. It represents a major undertaking to preserve the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital, and to enhance the economic health and vitality—and the livability of the National Capital community. And it is directly related to the efficient and effective performance of the work of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I have often stated my conviction that the District of Columbia is a national trust, and that all our citizens have a direct interest not only in its day-to-day government, but in all decisions respecting its welfare. I can state without hesitation that at no time during my years of service in the House and on the District Committee have we brought forth legislation more important to the welfare of the region than this. The transportation problems of the National Capital region have grown ever more serious with the passage of years. In this age of jets and rocketry, Washington is beset by a creeping paralysis of its transportation system during the critical periods of the day. The influx of visitors on special occasions makes downtown Washington a place to be avoided. In bad weather, traffic comes to a complete standstill. And the forecasts show that the region will steadily expand and this problem will steadily get worse unless we act promptly to construct a rapid transit system. If Washington is to remain the beautiful, spacious, exciting city it is today; if our Capital is to be free to develop and enhance its resources in a manner befitting its position of leadership in the free world; if we are to accommodate the tremendous growth and development anticipated for the National Capital region in years that lie ahead, action is needed now to bring present relief and to gear our transportation facilities to the future.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has long recognized that because of their inevitable impact on the life and development of the community, decisions on major transportation improvements in Washington had to be carefully weighed. Consequently, under the aegis of the District Committee and the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems of the 85th and 86th Congresses, steps were taken by the Congress to obtain comprehensive studies of the region's transportation problems and requirements. The National Capital Planning Act of 1952 called for the formulation and adoption by the National Capital Regional Planning Council of a coordinated areawide development plan—including plans for land use, major thoroughfares, and mass transportation. From 1955 to 1959, more than $400,000 was appropriated to the Commission and Council for the performance of special transportation studies, and the preparation of a plan for regional transportation improvement.

This study was one of the most exhaustive transportation investigations ever conducted in any American city. It took 4 years to complete. While it was underway our joint committee conducted a number of independent research projects on transportation and other metropolitan problems. We kept close watch over the major study and held hearings to check its progress. When it was completed in 1959, President Eisenhower forwarded it to the Congress for consideration, and in November of that year the joint committee held 6 days of public hearings on its content and recommendations.

The 1959 study was an examination in depth of the transportation problems faced by the region. It made clear that if Washington and the National Capital region are to continue to thrive and grow in an orderly manner, a balanced, coordinated areawide transportation system is essential. This study made it absolutely clear that an improved system of highways is necessary but that highways alone cannot meet the region's critical congestion problem. To move the huge number of people that enter and leave downtown each working day, and to relieve the pressures on the highway system, a vastly improved network of public mass transportation facilities is essential. The 1959 study concluded that a system of rail rapid transit, operating on exclusive rights-of-way, should be developed for this purpose, and it was evident from our hearings that this approach had the enthusiastic support of virtually every public and private agency, organization and individual whose views were heard. There was then, and there is today, widespread public demand for the establishment of a rail rapid transit system.

On March 14, 1960, Mr. Chairman, I introduced in the House a bill, H.R. 11135, which was later enacted as the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960. The 1959 transportation study had shown us the way. It had identified the problems. It had not, however, produced a program for rapid transit development in sufficient detail of design, preliminary engineering of routes, cost estimates, traffic studies, recommendations on financing—and we needed an organization qualified and equipped to do the job. My bill was calculated to move us forward to the point of action. The organization created by the 1960 Act—the National Capital Transportation Agency—has given us 2½ years of detailed preparation. We now have the engineering, cost, traffic, and financial information needed for an action program. The Agency's work has weathered the tests of official and public scrutiny. I am satisfied that it has performed its job well, and am confident that the Congress has a sure footing for the action now requested of it.

The bill before us now would authorize the construction of some 23 miles of rail rapid transit within the District of Columbia and to terminal points short distances beyond the District line in Virginia and Maryland. It also authorizes the establishment of an up-to-date commuter railroad service from Union Station through much of Prince Georges County to Bowie, Md., on the existing facilities of the Pennsylvania Railroad. Under the bill a downtown subway line will be constructed along G Street NW., from 12th Street east to Judiciary Square to the Capitol. Radial rapid transit lines will extend to Van Ness Street NW., to Columbia Heights NW., Pentagon City and Rosslyn in Arlington, Woodside near Silver Spring in Montgomery County, and Anacostia in Southeast Washington. Except for the line to Montgomery County and the one to Bowie, both of which will occupy existing railroad right-of-way, the service will be in subways within the District. Operations will be conducted with the most modern high-speed, high-capacity transit equipment available. The total estimated cost of constructing and equipping the facilities will be $400.6 million.

A key feature of the program is that its costs are to be met primarily by the users and not by the taxpayers. This amount will be raised by a combination of grants from the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, and proceeds from the sale of revenue bonds in the private market underwritten as to principal and interest by the Federal Government. The direct outlay of Federal funds will total $120 million. The District's contribution will be $21.7 million. The balance of $258.9 million plus interest requirements during construction will be repaid out of the revenues of the system. It is anticipated that the system will repay its bonded debt over a period of 36 years, and that we may reasonably expect a refunding of government grants during later years.

I want to emphasize that these forecasts are based on a fare structure that is very similar to presently prevailing fares; that is, a 25-cent base fare within the 10-mile square and a maximum of 55 cents to the farthest point, which is Bowie, Md.

Mr. Chairman, under the very able leadership of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], the District Committee has examined this system and its proposed financing with the utmost care.

In view of my own deep concern for the transportation problem over the years, I have taken special pains to assure myself that the program now proposed to the Congress is a correct solution. I am pleased to be able to say that in my opinion the proposal before us now is sound in every respect.

The construction cost estimates have been carefully developed. The Agency's forecasts of operating costs, traffic, and revenues have been expertly prepared, and are reasonable. I am convinced that every effort has been made to treat these factors conservatively. In my judgment there is every reason to expect that the proposed transit system will be an economically viable, self-sufficient operation. When the Congress enacted the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, we recognized that if major transportation improvements are to be undertaken in the National Capital region, financial participation by the Federal Government is a prerequisite. In the 1960 act, we called for a plan of finance which would place the principal financial burden on the persons benefiting from transportation improvements. The present bill does just that. The bulk of the expense will be borne out of the farebox, and the direct Federal and District contributions are, I think, appropriate and reasonable.

The facilities to be constructed under the bill will be confined largely to the District of Columbia, the area of special interest to the Congress. They will go far toward relieving surface traffic congestion in the central city, and will bring to Washington the type of fast, efficient mass transportation that presently exists in all of the other major capitals of the world. This bill will fulfill the Federal Government's obligation for transportation improvement in the National Capital region. It will establish a system which may later be extended throughout the region by the Agency in cooperation with the local governments. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, of the soundness of the present investment. The financing of this program has been handled in a clear-headed, businesslike manner. For an immediate outlay of $141.7 million in Federal and District of Columbia funds, the National Capital will obtain a $400 million rapid transit system—with reasonable expectation of a recovery in full of the expenditure. I commend this to the House as good business.

I am well aware, Mr. Chairman, that the bill before us now leaves many important questions unanswered. This legislation is designed to enable us to begin. It is limited to the construction of the needed facilities. This will be a time-consuming proposition, should move forward without delay, and can get started with the grant funds called for by the program. Additional legislation will be required to authorize the required revenue bond financing, and the operation of the facilities. This will be prepared as construction progresses. It will involve complex questions concerning the nature of the organization which is to control and operate the system, the rights of the private transportation companies that are presently serving the region, labor relations, and many others. I agree completely with the committee's judgment that these are matters which require more study and investigation than has been possible to date. We are dealing here with a major construction program. Transit operations cannot reasonably be anticipated before 1970, and there is no reason to rush decisions on many subjects of major importance. At the same time, it would make no sense at all to delay construction until all matters have been resolved. This program has been 10 years in the making. The Congress has before it all the information it needs to launch the construction phase. H.R. 8929 is the first order of business, and it should be enacted without delay.

All have recognized that major transportation improvements such as that authorized by the bill before us today are essential if the beauty, the dignity, and the economic vitality of the National Capital are to be preserved and enhanced. This is indeed a matter which transcends party lines, and has a strong appeal to all Americans. I want to commend all of my colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee for the years of devoted effort it has taken to produce today's bill.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of my district, the people of the District of Columbia, and the citizens of the Nation as a whole, I urge the enactment of H.R. 8929.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. May I say by way of preliminary remarks that I am not hostile to this legislation. I am trying to find out something about it. I have not made up my mind as to how I shall vote and I intend to listen to the discussion.

I recognize this city needs a rapid transit system, but I would like to have someone explain the formula or the basis on which the committee justifies recommending that all of the taxpayers of the United States pay 30 percent of the cost and that the taxpayers of the District of Columbia pay only 5 percent of the cost. If the gentleman will go into that and give us the thinking of the committee and the formula that was used to arrive at the apportionment I would appreciate it.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I will confess that the formula came originally from the formula in the originally proposed national transit bill. I should like to point out to the gentleman from North Carolina it is provided in that bill that two-thirds of the costs in the various metropolitan areas of the country be paid by the Federal Government, and 33.3 percent by the local communities; that is, in the original $800 million recommendation which I referred to. It was provided that the local communities, the District of Columbia, and the suburban areas of Maryland and Virginia should each contribute $60 million, and the Federal Government $120 million.

When we cut the program in half, it eliminated the suburban communities from the program, but it left in the $20 million for the District of Columbia and the fully recommended Federal contribution.

It is not too important whether the Federal contribution is $120 million or $60 million or $20 million. Sixty-five percent of the total cost will be financed by revenue bonds. This is the Nation's Capital. I am not going to be facetious, but this is the Nation's Capital. If we do anything in improving the transportation situation here in Washington, or solving any other problems which it might have, whether it be in education or police protection, whatever it may be, we are going to have to spend money, and we are going to have to provide the financing. We could tax the District of Columbia to a point of disminishing returns but this would accomplish no useful purpose. We have just finished deliberating a bill for the District of Columbia in which we provided an increase to $50 million in the Federal contribution to the Nation's Capital and also an increase in its borrowing authority. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] pointed out that the District last year had borrowing authority which could be used for financing $21 million for the District of Columbia's portion. But again, we are hoping that the $120 million can ultimately be repaid. But it is up to the Congress to make the grant as recommended in the bill or in the form of a loan. I do not think we can shirk our responsibility to see that the Nation's Capital is properly financed or properly run.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I pointed out that a member of the committee staff in conference with Mr. Schuyler Lowe, Director of Finance of the District of Columbia, states that Mr. Lowe has expressed the opinion it will not be necessary to resort to this extra borrowing authority that we granted to the District. He feels that since this is to be paid out over a period of years to the District of Columbia it could be taken care of through current revenues.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina on the very fine presentation he has made here today. I want to commend both him and my other distinguished colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee for the sustained and careful interest and effort they have devoted to the preparation of the program now before us. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, every Member of the House

can and should take great pride in today's accomplishment, for the transit development program before us today is the product of many years of planning and preparation which have had the continuing and enthusiastic support of the whole Congress from the beginning.

As the National Capital, the District of Columbia is the showplace of our Nation. It symbolizes our heritage of democratic freedom and progress, and it is from within its precincts that the power and prestige of the Nation is exercised. Its public buildings and monuments memorialize our national traditions and institutions and stand as living expressions of our history of freedom and democratic government. Washington is the reception place of the Nation. It is the mecca of millions of visitors every year from throughout the Nation and the world. Every American has a direct interest in preserving its beauty and dignity as a city and seeing to it that conditions are right for its orderly growth as an economically healthy and vital community. The passage of H.R. 8929 is of tremendous importance to the National Capital and all of our citizens have a stake in what we do here today.

Mr. Chairman, unless the Congress takes prompt action to improve transportation in Washington, the physical integrity of the city will be endangered and its cultural and economic life will be stifled. Since 1940 the population of the Washington metropolitan area has increased from some 970,000 people to over 2 million. By 1980 3½ million are expected, and by the year 2000 this may be a community of 5 million. These past years have been ones of ever-increasing street traffic congestion. Automobiles have multiplied so that movement in the Nation's Capital is agonizingly slow during critical hours. Weather hazards bring everything to a standstill. Who of us can forget the snows and traffic problems of the last inauguration day. This will be repeated time and again unless corrective action is taken now.

Our distinguished colleague from North Carolina has given us the history of the bill before us now. It is the product of 10 years' preparation. We recognized long ago that major transportation improvements are required. The transit development program authorized by this bill has weathered the test of public scrutiny and examination. The construction of subway rail rapid transit for Washington has the strong support of the administration, of all interested Federal agencies and of the local governments and planning bodies of the National Capital region. This solution to the transportation problem has been endorsed by some 500 citizens, professional, trade, and political organizations. The public demand for a rapid transit system is unmistakably clear.

I have said that passage of this bill is important to the Nation because the future of our Capital City is involved. I think Mr. Chairman, that we should also ask ourselves just what this program will mean for the people of the community whose welfare is the peculiar and unique concern of the Congress. If we do so it becomes apparent that in addition to preserving and enhancing the beauty of the National Capital, the program will produce many desirable benefits for the community.

For example, consider the benefits to labor and business. Preliminary estimates of the labor and materials required for construction of the facilities indicate that average manpower requirements for construction over a 5-year period will amount to some 3,800 jobs, including the employment of miners, engineers, teamsters, carpenters, electricians, and many other skills. More than 1,700,000 cubic yards of concrete involving over 2 million yards of sand and aggregate and almost 2½ million barrels of cement will be needed. Lumber requirements will approximate 175 million board feet and some 400 tons of steel will be needed. The program will mean major opportunities for business and labor. It will relieve unemployment and open a new market for materials. In short, Mr. Chairman, this program will be a significant contribution to the economic well-being of the region.

Furthermore, by relieving traffic congestion the facilities created will do much to infuse new life in the commercial areas in Washington. Property values along the routes of the system will increase and the tax base of the District will be enhanced. The time saved in travel alone can be measured in the millions of dollars.

By facilitating movement into and through downtown the proposed transit facilities will do much to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Government operations. This bill will bring to Washington a modern system of transport of the type already available in every other major capital of the world. Indeed, we can expect that the system created for Washington will be a substantial improvement over these others. After 10 years of planning and faced with the prospect of paralyzing traffic congestion in the years ahead our responsibility and opportunity today is to get on with a solution.

I have said that this legislation has the overwhelming support of the people. I should like to point out, however, that concern has been expressed over the failure of this legislation to include any provision dealing with the rights of labor and that an amendment was proposed before our committee providing that private enterprise would operate the system.

Mr. Chairman, I want to assure each and every Member of the House that all of these matters have received the careful and studious attention of the District Committee. We did not treat these matters in the bill because we felt they were premature. This legislation involves no attempt to dispose of or pass judgment on these questions. The facilities authorized by H.R. 8929 will require many years to construct. Transit operations cannot reasonably be anticipated before 1970. In the judgment of the committee, the most pressing task at hand is to get on with the construction phase of this program. Action in this direction is already long overdue. The concerns I have just mentioned involve very complex issues, the resolution of which will require careful decisions in order to achieve a proper balancing of the public and private interests involved. In view of the overriding public demand for immediate action on construction and the fact that several years remain during which such judgments can be reached, it would make no sense at all to delay this phase of the program. Instead, it is the considered opinion of our committee that the time available before transit operations can commence should be devoted to careful study and investigation of such issues so that the ultimate decisions on them will be correct ones.

In the meantime the rights of the private transportation companies in the area and the interests of my good friends in the labor movement will be undisturbed. In fact, as I have pointed out earlier, the bill by providing new jobs here and throughout the country will be a very great help to labor. The activities of the National Capital Transportation Agency under this bill will continue to be subject to the provisions of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960. Section 205(a)(2) of that act provides that the Agency shall not operate any transit facilities or provide by agreement for the operation of transit facilities, until the Congress shall establish for the Agency a labor relations policy, defining labor's right to organize, to bargain collectively, to arbitrate disputes, and to safeguard job rights. Transit labor is thus assured that its concerns will be met before operations can begin.

By the same token section 205(a)(2) of that act also provides that the Agency shall not acquire facilities, property, or rights-of-way of private motorbus companies and persons; or operate buses or similar motor vehicles or make agreements for the provision of motorbus service competitive with private transit companies. The question of operation of the rapid transit system can be dealt with by the Congress while construction moves ahead.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, the 1960 act and the present bill constitute reasonable protection for both labor and industry. All we are being asked to do today is to get on with the work of construction. Additional legislation will be required before transit operations can begin and I want to assure any who may be concerned over the matters we leave open today that the rights of labor and industry will be protected in such subsequent legislation.

I might say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] proposed an amendment which is sponsored by labor to the bill which I supported in committee. I might say I expect to support his amendment today, but I do want to make it clear that I shall support this bill whether or not this amendment is offered, believing there is ample time to settle this issue at the appropriate time.

Mr. Chairman, the Nation as a whole and the people of the National Capital

region have waited long for action by the Congress on this important and critical subject. Transportation relief in Washington can come about only if the Federal Government commits itself to the task and takes the first step. Passage of H.R. 8929 is that step. I commend the bill to the House. The future welfare of our Capital City hinges on its passage.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on a very fine statement and also to take this opportunity to urge the House to give favorable consideration to the amendment referred to by the gentleman when it comes up later this afternoon.

May I say as a fellow member of the committee that I concur in everything that the gentleman has said. I feel it is most important that this legislation come to grips with the amendment dealing with appropriate labor provisions today. This can be done. As the gentleman has pointed out, they are reasonable, and I only hope that we will act favorably upon it in the Committee today.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

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

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

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

[Roll No. 225]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ayres | Hemphill | Rooney, Pa. |
| Bolling | Jarman | Roosevelt |
| Bolton, | Kee | Roybal |
| Oliver P. | Kelly | St. George |
| Brooks | Keogh | St Germain |
| Brown, Calif. | King, Calif. | Senner |
| Buckley | Kirwan | Shelley |
| Burton | Kluczynski | Sheppard |
| Carey | Leggett | Shriver |
| Celler | Long, La. | Sibal |
| Clawson, Del | McDowell | Sikes |
| Cooley | Macdonald | Smith, Calif. |
| Corman | Mailliard | Stephens |
| Davis, Ga. | Martin, Calif. | Stinson |
| Davis, Tenn. | Martin, Mass. | Teague, Tex. |
| Dawson | Michel | Thompson, La. |
| Delaney | Milliken | Thompson, N.J. |
| Derounian | Minshall | Thompson, Tex. |
| Diggs | Monagan | Trimble |
| Dingell | Moore | Tuck |
| Edwards | Morrison | Utt |
| Fogarty | O'Brien, Ill. | Vinson |
| Gill | O'Hara, Mich. | White |
| Grant | Passman | Whitten |
| Green, Pa. | Powell | Wickersham |
| Gurney | Quie | Willis |
| Hanna | Reid, N.Y. | Wilson, Bob |
| Hansen | Rhodes, Ariz. | Wilson, |
| Harvey, Mich. | Rivers, S.C. | Charles H. |
| Hébert | Roberts, Ala. | |

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, 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. 8929 and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 345 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. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8929. I sat on the subcommittee and I listened to hours of testimony concerning this legislation. When a vote was taken to report this bill, I was one of the members who opposed its being reported.

For the life of me I am unable to differentiate between a system of this type as proposed by this legislation and those systems to be proposed in the so-called mass transportation legislation.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I oppose that legislation and with the same vigor that I am opposed to this. This bill provides for a so-called bobtailed rapid transit system. It will be paid for in the following manner—$21.7 million by the District of Columbia, by a direct contribution, and $120 million by the taxpayers of the U.S. Government, because this is a Federal contribution, and $258.9 million by a bond issue carrying 4.5 percent interest and which is subject to tax.

The assumption has been advanced that the cost of this system will be borne by the riders themselves. First, I would like to point out that the $121 million proposed as the initial Federal contribution will not be repaid under this act to the Federal Government. What if this curtailed system does not pay off financially? What if some of these fine estimates that we have been given today go wrong? It looks to me as though the Federal Government will not only lose its $121 million contribution but will be saddled with requirement that we make good the $258.9 million in bonds and possibly be on the hook for the $21.7 million for the District contribution.

I would like to say that I have talked to many people on both sides of this issue. Certainly my objection to rapid transportation, if I can use that description, in the District of Columbia is exactly similar to my opposition to this type of transportation system in any other city in the United States, if the Federal Government is required to pay for it.

It is my understanding a motion will be made to recommit this bill. I shall support the motion to recommit and urge the Members of this body to do likewise.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I read this morning, I think, in an editorial in one of the local newspapers that this $121 million was not very much but was just a starter and that later on more Federal funds could be obtained. Could the gentleman enlighten me on that?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I think the point is well taken by the gentleman from Washington. I think $121 million is a lot of money. However, I did read the same editorial he refers to, and it is apparently a feeling among some of the people in the District that they will come back and see the Federal Government at some future time and ask them for additional funds to carry out this system.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman tell us how realistic are these figures, and how they were compiled, that appear in table 12 on page 39 of the report, these very heavy net revenues after depreciation? How were those estimates compiled?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I compliment the committee on securing the very best witnesses and the very best authority possible on those figures. We received those figures which appear in the hearings, and while I cannot give all the names of all the different organizations and individuals who testified, we did secure the most knowledgeable information possible from the leading transit authorities and experts in the Nation. We did have those people before our committee and they presented the figures that appear in the table.

Mr. JONAS. They were not based on comparisons with other rapid transit systems—for example, the one in New York City?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Yes, sir; they do compare, some of their basis is a comparison with other cities' transit authority.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I am pleased to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHITENER. I take it the gentleman from Washington was referring to an editorial in the Washington Post this morning. If so, I fail to see anything in that editorial to support the gentleman's position. I do know that the editorial said that.

I did see the following sentence:

> To those who find the bill's subway system too small, the answer is that it can be expanded later.

That does not imply any additional Federal funds. I think that should be made abundantly clear.

I would say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] that I appreciate his diligent service as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I also appreciate his candor in his statement that he is opposed to any mass transportation system anywhere; that he is not saying that this one is not a sound sysem that we are proposing in this legislation. As I interpret what he says he is just "agin" it, period.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. That is a pretty good summation of my position. I oppose the building of public transportation systems at the expense of the taxpayers for the use of a limited few.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I think rather than the item to which the gentleman from North Carolina referred as being in the Washington Post, he may have had in mind the editorial in the Star over the weekend in which they said that this is just a little bite as a beginning for massive expenditures.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. It was in one of the Washington papers; which one, I do not recall.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to start talking sense, and dollars and cents, about transportation in Washington and to do something about it.

I recently stated that I consider the rapid transit bill presently pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia a must item. And, so far as I have been able to determine, it is the sense of the Congress that a rapid transit system is urgently needed.

The only fly in the ointment appears to be the apparently useless debate over the so-called highway-transit issue. I use the phrase "so-called" advisedly because if there is a real issue involved I am not aware of it.

We need the Interstate Highway System in Washington and we need it as soon as we can get it. We need a rapid transit system in Washington and we need it as soon as possible. I cannot believe that anyone can seriously question the need for either of these facilities.

The only portion of the Interstate Highway System in Washington that I understand to be in question consists of two projects: An additional bridge across the Potomac and the north leg of the inner loop. These have been temporarily deferred to see if there is not a way to construct them so as to avoid injury to parklands and undue displacement of people. It is my further understanding that rapid progress is being made on means of constructing these projects in such a way as to avoid or minimize the taking of parklands and the displacement of people and that in a short time the President will announce the results of the study so that these important projects can move forward promptly.

It is essential that construction of a rapid transit system in Washington move forward with equal speed. Indeed, the usefulness of the Interstate Highway System depends to a very large extent on the existence of a companion rapid transit system. For if there is any question concerning the future of the highway system in Washington it is the question of whether the highway system will suffer the fate of so many other urban freeways around the country which are intolerably congested with automobiles almost from the moment the ribbon is cut. Is this system, originally designed to speed interstate travel through and around Washington, to become just another huge artery clogged with suburban commuters many of whom would prefer to use rapid transit?

This may seem to be a gloomy forecast, but, unfortunately, it will come true all too soon unless we take steps now to build a rapid transit system capable of easing the load on our highways.

The trucker who wants to move around Washington faster than he does today is in for a rude awakening if we do nothing more than finish the Interstate Highway System. The fact that his trucks can use a new highway will be little consolation to him if the highway is so jammed with commuters that traffic moves no faster on the highway than it does on today's streets.

The motorist who hopes that the highway system will provide him a fast means of traveling around downtown in the rush hour also has some sad news in store for him if no rapid transit system is built. He will find himself slowed to a crawl by other motorists, many of whom are destined downtown and would be glad to leave their cars at a suburban parking lot and use rapid transit into town.

Introduction of fast, comfortable, convenient transportation to downtown via rapid transit would lure thousands of drivers from congested streets and highways. Most local traffic would thus be diverted, leaving Washington's new freeway system available for its intended purpose—swift passage to and through downtown by motorists, buses, and trucks.

We can insure that these planned freeways serve their intended purpose by acting favorably upon H.R. 8929. The recent hearings on these bills by the House District Committee showed wide ranging bipartisan support for rapid transit in Washington.

We owe it to all citizens of this country to maintain an efficient transportation system for our Nation's Capital. It is imperative that we support this vital legislation.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill for several reasons.

No. 1, I think we must put first things first and that we should, if we had only as little as $20 million of District money to spend in the District, spend it on education and educational facilities first.

No. 2, this bill completely ignores the rights of labor.

No. 3, I think the planners who came in with the plan are utterly incompetent as planners, and if they are incompetent as planners, they are more incompetent as builders and operators of a subway system.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little amused as I stand here and recall that for many years I have advocated the enactment of bills which have come out of the Committee on Banking and Currency and have been accused of driving private enterprise out of our system, out of our economic system, and replacing it with Government.

Here I find today practically all of the people who have charged that against me are now advocating public ownership and operation of a new transit system in the District of Columbia. I am standing here again advocating private enterprise.

I say if this system is to be built, it is going to be built, owned, and operated by the District of Columbia, if this bill is enacted. The overall mass transportation bill we have been trying to get enacted calls for a half-billion dollars for the whole country, including the District of Columbia.

This bill, you are told, will call for $400 million just for the District of Columbia. Is that all? Read the bill and you will find this is a blank check. There is no limitation of amount as to what this Agency may spend, but it does provide that every dollar that is going to be spent will come out of the District of Columbia revenues by grant or out of the U.S. Treasury by grant or it will be guaranteed by the U.S. Treasury. In other words, every dollar will be Government money or Government guaranteed.

I said that the planners were incompetent. The charge should not be made unless it can be sustained. Originally the bill that is now the law, to which this bill is to be an amendment, was enacted on the representation that it was to set up an agency to do some planning and come back with a plan. It provided, after they brought the plan back, the Congress would enact further legislation authorizing them what to do.

Take a look at the original law now on the books and you will find it also provides that the Agency may build, own, and operate the system. There have been some statements made that when they get to operating 2 or 3 years from now they will then talk about whether private enterprise will be brought in. It is my opinion that this Agency, if authorized to build will operate also.

What did this Agency do, if anything, about inviting private enterprise in?

Mr. Chairman, the question was asked earlier in the debate whether or not private enterprise indicated any interest in doing this job. The job must be done, of course, but it should be done privately. As I have said, whenever private enterprise can do the job. the Government should not do it.

If you will look at the supplemental hearing, pages 40, 41, 42, and 43, you will find proposals by private enterprise to do part of this job. They tell you they can do a job of improving transportation in the District of Columbia by spending $103 million of their own money. They also tell you after improving surface transportation that they propose to provide for a realistic test project, a rail rapid transportation system, in an area most suitable for such a system. Such "an experimental project will provide an opportunity for extensive operational study prior to expending what would inevitably be a minimum of $1 billion on an areawide subway system."

Those of you who spend your weekends here in Washington know you do not have too much of a traffic problem here on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. You have your traffic problems the other 5 days a week.

If you want to correct your transit situation here in the District of Columbia, arrange for people to get into the District by rapid transit, so they do not come in by automobile. Let them leave their automobiles in parking lots around the periphery of Washington as we do in New York City and then use the subway system in the city.

These planners are going to compound the difficulty by building a subway first, the experimental part right in the heart of the city. How are you going to get there except by bringing the automobiles to the heart of the city in order to use the subway? That is why I say the planners were incompetent. This bill should be returned to the committee and further study given to it, and a proper plan brought in so that we can get a rapid transit system that will do the job.

I say private enterprise should first be asked to do it. If they cannot do it, then let the Government step in and do it for the public.

I repeat, there is not a single limitation dollarwise in this bill or in the original act. It is true it is only an authorization. The original act authorized them to spend as much as they may need. The Agency will decide what they need, and there is no further limitation on it in this bill. We are being told today it needs about $400 million, provided 5 percent by the District, 35 percent by grant from the Federal Government, and 65 percent by revenue bonds to be paid over 36 years. The last dollar of that 36-year payment will have earned 144 percent if it carries only 4 percent interest. You will find this $400 million, as people who know have told us, to be only a small bite, a little bite, just a little beginning. I am in favor of a beginning and spending a little money if we can see the end and know where we are going and know that as a result of this we will get a system we can be proud of and that will do something to relieve the conditions here in the District. This bill will do nothing to relieve those conditions. It will compound them and make them worse. After we have put in the first $400 million we will be asked to put in another $500 million and another billion on top of that. Like the city of New York, you will have your streets torn up for 20 years. The businesses on both sides of the street will be driven into bankruptcy. You will not be correcting the situation; you will be making it worse.

If you really want to do a job here in the District, when the time comes you will recommit this bill for further study and action by the District Committee. This is no time to start this kind of an experiment, with this large amount of money as a mere beginning, when we do not have a proper plan. These people have not studied the situation. They have not called on the best engineering and the rest railroad brains in the country to support it. Sure you have a lot of clamor from all around the city and all the agencies to do something about transit. I want to do it now, but I want to do it correctly.

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

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

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman implied this opens the door wide open for the National Capital Transportation Agency to just spend the taxpayers' money at will. I am sure the gentleman does not mean to leave that impression, since he must know this will be subject to the action of the Appropriations Committee and the Congress from time to time as expenditures are made.

Mr. MULTER. There is no doubt about that. This is an authorization, and the Appropriations Committee will have to take a good look at it.

Mr. WHITENER. So the gentleman does not mean to leave the impression with the Members of the House that the Agency has carte blanche to just spend money?

Mr. MULTER. No; but I am trying to impress on this body that we should not pass an authorization so that anybody can go before the Appropriations Committee and say "Well, the Congress has approved this plan; now give us all the money we need to carry on."

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman has mentioned the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, and said that this act gives unlimited authority to the Agency to operate a transit system. I will ask the gentleman if it is not correct that that cannot be done until the matter is reviewed by the Congress, and the Congress must review and approve any operating plan which the National Capital Transportation Agency might suggest.

Mr. MULTER. They cannot begin to operate until they determine a labor policy for operation, but they can begin to operate as soon as they have that labor policy laid down. But the labor policy is not laid down in this bill for building this subway. Certainly we do not want labor to be left at the mercy of this Agency in the building of the subway system.

Mr. WHITENER. That is exactly the point I hoped the gentleman was making, because I am sure the gentleman knows there is an established labor policy so far as construction of this project or any other project is concerned under the Davis-Bacon Act, and that the gentleman's amendment, which I understand he will offer, relates to the operation of the transit system and not to the construction.

Mr. MULTER. And the gentleman, I am sure, must agree that the Davis-Bacon Act has many omissions. We have been trying for years to correct them. As a matter of fact, in the city of New York we have today government jobs being let to nonunion contractors and the Davis-Bacon Act does not protect their employees and it will not protect them here in the District of Columbia either.

Mr. WHITENER. But the gentleman is not saying to this House that the Davis-Bacon Act is not applicable to the construction of the transit system under this bill; is he?

Mr. MULTER. It is applicable—it is applicable but I repeat—it does not give union people and the worker the protection he is entitled to whether he is a member of the union or not.

Mr. WHITENER. I would like to ask the gentleman about a third point. He has mentioned the so-called private enterprise proposition offered to the committee. Of course, the gentleman is not a member of the subcommittee and did not hear the testimony.

Mr. MULTER. But I have read the testimony taken in the hearings.

Mr. WHITENER. I will ask the gentleman if anyone has offered in behalf of any private company to build the proposed rapid transit system embraced in this legislation and, if so, who were they?

Mr. MULTER. Beyond the extent of the D.C. Transit System, Inc., offer, which is contained in the supplement of the hearings, I know of no other. But I say again, it was the duty of this Agency that brought in the report to have consulted with all the private railroad builders or subway builders and operators in the country to find out whether or not private enterprise was willing to do this. It was the duty of this Agency to have invited them in to find out if private enterprise was willing to do it. There is not a single word here anywhere in the hearings to the effect that private enterprise will not do this job.

Mr. WHITENER. I will ask the gentleman if the same gentleman you say made this proposition did not send a telegram to every Member of this House or to at least most of us a few days ago, in which he said the proposal was a proposal of an outmoded system, but he wound up saying he wanted to operate it.

Mr. MULTER. I did not see the telegram that the gentleman refers to.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman can come to the desk, and I will show it to him.

Mr. MULTER. At the proper time I will offer an amendment to at least invite in the private enterprise people, whether it be the D.C. Transit Co. or anybody else, and ask them to do this job and, if they do not want to do it, then let the Agency do this job. But let us try private enterprise first.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not speak today on the technical aspects of this bill. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee have already covered these points very competently. Nor shall I attempt to argue that opinion within the Washington metropolitan area is unanimously in favor of this bill with or without some suggested amendments. The debate you have already heard would indicate there are many conflicting opinions on the bill. But I will address myself to the urgency of making a decision in the area of transportation in the Nation's Capital—and making that decision now.

In the first place, you have to accept the premise that there is congressional responsibility for the transportation difficulties and for their solution. We have

reserved to the Congress virtually all of the authority contemplated by the Constitution to control practically everything that happens within the District of Columbia. With that authority goes responsibility. It is that responsibility which we are being called upon to discharge today.

If you would have this Capital live—if you would prevent the danger of strangulation in this city of Washington, then you have to give serious consideration to this bill.

The fact that an area now delimited by the borders of the District of Columbia was set aside almost 2 centuries ago is not sufficient to limit the Federal interest and the congressional interest to the legal limits of the District of Columbia.

Washington, as a modern city, includes the Washington metropolitan area, and I would propose that there is a congressional responsibility which is coterminous with the metropolitan area.

The major reason why I am advocating the passage of this bill is because it is a sheer necessity. There is not a Member of this House that does not have firsthand knowledge of the difficulties and problems involving traffic and transportation in the Washington metropolitan area. There is not one of you who does not know, because you have traveled the streets and the highways of this city yourselves, that we are not current in resolving our existing transportation difficulties. If we are not current today, I ask you, what will be our situation tomorrow?

On the 23d of August of this year I inserted in the RECORD an article written by Jack Eisen published in the Washington Post in which he stated that it was predicted that the area population by the year 2000, in a little more than 30 years, would be 5 million. This is more than double the current population. Mr. Eisen in his article stated that "a metropolis of nearly 5 million persons with a possible range of 3.7 million and 6.3 million compared with the 1960 census total of 2 million" was considered a certainty.

I ask my colleagues in the House, if this does not represent a situation which is urgent to the point of emergency. We have to move faster than we are moving to resolve the problems of today, and we have facing us a population explosion which will double and perhaps triple the population of the metropolitan area within 30 years.

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

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman agree, perhaps, if this situation is as critical as we are told it is, it might be well in the future to disperse some of these agencies that are being contemplated out of the Washington area, such as the environmental health center and others, where they can go out over the country. Thus we would relieve a great deal of this situation if we would have them scattered throughout the country rather than having a concentration of them in the capital area.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. Just a minute and I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

I believe the gentleman from Ohio is very sincere, and I am sure that he would like to have the environmental health center located somewhere in his great State of Ohio. I would point out, however, that the need for this center and similar Federal agencies in the Washington metropolitan area exists because this is the seat of the Government of the United States. This is the place designated under authority of the Constitution of the United States for the Government to establish its major facilities. The fact that the executive Departments are here and the great Federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health are here and the existence of an academic community of enhancing reputation and other unique assets here makes it necessary that new facilities of the character of the environmental health center be established here to operate with maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree that the Cabinet officers and others should be here. This is the Government. However, there are many of these things that can be done that have no connection at all with the actual operation of the Government. There is research and many other things that could be done elsewhere, and I think there is no question but what they could be sent out over the country.

Mr. MATHIAS. As a matter of fact, the record shows that already is the case, because 90 percent of the Federal Government employees today are located in places other than the Washington metropolitan area.

Mr. BOW. There should be more of it.

Mr. MATHIAS. I think that the projection of the population figures for the next 30 years points to a doubling or perhaps a tripling of the population in the metropolitan area of Washington, and I would say to the gentleman from Ohio this is not entirely due to the proliferation of Government agencies, but it does mean that we have to make an urgent decision now.

In the first place, it should be clear that this bill is not in any way meant to be in derogation of surface transit in the metropolitan area. When we bring into the metropolitan area by subway a number of people who concentrate at some central point, they are going to need surface transit within the downtown area to their ultimate point of destination. This subway bill may affect the business of the surface transit system, but it is not intended to destroy it.

Secondly, I think that the objections of those who are primarily highway proponents are not well founded in opposing this bill.

This bill is not to be in conflict with the highway needs of the metropolitan area. There is need for more highways and also for mass transit. I think this bill underscores rather than minimizes the need for rapid progress on a highway program for the Capital metropolitan area.

I urge passage of this bill because it is so definitely a bill which is designed to meet a growing problem which the Nation's Capital faces. As we have responsibility for the welfare of this Capital we have a responsibility to consider this bill seriously and sympathetically. I hope Members will vote for passage.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, we ought to put this in its true perspective. To give you an idea of the enormity of this undertaking proposed in this bill, the other body some time ago passed a bill providing for $325 million in grants and loans for mass transport systems throughout the entire United States—a measly $325 million. That passed the other body. The House in its wisdom has even refused to consider a Government grant and loan mass transit aid program for the whole country in the amount of $325 million. Here you have a bill that calls upon the taxpayers of the United States of America to underwrite in one way or another $406 million for just one little speck on the map of the United States; namely, the District of Columbia. The House in its wisdom refused to act on the other bill because we cannot afford it. We are going into a field that needs further study and we have refused to take it up. Yet you are confronted with a proposition that calls for much more than $325 million; namely, $406 million for just one city. That is the enormity of this project. Of course, they say, "Well, of this $22 million will be a grant from the District of Columbia." Make no mistake about it, when the District of Columbia in its great feeling of good will says that they will donate $22 million they will just come to us and ask for $22 million of the taxpayers' money as their share because they are using that money for this purpose.

They say to begin with that the Federal grant is only going to be $120 million and then $259 million will be bonds guaranteed by the Federal Government. The very fact that this bill calls for bonds guaranteed by the Federal Government is an admission of the fact that the bonds could not be sold on the open market; nobody would buy a dollar's worth unless they were backed up by the Government of the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, it was not very long ago that we had some experience along those lines, when we built the $17 million District Stadium.

Mr. Chairman, we have had facts and figures here showing how the stadium was going to pay off, how they were going to make lots and lots of money on the stadium. Well, the members of the Committee know what happened. The stadium is operating at a deficit, the bonds are in default, and the Government which guaranteed those bonds, the Government and the taxpayers of the United States of America, are paying off those bonds.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who knows anything at all about transportation systems knows that the rule rather than the exception throughout the United States of America is that the transporta-

tion systems in all of our major cities are operating in the red.

So, Mr. Chairman, when the Committee comes here with findings and tries to tell the Congress of the United States that this is a public transportation system, or private, that is going to make money in the Nation's Capital, they do not know what they are talking about. They are merely guessing at the figures, because the rule rather than the exception throughout the United States is that transportation systems of major cities are operating at a deficit and not at a profit.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who thinks that I am naive enough to swallow the notion that this $259 million is going to be paid back, I am not that naive, because I have been in this body for 22 years and not once has anyone ever come up who made a proposition of this kind has the Federal Government recouped any of its money.

Mr. Chairman, there are people who know what is going on, and I want to emphasize that.

All of the members of the Committee should read the editorial which appeared in the Washington Star. These people know what is going on because it is the business interests and what they call "downtown Washington," who are really the promoters of this project.

Mr. Chairman, here is what the editorial said:

> The District Committee by an 11-to-2 vote authorize a start on Washington's rail transit system.

Notice that the words were "a start." This involves $406 million. That is a start?

Now, listen to the last paragraph:

> The whole point is to approach the transit program in small bites rather than in an attempt to swallow the whole thing in one gulp. The first bite is endorsed by the District Committee. Let us go ahead with the first bite.

This is just the first bite, my friends, and remember that, when I propose a motion to recommit to send the bill back to the District Committee for further study.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURKHALTER].

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I rise in support of H.R. 8929.

First, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], and all of the members of the gentleman's committee for all of the time and effort and hard work which they have put into this bill and in bringing to the floor a bill that in my opinion is deserving of the support of every Member of this House.

Mr. Chairman, in California we are spending $1,250,000 a day, 240 days a year, on a highways and freeways program, and have been doing that since about 1947.

You can build highways and freeways and major city streets, primary and secondary roads, but that is not the answer to the traffic problems in the urbanized cities today.

Many people are saying—it was mentioned here this afternoon—why private enterprise does not become interested in mass transportation and its problems and financing throughout the country, since it is a problem in every urbanized community in America which has a population in excess of 50,000 people, of which we have 212 such communities today.

I think most of the members of the Committee know that all statistics and all reports will prove that there are only three metropolitan cities in America where mass transportation pays its own way, without some kind of subsidy from some governmental agency.

Those cities are Cleveland, Ohio; San Diego, Calif.; and Chicago, and some of them are going in the red, I have been told recently.

So it is very simple, and the question is very easy to answer, why private enterprise does not finance mass transportation systems in urbanized areas, because private enterprise is not going to throw money into a losing venture. We all know that.

The time, in my opinion, is fast approaching when in order to take automobiles off the streets and to provide for movement of more people between two designated points, you are going to have to provide fast, economical transportation. You cannot stay on the surface. You can spend $100,000 for a bus and street car and put it on the surface but it is bogged down in its own tracks. It can move no faster than the flow of traffic in the traffic lanes in which it is moving. Therefore, you are going to have to go overhead or underground by either subway or elevated, such as the monorail, or any kind of mass transportation, as long as it is elevated or underground. You are going to have to provide off-street parking facilities in all of the urbanized cities.

You are going to have to provide a transportation system, not a line, but a system, that will clear all railroads, buses, or vehicular traffic, and all pedestrian traffic. You cannot have any interference whatsoever.

Air pollution is another problem when you begin speaking about mass transportation. I refer to air pollution in mass transportation because they are closely related. All of your scientists, chemists, your medical profession, will tell you the motor vehicle is discharging into the air 60 percent of all the polluted air coming from the exhausts of motor vehicles. One advantage of this system is it is electric. In future transportation systems that are built I urge them to go electric.

You may not have the problem today in your metropolitan cities, but the time is coming, and fast approaching, when air pollution in every city is going to be a major problem.

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

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

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think the House should know about the gentleman's experience as a member of the governing body of the city of Los Angeles, and his particularly being assigned to study this problem.

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned before, we have spent millions of dollars in the city of Los Angeles and we have not come up with a solution yet. Many experts say that private industry would do the job, we do not have to put any of the taxpayers' money into this program; private enterprise will do it, let them do it. We have been talking about that for 25 or 30 years, but we are no further ahead than at the beginning. People demand action, and they demand action now.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and I would recommend its passage.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice in support of H.R. 8929 and to urge that it be passed. I also want to make mention of the fact that as a member of the subcommittee I attended most of the hearings and might indicate to the other Members that we had a great number of hearings and many hours were spent in receiving testimony from various witnesses interested in this matter.

I think at the outset it should be indicated that some people have tried to make it appear there is a conflict of interest between users of the highways, bus companies, and users of other modes of transportation, but it seems to me this rapid rail or subway type of transportation will supplement the present means of transportation in this area. So I do not believe there is conflict between this and other modes of transportation.

I want to say first and foremost that I am absolutely convinced that unless immediate action is taken by the Congress to create the kind of high-speed, high-capacity transportation facilities called for by this bill, in a very few years rush hour traffic in downtown Washington will grind to a halt. In many sections downtown today traffic is already at a standstill.

Public transportation facilities have not kept pace with the growth of the National Capital region. Today's transit system is itself mired in the traffic snarls that beset all of us as we fight our way to and from the office every day. It is imperative that part of the job of moving rush hour commuter traffic be done by a high-speed rail rapid transit system operating on exclusive rights-of-way.

As a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and of the subcommittee which considered H.R. 8929, I have devoted much attention during the past several months to the rapid transit legislation proposed here today. I have sat through the lengthy hearings that were held to consider the problem and heard the countless witnesses—Federal officials, transit experts, and representatives of civic and governmental organizations throughout the National Capital region—who testified in support of the legislation. I have examined the voluminous studies that have been prepared. To me, it is beyond question that

rapid transit is needed right now in our Nation's Capital.

The city is engulfed in traffic congestion. Twice a day, for 2 hours each in the morning and evening long lines of cars form to enter or leave the city. Each day the lines grow longer. Worse still, the National Capital Transportation Agency and the highway departments of the region forecast that between now and the late 1970's there will be a 40 percent increase in the number of trips to and through the downtown area in the morning and evening peak hours. Existing streets and programed new highways cannot conceivably accommodate the new loads that will come, much less ease the situation that now exists. There is no other answer but the construction of a rapid transit system that will move people underground and relieve the pressures on our streets and highways.

I am convinced that without such a system, the future of the Nation's Capital will be grim, indeed. We can look forward to a steady increase in congestion, to more and more prime downtown land being used for parking—I think this is important to emphasize—and to a decline in the vitality of the downtown area. The net result will be serious injury to the health and appearance of the National Capital and costly losses in time and money to the truckers, the motorists, and all others who must use the city's streets and highways.

I point to the city of New York and ask you to consider the cost to the truckers, motorists, and other users of the highways in the city of New York if they did not have a subway system.

We cannot permit such a situation to occur here. We must act now to meet and alleviate Washington's traffic congestion problem, and I believe H.R. 8929 is the answer.

The rapid transit legislation originally proposed would have provided a regional system that would cost some $800 million to construct and place in operation. That system would have provided 83 miles of rapid transit service throughout the region, with lines extending deep into the suburbs and would have provided a very large downtown subway distribution system. Under the original proposal, the Federal Government would have contributed $120 million, the same amount called for by the present bill, the local governments would have contributed $60 million, and the rest—over $600 million—would have been paid for by the users of the system and would be raised by the sale of revenue bonds.

I reviewed the original proposal including the many, comprehensive studies that were made in support of it. I was convinced then, and I remain convinced now, that the original $800 million system was a necessary and desirable one, and made good business sense.

On the other hand, it was the view of the other members of the committee that it would be undesirable to commit the Federal Government to so large a rapid transit system. Those members felt that a smaller system would do much to relieve congestion, would be economically feasible, and that such a system could be extended at a later date if this were found necessary. I think it will be found necessary. I think it is very important to extend it at a later date. Accordingly, our very able colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], introduced H.R. 8929, the bill presently before us, to authorize construction of a smaller system incorporating many of the features of the larger plan but reducing the size of the downtown subway system, shortening the suburban lines and reducing the total investment involved. Despite my own belief in the desirability of the larger system, which would cost the Federal Government no more, the smaller system represents a compromise which I can readily support. I have no hesitation in saying that the system that would be authorized by the present bill represents a bare minimum and that the size of the originally proposed system has been reduced just as far as it is feasible to reduce it. To me the all important point is that construction of a rapid transit system must begin at the earliest possible date.

I should also mention that subsequent to the introduction of the bill, H.R. 8929, we canvassed all of the organizations that appeared before the committee.

There is a supplement to the report of the hearings which includes the reaction of various organizations and businesses indicating their approval of this so-called bobtail system.

As a minority member, to me one of the most appealing features of this rapid transit program is that its financing has been made as businesslike as possible. I do not hold with the view that merely because a public facility is needed it should, therefore, be supported entirely by taxation. My view is that since a rapid transit facility is needed, the people who need it ought to pay for it as directly as possible. This was certainly the view of Congress when it directed the National Capital Transportation Agency to prepare a financing plan placing the major burden of paying for the facilities upon the users of the system. I know that in some cities this is an unpopular view and that low fares and high subsidy are considered to be desirable. But Congress established a contrary policy for the Nation's Capital and, it seems to me, a far wiser one.

The Agency carefully adhered to the instructions given it by the Congress. The result is that while Federal assistance for this program is necessary, the amount of Federal funds required has been kept to a reasonable minimum. All of the operating costs of the system and the predominant portion of its capital costs will be met from revenues. The remaining costs have been equitably distributed between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. Furthermore, the estimates show that while a $120 million Federal grant is required for this system, there is good reason to anticipate that this outlay may be repaid after the retirement of bonded debt.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] and our colleages on the other side of the aisle have referred to the time it has taken to bring this bill to its present posture. Many years of intensive and exhaustive planning and preparation have been spent. I daresay that the House has never considered any piece of legislation with greater preparation behind it. Before this program was transmitted to the Congress it was the subject of searching examination and analysis by several Federal agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget. Throughout the year that has passed since the transit development program was published in November of 1962, a rapid transit system for Washington has been the subject of wide public debate. Our subcommittee hearings revealed not only a virtually unanimous enthusiasm for the creation of such a system, but a remarkable degree of understanding by the people of the details of the transit development program. In addition to the days spent in public hearings, under the tireless and dedicated leadership of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], the members of the committee have held numerous conferences and executive sessions to evaluate the evidence, and to fashion an action program which will serve the best interests of the District of Columbia and the National Capital region. I am satisfied that H.R. 8929 accomplishes this end. The improvements it would authorize are long overdue. I have no reservations at all regarding the soundness or the necessity of the investment it entails. This rail rapid transit system will be an asset that we can ill afford to do without. This legislation is imperative for the well-being of the Nation's Capital, and I strongly urge its enactment.

I also want to point out, I certainly agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] when he said he is for private enterprise operating this system. But, as was pointed out earlier in the debate, the question of the operation of the system is not here involved. All we are involved with is authorization for construction. It seems to me, the point the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] made with regard to private enterprise operating this system should be taken up later since it is not involved in regard to the question we have here before us now.

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

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHITENER. I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York and express my appreciation to him for his diligence throughout the hearings and in the deliberations of the subcommittee and say to him that while I am in sympathy somewhat with his views that we should have gone into a bigger original project which would involve $800 million, I am sure that the gentleman will agree particularly after moving about the floor of the House today, that the better part of wisdom was to proceed with this revised or limited version. We felt it was a very practical minimum approach to this problem.

Mr. HORTON. I would certainly agree with the gentleman and I have cer-

tainly indicated in my statement that I am completely in accord with the bill, H.R. 8929.

I also want to emphasize again I feel that the proposal here before us can be amplified at a later date and thus give an opportunity to the suburban communities to become integrated in this system.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to make a statement and ask a few questions.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is admittedly a first step or a bobtailed bill. Apparently with respect to some of the opposition to the bill, this is a bad thing. With respect to those who live in the community, we faced this with some concern at first, but this does not appear to be fatal to us because we feel, as we know you feel, that the needs of the community will not be met satisfactorily until a complete system is adopted. Although this is a first step, it is a necessary step and, of necessity, more will come. The original proposal was for a $800 million bill, and this has been cut to $400 million. However, the additional $400 million, you must understand, does not include any additional Federal contribution but, rather, the additional moneys are to come from the neighboring jurisdictions, that is, my own Maryland and neighboring Virginia, and the balance from increased bonds which must be floated.

However, even while this system is being constructed it will be necessary to plan for the final system. I would like to state for the RECORD that the Agency, the National Capital Transportation Agency, should consult with the various agencies both in Maryland and Virginia well in advance of their decisions. One of the biggest problems we have had with respect to this program was the failure on the part of the Agency adequately to deal with and meet with the agencies in Maryland and Virginia.

Again I want to state for the RECORD that the people of Maryland do not want future planning and development to be managed and controlled solely by a Federal agency through the development of this mass transit system out in Maryland and Virginia. We want to be consulted. I want to emphasize that when you look at this bill, the first impression is that it is only for the District of Columbia. Nothing could be further from the truth. Not only are there at least three spurs that go into the adjoining jurisdictions but ultimately a complete system must service all of the jurisdictions in this area.

Now, if the chairman of the subcommittee will yield for two questions, I would like to ask this:

First I have been told by representatives from the Agency—and I want to be correct in assuming that—that nothing in H.R. 8929 authorizes the Agency to issue bonds and that further legislative authority will be necessary before bonds may be issued. Am I correct in this?

Mr. WHITENER. Of course, I am not aware of any conversation the gentleman may have had with another person. The only thing I can say is that it is my information that the bonds will not be issued until the Appropriations Committee has spoken on the matter.

Mr. SICKLES. It will take further legislative authority?

Mr. WHITENER. I say that is my information.

Mr. SICKLES. Am I correct also in stating that this is a bill only for construction and that there is no authority for the agency to operate either under this bill or any other law on the books?

Mr. WHITENER. This bill relates only to construction. There is a difference of opinion as to the content of the act of 1960.

Mr. SICKLES. As to whether they can proceed with construction?

Mr. WHITENER. If the gentleman will yield to me a moment further, I have just been looking at the record of the hearings and I want to express to the gentleman my appreciation of the support he gave this program and of his testimony before the committee. I hope that it indicates his undying support here on the floor of the House.

Mr. SICKLES. Well, I do not propose to die at this point, but if I have any further time remaining I would like to address myself to a discussion of the labor provisions of the bill. Let me point out to you ladies and gentlemen that pursuant to the act of 1960 there are in progress negotiations between Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia to establish a compact agency for the operation of the system which is finally established.

Under that act a Federal negotiator has been appointed. This Federal negotiator is meeting with us. I say with us because I represented the State of Maryland on this commission for some time. We are just at the point of considering the issue of the labor policy with respect to the operational employees of the system. It would be extremely helpful to us if we knew the congressional policy on this matter.

We cannot realistically handle our compact on a piecemeal basis but must produce an all-inclusive document considering all issues.

Earlier in the testimony, it was stated that the labor provisions to be offered were first suggested to the committee in 1960. I have reviewed these proposed amendments, and for the life of me, I cannot see the reason for the delay in their consideration. I have talked to many of the employees of the transit system in operation now, who are my constituents, and they are concerned, deeply concerned, about their future. They are concerned about their seniority rights, and pension benefits, and they are concerned now.

I for one intend to vote for this amendment when it is proposed, and I urge you to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me the additional time.

It has been said that the financing of this program is sound, but I submit to you that the financing authority of this program is sound only if an adequate number of people patronize the transit system. At best the soundness is based on estimates. At this point I would like to ask the distinguished chairman how many commuters there are in the District.

Mr. WHITENER. If the gentleman had mentioned that to me earlier I could have furnished him the information. It is here in the files. If the gentleman will proceed with his statement, I will endeavor to find it.

Mr. HARSHA. Also I would like to know how many of these commuters were surveyed, if the gentleman can tell me that, and what percentage those surveyed are to the total number of commuters? I add that for the reason that during the hearings I asked the same question, and I want my colleagues to know what type of survey was permitted. Here is the answer that was given as it appears on page 69 of the hearings. There were only 2,005 commuters surveyed.

First, the question was asked: Considering bus and rail vehicles, with no difference in cost, time, or convenience, which would you prefer?

I place special emphasis on the word "convenience" because this is an age of convenience. I think it is readily admitted by everyone that there will not be the same convenience in this system as in the original system. One of the main objections to the original system was the number of transfers that would have to be made.

Again the question asked assumed you could make the two facilities just as fast, and just as convenient.

But it is obvious that this will not be as convenient as the present bus system. It will not be as convenient as the present use of automobiles by the commuters. It is unrefuted that you will have to make a number of stops. First, you will have to locate a bus that will take you to a subway station. You will have to disembark from that bus and then get on the subway. Or you will have to drive to a point on the rail system and park your car. Disembark and board the transit.

Then, when you are brought into a central point, you will again have to disembark and, depending upon the location of your work, you may have to walk some 8 to 10 minutes in order to get to your destination. In all kinds of weather, rain or shine.

Now, in this age of convenience, this is not equivalent to the convenience of a commuter's automobile.

Certainly, with this bobtailed system where the transfers are going to be multiplied by a great deal more, the convenience is lacking. With the lack of convenience the patronage falls far short of the estimates.

If the patronage is not available to the system, then its financing program is not sound and, of course, it will fail

and Congress will have to provide the necessary funds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read to the members of the Committee a portion of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission's report, the Agency charged with the responsibility of alleviating traffic congestion and regulating and improving transit within the Washington metropolitan area. I think it is generally conceded by all that this is only a forerunner or a step in the door to expand to the $1 billion program. Here are the views of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission:

The Commission, by a majority vote, voices the same objections to the bobtailed version of the original plan because the new version is a forerunner of and, apparently, was submitted in anticipation of the eventual expansion to the originally planned full system. However, if the assumption is made that the bobtailed version will constitute the ultimate rail system for the region, the major objection to the original plan has been aggravated even more by the new proposal. The transfer requirement has been multiplied manifold under the modified plan. From a patronage standpoint, it would not be used; from an investment point of view, it would be disastrous.

Further quoting from the comments and views of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission is the following:

Indeed, if the bobtailed version is approved and constructed, it will be so unattractive from a passenger-convenience standpoint and consequently, so economically unsound, that the resulting exigencies will demand almost immediate completion of the original proposed system in order to salvage something from the tremendous investment. Because of the major fallacies of the original proposed rail system a smaller part of that same system should not be allowed to be constructed, even at a proportionately lower cost, for the purpose of establishing a lever to bring into existence the original plan. The only attractive feature of the new proposal may be compared to installment buying—the downpayment (one-half of the cost) is made attractively low in order to sell an otherwise unsalable commodity. Once the downpayment is made the point of no return will have passed and no other result can be reached.

One of the major objections to the original system as proposed by NCTA was the requirement, inherent in the system, that a great majority of passengers would have to transfer in traveling from origin to destination; at least one-half of the passengers would have to transfer at least twice. Under the bobtailed version this deficiency is magnified tremendously as only a handful of people would be offered through service from origin to destination. No rail system can be reasonably expected to meet the minimum criterion with respect to passenger volume if the great majority of passengers are required to transfer at both ends of the line.

This boils down to simply this, that if the convenience is not there the patronage is not there—when the patronage is not there the financial soundness of the program is not there and then the taxpayers have to subsidize the program.

Under this legislation the Federal Government will eventually pick up the tab for over $400 million.

How then can you justify voting against the mass transit bills if you support this bill?

I urge the defeat of this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in these remaining 2 minutes I would like to again urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to this legislation which we believe is vital to the orderly development of this Federal city.

It has been said by one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this amount of money involved exceeds the amount involved in another bill which would apply nationally.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the members of the committee that it is estimated by the Agency that the revenue bonds will be readily paid by the proceeds of the farebox. They also express the view that the farebox could very well repay the grants which come from the District Government and the Federal Government. It has been said by this same gentleman that transportation systems throughout the country are losing money. This is one of the bright spots of this legislation, as we heard the discussion of it by the Agency, and that is that the ridiculous fare structure which is bringing about losses in other areas is not contemplated here. The minimum fare will be 25 cents here in the District of Columbia. The fare will increase as the amount of mileage traveled increases.

So it is reliably, we think, projected by financial experts that this operation will be able to support itself through the fare box and retire the original debt as represented in the form of these revenue bonds.

The Agency people further tell us that they feel there is a possibility that the farebox will repay the grants which are made by the local people and the Federal Government.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we urge the enactment of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. 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, in accordance with section 204(c) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (40 U.S.C. 664(c)), the National Capital Transportation Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Agency") is hereby authorized, subject to the availability of appropriations and other funds, to undertake the construction and acquisition of the following rail transit routes, including the facilities pertinent to such routes, as described in the report of the Agency entitled "Summary Report of the Transit Development Program, May 1963": (1) The Northwest-Bethesda Route from Twelfth and G Streets Northwest to Van Ness Street Northwest, (2) the Columbia Heights-Petworth Route in the District of Columbia from Seventeenth Street and Columbia Road Northwest to the junction with the Northwest-Bethesda Route, (3) the Springfield-Alexandria and Henson Creek-Anacostia Routes from Pentagon City in Arlington County, Virginia, to Anacostia Southeast in the District of Columbia, (4) the Route 66-Rosslyn Route in Arlington County, Virginia, from Rosslyn to the junction with the Alexandria-Springfield Route, (5) the Rockville-Silver Spring Route from Woodside in Montgomery County, Maryland, to the junction with the Springfield-Alexandria, Henson Creek-Anacostia Route near Union Station in the District of Columbia, (6) the Bowie-Cheverly Route from Union Station in the District of Columbia to Bowie in Prince Georges County, Maryland: *Provided,* That no portion of any such routes shall be constructed within the United States Capitol Grounds except upon approval of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol.

SEC. 2. The work authorized by section 1 shall be subject to the provisions of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (40 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) and substantially in accordance with the schedules and plans contained in the aforesaid report with such modifications thereof as may be advisable in the discretion of the Administrator of the Agency.

SEC. 3. The Agency is authorized to make relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations, whether owners of land or tenants thereof, to reimburse them for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and any actual direct losses of property except goodwill or profit, for which reimbursement or compensation is not otherwise made, resulting from their displacement by the acquisition of lands or interests therein by or for the Agency. Such relocation payments shall be made subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator of the Agency, and shall not exceed $200 in the case of an individual or family, or $3,000 (or, if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of a business concern or nonprofit organization. Such rules and regulations may include provisions authorizing payments to individuals and families, of fixed amounts (not to exceed $200 in any case) in lieu of their respective reasonable and necessary moving expenses and actual direct losses of property. Where the land is acquired for the Agency by another Federal agency or by State or local agency or authority, the Agency may reimburse the acquiring agency for relocation payments made by it, up to the amounts specified herein.

SEC. 4. The Agency shall submit to the President in December of each year for transmittal to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session a report of its operations under this Act.

SEC. 5. Section 205(e) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (40 U.S.C. 665(e)) is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof the words "without fiscal year limitation."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 17, insert the following:

*Provided,* That no portion of any such routes shall be constructed within the United States Capitol Grounds except upon approval of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: At page 3 line 2 after the word "Agency" strike out the period (.) and insert a comma (,) and insert the following words:

"*Provided,* That the Agency shall undertake the performance of none of such work until it has given private enterprise at least six

months in which to submit offers to build, own and/or operate such routes and no such routes after being built by the said Agency shall be operated by it unless and until permission to do so has been obtained by further legislative enactment of the Congress."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this is a private enterprise amendment, and it provides very simply for doing what the Agency that brought in the report has not done yet; that is, to call upon private enterprise to come forward and indicate whether or not they will build this system. If they will and can build it, then give them the opportunity to do it. Obviously, we have to have some time limitation in the amendment. It does not matter to me whether it is 4 months, 5 months, or 6 months, but we must give them an opportunity to say whether they can or want to build this system. If this Congress is ready to approve this plan and call for the building of this subway system, despite all that has been said against it, I say take the plan and call on private industry to see whether they can build this, and are willing to do it, if they have the finances to do it, and, if so, let them do it. If they do not, then let the agency proceed to build it.

I have a second provision in this amendment. After it is built they must give private enterprise an opportunity to operate it. I say that while it is all right to let the Agency in the first instance determine whether or not private enterprise can and will build, when it comes to operation, you have an entirely different problem. I say when it is built or almost built, then let the committee come before the Congress and say whether or not the Government should run this system or private enterprise should be given an opportunity to do it. I am certain there can be no doubt that the system once built can be operated by private enterprise. As a matter of fact, we have been told it is the intent of the Agency to let private enterprise operate this system if and when it is built. If that is so, let us put it right in the bill, put it in the act, and require them to do it, and do not permit them to change their minds, as they can do under the existing statute because the existing statute gives them the right to build, own, and operate, all with Government money. I say let us give private industry every opportunity to do so on its own.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment would go to this point, that they have to finance as well as physically operate the railroad?

Mr. MULTER. That is what it does.

Mr. GROSS. Or the transportation system?

Mr. MULTER. That is what it does.

Mr. GROSS. The bill provides for financing and operating it?

Mr. MULTER. That is the intent of my amendment.

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

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

Mr. WHITENER. I understand the gentleman is saying this private group he must have in mind would pay for this without any cost to the taxpayer in building or operating the system?

Mr. MULTER. I want to be frank with the gentleman and the rest of this body. I have in mind that we have a mass transportation bill pending in the Rules Committee which calls for money for the entire country, grants and loans, including the District of Columbia. If private industry comes forward after that bill is enacted into law, and is law, we should not exclude private enterprise from coming in and qualifying if they can. If we do not have such a bill they will have to build it on their own.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman mentioned one private organization earlier as being the one he had in mind. I ask the gentleman if he does not know that organization is now receiving substantial subsidies from the Federal and District taxpayers. Is that the type of free enterprise the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. MULTER. No. Let us get this clear. I did not say, and I am sure the record will bear me out, that this is intended to cover the D.C. Transit System, Inc. The D.C. Transit System, Inc., is not the only private enterprise that is willing to do this job. This does not limit it to D.C. Transit and does not say D.C. Transit will do it.

I think the gentleman is mistaken when he says that the D.C. Transit System gets a subsidy. They get a certain tax exemption if their net income does not give them a 6-percent return. They have never yet earned that 6 percent. They get no subsidy from the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my good friend from New York talks in terms of:

Offers to build, own and/or operate such routes and no such routes after being built by the said Agency shall be operated by it unless and until permission to do so has been obtained by further legislative enactment of the Congress.

I rather think the gentleman has put down a proviso in his amendment that appeals to many of us, certainly to me, because I think that everyone knows that I am a strong advocate of private enterprise and an opponent of excessive Government intervention. But the hard, cold fact is that no private enterprise in the 7 or 8 days of the hearings we had appeared to talk on this situation here in the District of Columbia. I further make the statement that they did not do it because they know it is not feasible.

This amendment is offered by my good friend in such a way that to adopt it would be to try to anticipate both propositions, that the Agency will build this system and then, as he calls it, private enterprise will take over.

Then as to the proposition that you cannot build or own or operate, I am sure every Member of this body knows the problems that any private operator would have in financing and getting rights-of-way and all of the other property. This is one of the areas in which it is peculiarly a matter for the Government through an agency to operate. I am sure my friend would not recommend that the D.C. Transit Co., Inc., or some other corporation take over the streets and highways of the District of Columbia or the sewer systems of the District of Columbia or other services which are peculiarly Government functions. I know that my good friend from New York has had an opportunity to observe the operation of the transit system in his city of New York, and he knows that no private operator could operate that system nor could they have built it originally. So that is why I say that this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia Of course, as the gentleman pointed out, all of us are for private enterprise doing the job if they can and will do it. We did discuss this at length in the committee. In fact, when the joint committee was meeting, considering the creation of a National Capital Transportation Agency, we directed the agency to explore means of private enterprise doing the job and to check with existing privately owned public utility companies to see if they could expand their operation procedures and solve the problem without the Federal Government getting into it.

During the hearings, privately owned companies had every opportunity to come before the committee with a plan or with a program to set up this system themselves. The only proposal that was offered, I understand, was one which called for Government loans and Government subsidies. If we are going to underwrite this program, I do think we ought to construct it and make certain that private enterprise can operate it properly before we undertake to turn it over to them. I think, frankly, that what the gentleman proposes here is not necessary or it is not necessary to have this bill at all for private enterprise to come in and construct a subway system. They have refused to do it.

Mr. WHITENER. This subcommittee heard from 104 different official agencies, groups and organizations in the District of Columbia, including business interests, labor and civic groups, and every type of Government agency that had any interest in this project. I am sure no one would deny those people are just as much interested in private enterprise as is my good friend, the gentleman from New York. The only people who have opposed this legislation were those people who operate two bus systems and some of the labor groups, if it was not amended, and this regulatory agency, W.M.A.T.C., or some such agency which is directly associated with the bus operators.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 56, noes 35.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MULTER and Mr. WHITENER.

The committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82, noes 37.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to find a basis to justify a vote for this bill, but I have some reservations and would like to have them cleared up. I direct this question to some member of the committee. As I read the bill, for example, I find absolutely no limitation whatsoever on the amount of money authorized to be appropriated. It is absolutely wide open and the Committee on Appropriations could appropriate $2 billion or $3 billion or any amount of money. There is no limitation. Am I correct in my understanding of the bill so far as that is concerned? Since no member of the committee wishes to respond to it, I make the assertion that there is no limitation.

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I made that statement during general debate and I repeat it now. In specific and categorical answer to the gentleman I say there is no limitation either in the bill or in the act being amended by this bill. The only provision in the act is that as much as may be required by this agency is authorized, and there is no limitation on it in the bill now before us. It is wide open.

Mr. JONAS. Subject only, of course, to funds that may be appropriated.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. But is it not unusual to have an open-end authorization bill?

Mr. MULTER. I believe it is unusual and it gives a blank check.

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

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from North Carolina, because I am seeking enlightenment here.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Knowing he is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I think he would be pleased to know in our deliberations the subcommittee and the Committee on the District of Columbia expressed full confidence in the Committee on Appropriations and felt that that branch of the Congress would see to it that money was used judiciously. We recognized the uncertainty of the expenditures. Therefore, it must be left to the discretion of the Congress.

Mr. JONAS. I appreciate the compliment of the gentleman to the Committee on Appropriations, and think the chairman of the subcommittee is correct in assuming that the Committee on Appropriations will give careful consideration to requested appropriations, but I just wanted to be sure that I had not overlooked something in the bill.

I could not find any limitation of any sort. We usually look to a scrutiny of these bills by two committees.

The Authorization Committee fixes a ceiling and the Appropriations Committee is required to operate under that ceiling.

Mr. WHITENER. I am sure that the gentleman understands that under this bill there would be probably more than one subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee looking into the various aspects of it, and then the full committee would get the recommendations of those subcommittees.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman. I have one other question on which I would like clarification. I am not asking these questions to indicate hostility to the bill. I recognize the need for improving transportation facilities in the District of Columbia. I am involved in this bumper-to-bumper traffic every morning and every evening. I recognize that this is a growing community and that the problem will get worse before it gets better. I think we ought to do something about it. However, I would like to have some statement from the committee which would justify me in voting to tax all of the taxpayers of the United States or subject them to liability on 95 percent of the cost of this system while the taxpayers of the District of Columbia are required to ante up only 5 percent. I recognize that some formula should be used. I recognize that the Federal Government has a responsibility for part of this financial obligation. But is 95 percent against 5 percent a fair separation of the respective liabilities? It strikes me that the committee is subjecting the taxpayers of all the United States to too great a share of this financial burden.

I would like somebody to explain to me and to justify that kind of an overbalance in Federal responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULTER

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: At page 3, after line 2, insert the following new section to be numbered section 3, and renumber all subsequent sections accordingly, to wit:

LABOR PROVISIONS

"SEC. 3. (a) Employees of Agency shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. The Agency, its officers, or agents shall not deny or in any way question the rights of its employees to join, organize, or assist in organizing the labor organization of their choice, and it shall not interfere in any way with the organization of its employees.

"(b) Representatives designated or selected for the purpose of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees of the Agency, or any appropriate unit thereof, shall be the exclusive representative of all such employees for the purposes of collective bargaining: *Provided*, That any individual employee or a group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to the Agency and to have such grievances adjusted, without the intervention of the bargaining representative, as long as the adjustment is not inconsistent with the terms of a collective bargaining contract or agreement then in effect; *Provided further*, That the bargaining representative has been given opportunity to be present at such adjustment.

"If any dispute shall arise among the Agency's employees as to who are the representatives of such employees designated and authorized in accordance with the requirements of this title, or between the Agency and its employees as to the determination of appropriate bargaining units and the parties are unable to reach agreement through conference and negotiation, it shall be the duty of the National Labor Relations Board to resolve such disputes in accordance with section 9(c) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 159, 160, and 161 and the rules and regulations of the said Board thereunder.

"(c) The Agency shall bargain collectively with and enter written contracts with the duly authorized labor organization or organizations representing employees of the Agency concerning wages, hours, and conditions of employment including, but not limited to, health and welfare, insurance, vacations, holidays, sick leave, schedules, seniority, and pension and retirement benefits, *Provided*, That the Agency shall not recognize or bargain with any employee representative who, or representatives of any labor organization which, (a) advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of government in the United States, or (b) discriminates with regard to the qualifications, terms, or conditions of membership because of race, religion, color, creed, or national origins.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, or of any other statute or law of the United States, or of any State, the Agency and the labor organization duly designated and authorized to represent the employees of the Agency in accordance with the requirements of this title shall be permitted to make agreements providing for the deduction by the Agency from the wages of its employees and payment to the labor organization representing such employees, of any periodic dues, initiation fees and assessments (not including fines and penalties) uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership: *Provided*, That no such agreement shall be effective with respect to any individual employee until he shall have furnished the Agency with a written assignment to the labor organization of such membership dues, initiation fees, and assessments, which shall be revocable in writing after the expiration of one year or upon the termination date of the applicable collective agreement, whichever occurs sooner.

DISPUTES

"(e) In the case of any dispute between the Agency and any employee or employees of the Agency arising out of the interpretation or application of agreements between the Agency and such employees, properly accredited officers of the Agency shall meet and treat with properly accredited representatives of such employee or employees (who may be themselves employees of the Agency or officers of a labor organization duly authorized to represent such employees) on any such grievance. Any dispute that cannot be amicably adjusted by conference shall, upon the written request of either party to the other, be submitted to a Board of Arbitration. Such Board shall be composed of three persons: one to be chosen by the Agency, one to be chosen by the employee or the employee representative, and the two thus selected shall select a third disinter-

ested person who shall serve as Chairman of the Board. The party requesting submission to arbitration shall name its arbitrator in its written request. The other party shall name its arbitrator within five days after having received written notice from the other of the appointment of its arbitrator. If either party fails to name its arbitrator it shall forfeit its case. If, after a period of ten days from the appointment of the two arbitrators representing the Agency and the employee, or such additional period as the parties may agree in writing, the third arbitrator has not been selected, then either arbitrator may request the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to furnish a list of five persons from which one shall be selected to act as the third arbitrator. No later than five days after receipt of such list, the arbitrators appointed by the parties shall determine by lot the order of elimination, and thereafter each shall in that order alternately eliminate one name until only one name remains. The remaining person on the list shall be the third arbitrator. The findings and award of a majority of the Board of Arbitrators shall be final and binding on the parties. The agreement(s) between the Agency and its employees under which the dispute arose shall remain unchanged during the arbitration proceeding. Each of the parties shall bear the expense of its own arbitrator and the parties shall share equally the expense of the third arbitrator.

FUTURE AGREEMENTS

"In the event that the Agency and its employees, or the Agency and the duly authorized representatives of its employees, are unable through conference and collective bargaining to reach agreement on the terms of any agreement relating to rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, including health and welfare, insurance, and pension and retirement provisions, to be applicable in the future, the Agency shall offer, in writing, to submit such dispute to a Board of Arbitration composed of three persons, one to be chosen by the Agency, one to be chosen by the employee or employee representative, and the third to be chosen jointly by the two persons thus selected. The third, disinterested arbitrator shall be a person experienced in labor arbitration and shall be the Chairman of the Board of Arbitration. Each party shall name its arbitrator within five days after the agreement to arbitrate. If, after a period of ten days from the appointment of the two arbitrators representing the Agency and its employees, or such additional period as the parties may agree in writing, the third, disinterested arbitrator has not been agreed upon, then either arbitrator may request the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to furnish a list of five persons from which the disinterested arbitrator shall be selected. No later than five days after receipt of such a list, the arbitrators appointed by the parties shall determine by lot the order of elimination, and thereafter each shall in that order alternately eliminate one name until only one name remains.

"The agreement(s) between the Agency and its employees under which the dispute arose shall remain unchanged during the arbitration proceeding. Each party shall bear the expense of its own arbitrator, and shall share equally the expenses of the disinterested arbitrator.

"The award of a majority of the Board of Arbitration, which award shall be final and binding on the parties, shall be rendered within sixty days, or such additional period as the parties may agree in writing, after the appointment of the disinterested arbitrator, and shall be retroactive to the expiration date of the bargaining agreement.

"(f) If the Agency acquires any existing facilities from any public or privately owned transportation utility operating within the National Capital region, all employees of the transportation utility except corporate officers shall, upon application therefor, be transferred to and appointed as employees of the Agency, subject to all the rights and benefits of this title. Such employees shall be given seniority credit, sick leave, vacation, insurance and pension credits in accordance with the records of the acquired transportation system, and shall be protected against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment under conditions not less beneficial than those established pursuant to the provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

"If there is in effect at the time of the acquisition by the Agency of such existing transportation system a collective bargaining agreement covering the terms and conditions of employment of such employees, such terms and conditions shall remain in effect until the expiration of such collective bargaining agreement or until such time as both the Agency and the labor organization representing such employees agree to modify such terms and conditions of employment, whichever first occurs.

"All employees of the Agency shall be covered by a sound pension and retirement system, adequate to provide for all payments when due under such established system or as it may be modified from time to time by agreement or arbitration. The rights, privileges, benefits, obligations, and status of members and beneficiaries of any pension or retirement system established by any acquired transportation system shall be protected and not diminished in any way in the establishment of the pension and retirement system herein provided for. The Agency and its employees, through their representatives for collective bargaining purposes, shall take whatever action may be necessary to have pension trust funds under the joint control of any acquired transportation system and the participating employees through their representatives transferred to the trust fund to be established, maintained, and administered jointly by the Agency and the participating employees through their representatives. No employee of any acquired transportation system who is transferred to a position with the Agency shall by reason of such transfer be placed in any worse position with respect to rates of pay, hours and working conditions he enjoyed as an employee of such acquired transportation system, including but not limited to workmen's compensation, pensions, seniority, sick leave, vacation, health and welfare insurance he enjoyed as an employee of such acquired transportation system.

"(g)(a) It is hereby declared as a matter of legislative policy that the institution of transportation service by the Agency, whether through services operated by the Agency, by a private transit company through contract with the Agency, or by a private transit company conducting any competing transit operations established pursuant to a development plan adopted by the Agency, shall be accomplished with a minimum of adverse effect on the employees of the existing transportation service employers serving as common carriers of passengers in the National Capital region. To this end, prior to the inauguration by it of any transportation service, the Agency shall enter into an agreement with the duly authorized labor organizations representing such employees for collective bargaining purposes, providing for the fair and equitable treatment of any such employees who are adversely affected by such institution of transportation service. Such provisions shall be reduced to writing, shall be binding on the parties thereto, and may include, but need not be limited to, provision for the protection of the seniority rights of displaced and separated employees, provision of severance pay or protective payments for separated employees, provision of programs and facilities for the retraining of such personnel (including paid training and qualifying programs for continuing employment with the mass transportation system by which such employee was employed or by its successor) and shall establish procedures for the administration of such protective provisions, and for the resolution of disputes arising thereunder by arbitration or otherwise.

"In no event, however, shall such protective provisions for any employee, whether he is directly or indirectly adversely affected as a result of technological or other developments resulting from such institution of transportation service, receive benefits less beneficial than the protective conditions and benefits provided under the Washington Job Protection Agreement of May, 1936, including the schedule of allowances and benefits set forth in sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of that agreement.

"For purposes of enforcement of the rights, privileges, or benefits provided by any agreement entered into hereunder, any person claiming the same shall be entitled to the remedies provided under the National Labor Relations Act for employees covered by such Act, and the National Labor Relations Board and the courts of the United States for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction and power to enforce such rights, privileges, and benefits in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of enforcement of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

"(h) Employees of the Agency shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be subject to the following laws and parts of laws:

"(1) The Act entitled 'An Act to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain employments in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved May 17, 1928 (45 Stat. 600).

"(2) Title XV of the Social Security Act, 68 Stat. 1130, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 1961.

"(3) Section 9 of Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, and related statutes affecting the reemployment rights of persons entering the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(4) Section 6 of the Act approved May 10, 1916 (39 Stat. 66, 120), as amended, relating to double salaries.

"(5) Section 212 of the Act approved June 20, 1932 (47 Stat. 406), as amended, relating to the retired pay of members of the Armed Forces.

"(6) The second sentence of section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended, relating to dual employment.

"(7) Section 29 of the Act approved August 10, 1956 (70A Stat. 632), as amended (5 U.S.C. 30r. (a)). *Provided, however,* that the provisions of this subsection shall not be construed to mean that employees of the Agency are subject to any other statutory provision applicable to employees under the Federal civil service system or the municipal government of the District of Columbia personnel system.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such employees of the Agency shall not be subject to the following laws:

"(1) The Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883 (22 Stat. 403), as amended.

"(2) The Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 736), as amended.

"(3) The Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 708), as amended.

"(4) The Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), as amended.

"(5) The Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 954), as amended.

"(6) The Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 295), as amended.

"(7) The Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 679), as amended.

"(8) The Act entitled 'An Act to provide certain employee benefits for employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes,' approved September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1105), as amended.

"(9) The Performance Rating Act of 1950, approved September 30, 1950 (68 Stat. 1098).

"(10) The Veterans Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387), as amended.

"(11) The Federal Employees' Compensation Act of 1916 (39 Stat. 742).

"(i) The insurance program established by title III of the Social Security Act is hereby extended to service performed in the employ of the National Capital Transportation Agency and such service shall be deemed to constitute 'employment' as that term is defined in section 210(a) of such Act and section 3121(b) of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

"(j) Except as clearly inconsistent with its context, the term 'employee' as used in this title means any person employed by the Agency in connection with the operation of transportation services and facilities. Said term does not include the present employees of the Agency, nor shall it include such other employees as may from time to time be appointed by the Agency, for purposes other than the operation of transportation services and facilities. With respect to such existing and additional employees, the provisions of sections 205(a)(10) and 205(a)(11) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 and of all other presently applicable statutes and regulations, shall remain in effect. Prior to commencement of any transportation service or operations by the Agency, including any successor agency, corporation, or other organization, there shall be established a personnel system independent of the Federal civil service system and the personnel system governing employment in the municipal government of the District of Columbia. Such personnel system shall cover all of the employees of the Agency, or of any successor agency, corporation, or other organization; shall incorporate the principles and substance of the labor relations policy contained in this title, and shall be made effective prior to the employment of any employees pursuant to this Act."

Mr. MULTER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, may I first attempt to very briefly answer the last question which was propounded, but which went unanswered because the gentleman's time expired.

There is nothing in the act or in the bill that calls for any allocation, percentagewise. The percentages we have been talking about are the percentage contribution of 5 percent by the District government and a 35-percent grant by the Federal Government and a 65-percent guarantee by the U.S. Treasury which are found only in the report. If you are going to follow the act, the Congress when it comes to appropriating may appropriate every last dollar that is needed for this project and ignore every word about percentages.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment that I have just offered, this is the labor provision amendment. Very frankly I say to you, this was prepared for me by the labor unions of the District of Columbia and is supported by them and by the AFL-CIO. It is the same amendment which was submitted to the subcommittee and then to the full committee, but rejected by both of them.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will preserve for the workers of the District of Columbia as well as for union members the right to bargain but not to strike. It will preserve for them the right to bargain as to wages, fringe benefits, and all of the other things that a worker should be entitled to bargain for. It contains this further provision that in any dispute—and I emphasize "any dispute"—the matter must be submitted to arbitration and the determination of the arbitrators is final and binding on all concerned.

Mr. Chairman, this is a little unusual, but this is what the unions are willing to take, and I think it is the least we ought to give to them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize also that while this goes to the operation of the system once it is built—and the argument then might apply, "Let us wait until it is built," and under the existing act we will then make labor policy—it also goes to what will happen the day after this bill is enacted into law. It will apply to anybody and everybody who is working in connection with the construction of this system.

Mr. Chairman, the Davis-Bacon Act does not protect the workers, except to give them a prevailing wage rate. Now, what the prevailing wage rate may be in the District of Columbia when you come to building a subway, I do not know. I doubt whether anyone else knows. But it is important that in addition to giving them the prevailing wage rate, we guarantee to them the fringe benefits and also the right to go in and bargain and present their grievances and obtain whatever remedy they may be entitled to.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. On this compulsory arbitration matter, why would this not be a precedent for other industries or other parts of the transportation industry that the whole contract shall be subject to compulsory arbitration?

Mr. MULTER. I would rather not get into the question of whether or not this is precedent or bad precedent or good precedent. We are dealing with a peculiar situation in the District of Columbia. The people in the District of Columbia are workers represented by union representatives, both locally and nationally, and they say this is a good amendment and they would like to have it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield further, what unions approve this amendment?

Mr. MULTER. The transit workers' unions, the AFL-CIO, and the various subsidiaries of the AFL-CIO who are dealing with transit problems or have contracts with transit companies in the District of Columbia.

This also covers construction workers and the unions which represent them in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand that in this amendment of the gentleman from New York the gentleman provides for compulsory arbitration?

Mr. MULTER. I do not want to quibble about words. This provision, if enacted, requires that both sides, if they cannot agree after negotiating in good faith—if they cannot agree—that they must submit to arbitration. Each side appoints their arbitrators and they then must hear both sides and their determination is binding on both sides, and that is what the unions recommend for this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, is not that compulsory arbitration?

Mr. MULTER. I suppose it is.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that in discussing this amendment here today that it need be said that we are speaking for or against labor or for or against unions. I do not believe it is necessary to consider the prolabor amendment or prounion amendment to this legislation at this time.

In the act that created the National Capital Transportation Agency, it specifically provides that no system will be created or put into operation until the Congress itself establishes a policy insofar as labor is concerned. This bill here today merely authorizes the construction of a subway but does not put the system into operation.

The gentleman's amendment is much longer than the language of the bill itself. The gentleman asked unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read. This is a far-reaching amendment that the gentleman has offered. It was not offered or discussed fully in the committee. The gentleman brought up the subject of arbitration or labor agreement but did not have an amendment before the committee. Therefore it was not properly discussed or considered by the committee.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I want to make the statement that instead of reading the amendment I was asked to have it considered read and to explain it. I explained the amendment paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The operators will have to take a proper course in this matter. They can come back and get legislation providing for proper protection of labor. This matter was not particularly discussed in the committee. I think the amendment is too far reaching to be considered in the

closing hours of the debate when the House did not have the benefit of hearing the language of the amendment.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the gentleman if there is anything in the existing bill that will protect people who are put out of work under the amendment? I believe the amendment does take care of this.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It provides for the Agency.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It provides for protection of the people?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Insofar as organizing is concerned.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not mean that. Suppose the building of the subway displaces people in the present system, what rights do those people have?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The same as they would have under the Highway Act, and the Urban Renewal Act. There is provision for removal of those people the same as in other acts.

I have just learned this amendment is 15 pages long. If for no other reason it should be rejected for that reason alone.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and I concur in what has been said by my colleagues on the committee in support of the bill. I feel, however, that it is most important to perfect the bill by adopting the pending amendment.

As the gentleman from New York explained to us, this amendment—and I want to make this perfectly clear—has been endorsed by the interested labor organizations.

In addition to that, I understand there has been some question about the application of the Davis-Bacon Act. There has been some confusion on this question. I have been informed by my colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] that the Davis-Bacon Act does apply in connection with any expenditure of Federal funds.

I also want to say something about this type of labor provision for those who have doubts. In the State of California we have legislation dealing with this subject as they have in other States. I cite chapter 1056, California Statutes, 1957.

Here we have similar but not identical labor provisions in every rapid transit act which has been passed since 1957 by the State Legislature of California. There are labor provisions, in the rapid transit field, applying to the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, the Alameda Countra Costa Transit System, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority, and so forth. So what we are doing here is acting in an area that requires attention.

This amendment would merely provide protection for work rights which employees of Washington's transportation system have already earned—standard protection for seniority and pensions, for the right to organize and bargain collectively, and machinery for the settlement of disputes.

The majority of the committee in reporting this otherwise meritorious legislation have argued that provision for these rights can be taken care of after the system is ready to operate. This clearly begs the question. The time to provide these important work safeguards is now when all other general provisions are being considered. Indeed, as the report indicates, under existing law, Congress is required to act in this field—section 205(a)(2) of the 1960 National Capital Transportation Act.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN of New York. When the gentleman spoke of California rapid transit systems, was he speaking of private systems or public systems?

Mr. COHELAN. These are public systems.

Mr. RYAN of New York. If the gentleman will yield further, under the theory of the amendment which has been previously adopted, the proposed system, if this bill is passed, may be a private system. Is the gentleman advocating compulsory arbitration of labor disputes between employees and management of a private system?

Mr. COHELAN. I do not want to get into that part of the bill because I think that probably can be worked out. I indicated to my good friend and colleague, with whom I have worked so closely on so many occasions, that so far as the private part of this is concerned, I think this is not going to help this bill. This bill is badly needed. I am talking solely about the labor provisions of the bill. I think the committee chairman, with whom I have differed on many other occasions on the District Committee, should be warmly commended for doing an excellent job. I want you to know as a member of the committee that I have reviewed the hearings very carefully. He has done a fine job and should be publicly commended for it. But I do believe at the same time that he erred in not dealing with the labor provisions, and I believe this House at this time, in this Committee, should adopt the pending amendment which deals with this important subject.

Mr. MULTER. If the gentleman will yield, the very arbitration provisions in this amendment are also in the contract between D.C. Transit and the city.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have heretofore given my views on the presentation of this amendment when we were discussing the bill in general debate. I merely state to my colleagues in the House that this amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] consists of 14 typewritten pages. I daresay there are not over four Members of this body who have read it. I would, therefore, say that it seems to me no one should expect you as Members of a deliberative legislative body to vote in the dark on a matter offered in this manner.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is a very simple solution to this transportation problem in the District of Columbia. Everyone knows that in the past 30 years Federal employees have flocked into the District of Columbia and adjacent areas by the hundreds and hundreds of thousands, which has caused this transportation problem, the one that now exists, and is being debated here today, pro and con.

This problem could be solved and should be solved by the decentralization of the U.S. Government out of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, by reducing the number of Federal employees here in the District of Columbia by not less than 50,000 the need for even this proposed first bite of $406 million or any part thereof would be completely eliminated.

I would suggest that this bill be recommitted to the committee and this House henceforth do the thing that we should do and that is—bring about a decentralization of these Government boards and by so doing we will solve a lot of problems including the problem of these great and unnecessary expenditures that are being carried on today and have been for a number of years.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Would not my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, agree with me that a very good place to start this would be to locate the environmental health center down in North Carolina's research triangle where free land has been offered to the Government?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes, 61, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT BY MR. O'HARA OF ILLINOIS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: Amend section 1 by adding following the word "Capitol" and the period thereafter on line 20, page 2, the following:

"*Provided further*, That no land on which a residential structure is standing and presently occupied shall be acquired by condemnation, purchase or otherwise for the purpose of this Section until prior provision has been made for the relocation of individuals and families whether tenants or owners dislocated from their homes by reason of such acquisition of land for the construction of the rail rapid transit and commuters lines as contemplated."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is in the field of local transportation to which I gave 10 years of my life. That was during the period when local transportation in Chicago had gone bankrupt and we had to reorganize our local transportation system. We started a program after the reorganization of building the subways and the superhighways. We had many problems. One of those problems we

met in this way—whenever we condemned property, and we condemned many properties, and there were many homes and many people put out from the protection of a roof over their heads, never did we acquire a property and start the work of wreckage until we had provided a new home for the displaced tenants.

There was not one case. Thousands of families were uprooted, but not a family was left without a new home. It is because of that that I suggest we put in, in the acquiring of a plot of land for this public improvement that where we take a plot of land that is occupied by a resident, before it is taken over we be sure we have made provision for the dislocated tenants in a new home. That is my simple amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Not that I am lacking in sympathy with his thoughts, but section 3 of the bill, on page 3, has a very extensive relocation provision which we gave particular attention to, and I think it is adequate. As I understand the gentleman's amendment—and I am not being facetious—he has offered an amendment to the committee amendment. It would appear to me the only area affected by his amendment would be the Capitol Grounds. I do not believe there are many residents on the Capitol Grounds. Our relocation provision, section 3, we think is fair and in line with the Public Roads Act. Therefore, we believe this amendment should be defeated.

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

Mr. WHITENER. Yes; I will.

Mr. GROSS. I have been sitting here all afternoon looking at this longer segment of this proposed transit system. I see this segment to which I refer runs to Bowie, Md. I have never been out to Bowie, Md., but I wonder why this longer segment goes there. If the gentleman will bear with me, I do understand there are some ponies out at Bowie, and I just wondered if you have to have a special system to get people out there to beat the ponies.

Mr. WHITENER. I might say to the gentleman that not only are there ponies at Bowie, but there are some iron horses that have been running out there for many years, which are required to fix tracks owned by the Pennsylvania Railroad, which this agency can use under a contractual arrangement and not require any capital investment in tracks. We are just sorry that there were not more available fixed tracks running in other towns in the area. Maybe even Laurel or some of these other places like Charlestown, W. Va., and others. But this just happens to be the biggest bargain in the whole package—the Bowie run. I might say that the agency will have a daily double each day.

Mr. GROSS. That takes care of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8929) to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that that amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on 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.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'KONSKI moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 8929, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 76, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—278

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Bray | Curtis |
| Abele | Brock | Daddario |
| Abernethy | Bromwell | Daniels |
| Adair | Broomfield | Delaney |
| Addabbo | Brotzman | Dent |
| Alger | Brown, Ohio | Denton |
| Anderson | Broyhill, N.C. | Derwinski |
| Andrews, Ala. | Bruce | Devine |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Burke | Dole |
| | Burleson | Donohue |
| Arends | Byrne, Pa. | Dorn |
| Ashbrook | Byrnes, Wis. | Dowdy |
| Ashley | Cahill | Downing |
| Ashmore | Cameron | Dulski |
| Avery | Cannon | Dwyer |
| Baker | Carey | Ellsworth |
| Baldwin | Casey | Evins |
| Baring | Cederberg | Fallon |
| Barrett | Celler | Farbstein |
| Barry | Chamberlain | Feighan |
| Bass | Chelf | Findley |
| Bates | Chenoweth | Finnegan |
| Battin | Clancy | Fino |
| Becker | Clark | Fisher |
| Beckworth | Clausen, Don H. | Flood |
| Beermann | Cleveland | Flynt |
| Belcher | Collier | Fogarty |
| Bennett, Fla. | Colmer | Ford |
| Bennett, Mich. | Corbett | Foreman |
| Berry | Cramer | Fountain |
| Boland | Cunningham | Frelinghuysen |
| Bonner | Curtin | Friedel |
| Bow | | Fulton, Pa. |
| Fuqua | Lankford | Rich |
| Gallagher | Latta | Riehlman |
| Garmatz | Lennon | Roberts, Tex. |
| Gary | Lesinski | Robison |
| Gathings | Libonati | Rodino |
| Giaimo | Lipscomb | Rogers, Fla. |
| Gilbert | Lloyd | Rogers, Tex. |
| Glenn | Long, Md. | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Grabowski | McCulloch | Roosevelt |
| Gray | McDade | Rosenthal |
| Green, Oreg. | McIntire | Rostenkowski |
| Griffin | McLoskey | Roudebush |
| Gross | Madden | Roush |
| Grover | Mahon | Rumsfeld |
| Gubser | Marsh | Ryan, Mich. |
| Haley | Martin, Calif. | Saylor |
| Hall | Martin, Nebr. | Schadeberg |
| Halleck | May | Schwengel |
| Halpern | Meader | Scott |
| Harding | Miller, N.Y. | Secrest |
| Hardy | Mills | Selden |
| Harris | Minish | Shipley |
| Harrison | Monagan | Short |
| Harsha | Montoya | Sickles |
| Harvey, Ind. | Moore | Siler |
| Healey | Morgan | Skubitz |
| Herlong | Morris | Slack |
| Hoeven | Multer | Smith, Calif. |
| Hoffman | Murphy, Ill. | Smith, Va. |
| Holifield | Murphy, N.Y. | Snyder |
| Holland | Murray | Springer |
| Horan | Natcher | Stafford |
| Hosmer | Nedzi | Staggers |
| Huddleston | Norblad | Stratton |
| Hull | O'Brien, N.Y. | Talcott |
| Hutchinson | O'Hara, Ill. | Taylor |
| Ichord | O'Konski | Teague, Tex. |
| Jennings | Olsen, Mont. | Thomas |
| Jensen | O'Neill | Thomson, Wis. |
| Joelson | Osmers | Toll |
| Johansen | Ostertag | Tollefson |
| Johnson, Calif. | Passman | Tuck |
| Johnson, Pa. | Patman | Tuten |
| Johnson, Wis. | Patten | Ullman |
| Jonas | Pelly | Vanik |
| Jones, Mo. | Pepper | Van Pelt |
| Karsten | Perkins | Waggonner |
| Kastenmeier | Philbin | Wallhauser |
| Keith | Pike | Watson |
| Kilburn | Pillion | Watts |
| Kilgore | Pirnie | Weaver |
| King, Calif. | Poff | Westland |
| King, N.Y. | Pool | Whalley |
| Kirwan | Powell | Wharton |
| Kluczynski | Price | Wilson, Ind. |
| Knox | Pucinski | Winstead |
| Kornegay | Quillen | Wydler |
| Kunkel | Randall | Wyman |
| Kyl | Reid, Ill. | Younger |
| Laird | Reifel | |
| Langen | Rhodes, Pa. | |

NAYS—76

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Albert | Hawkins | Purcell |
| Aspinall | Hays | Rains |
| Bell | Hechler | Reuss |
| Betts | Henderson | Rivers, Alaska |
| Boggs | Horton | Rogers, Colo. |
| Bolton, Frances P. | Jones, Ala. | Ryan, N.Y. |
| | Karth | St. Onge |
| Brademas | Landrum | Schenck |
| Brooks | Lindsay | Schneebeli |
| Broyhill, Va. | McClory | Schweiker |
| Burkhalter | McFall | Sisk |
| Cohelan | McMillan | Smith, Iowa |
| Conte | MacGregor | Sullivan |
| Dague | Mathias | Taft |
| Diggs | Matsunaga | Teague, Calif. |
| Edmondson | Matthews | Thornberry |
| Elliott | Miller, Calif. | Tupper |
| Fascell | Moorhead | Udall |
| Fraser | Morse | Van Deerlin |
| Gibbons | Morton | Weltner |
| Gonzalez | Mosher | Whitener |
| Goodell | Moss | Widnall |
| Goodling | Nelsen | Williams |
| Griffiths | Olson, Minn. | Young |
| Hagan, Ga. | Pilcher | Zablocki |
| Hagen, Calif. | Poage | |

NOT VOTING—80

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Auchincloss | Dingell | Kee |
| Ayres | Duncan | Kelly |
| Blatnik | Edwards | Keogh |
| Bolling | Everett | Leggett |
| Bolton, Oliver P. | Forrester | Long, La. |
| | Fulton, Tenn. | McDowell |
| Brown, Calif. | Gill | Macdonald |
| Buckley | Grant | Mailliard |
| Burton | Green, Pa. | Martin, Mass. |
| Clawson, Del | Gurney | Michel |
| Cooley | Hanna | Milliken |
| Corman | Hansen | Minshall |
| Davis, Ga. | Harvey, Mich. | Morrison |
| Davis, Tenn. | Hébert | Nix |
| Dawson | Hemphill | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Derounian | Jarman | O'Hara, Mich. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Quie | Shriver | Utt |
| Reid, N.Y. | Sibal | Vinson |
| Rhodes, Ariz. | Sikes | White |
| Rivers, S.C. | Staebler | Whitten |
| Roberts, Ala. | Steed | Wickersham |
| Rooney, Pa. | Stephens | Willis |
| Roybal | Stinson | Wilson, Bob |
| St. George | Stubblefield | Wilson, Charles H. |
| St Germain | Thompson, La. | Wright |
| Senner | Thompson, N.J. | |
| Shelley | Trimble | |
| Sheppard | Thompson, Tex. | |

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hemphill against.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Reid of New York for, with Mrs. Hansen against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Duncan against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Edwards against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Forrester against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Nix with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Sibol.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Clawson.

Mr. Dingell with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Stinson.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Quie.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Michel.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Burton.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Gill with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. White with Mr. Wright.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Staebler with Mr. Senner.

Mr. BURKHALTER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PASSMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## PROVIDING OFFICE SPACE, AND SO FORTH, FOR MRS. JACQUELINE KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9291) to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That all mail matter sent by post by Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, under her written autograph signature or facsimile thereof, shall be conveyed within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, free of postage during her natural life.

"SEC. 2. For a period of twelve months following the enactment of this statute, the Administrator of General Services shall furnish to Mrs. Kennedy suitable office space appropriately furnished, supplied and equipped as determined by the Administrator, at such place within the United States as Mrs. Kennedy shall specify. The supplies to be furnished shall include a sufficient quantity of envelopes marked "Postage and Fees Paid" to be used for international mail. For the same period the Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, provide for an office staff for Mrs. Kennedy. Persons employed under this section shall be selected by Mrs. Kennedy and shall be responsible only to her for the performance of their duties. Mrs. Kennedy shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for her under this section which in the aggregate shall not exceed $50,000 during such period. The rate of compensation payable to any such person shall not exceed the maximum aggregate rate of compensation payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator. Each individual appointed under this section to a position on the office staff of Mrs. Kennedy shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the United States Secret Service, is authorized to protect the person of Mrs. Kennedy and her minor children for such period of time following the enactment of this Act as she may request.

"SEC. 4. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this Act and to pay not to exceed $5,000 toward the expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, including undertakers' charges and the expenses of transportation, the sum of $55,000 to remain available until June 30, 1965: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made from this appropriation to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services. Appropriations now or hereafter available to the United States Secret Service shall be available for the purposes of section 3 of this Act."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ALBERT moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in the Senate amendment insert the following: "That all mail matter sent by post by Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, under her written autograph signature or facsimile thereof, shall be conveyed within the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico free of postage during her natural life. The postal revenues shall be reimbursed each fiscal year, out of the general funds of the Treasury, in an amount equivalent to the postage which otherwise would be payable on such mail matter.

"SEC. 2. For a period of twelve months following the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall furnish to Mrs. Kennedy suitable office space appropriately furnished, supplied, and equipped, as determined by the Administrator, at such place within the United States as Mrs. Kennedy shall specify. The supplies to be furnished shall include a sufficient quantity of envelopes marked 'Postage and Fees Paid' to be used for international mail. For the same period, the Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, provide for an office staff for Mrs. Kennedy. Persons employed under this section shall be selected by Mrs. Kennedy and shall be responsible only to her for the performance of their duties. Mrs. Kennedy shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for her under this section. Such compensation, in the aggregate, shall not exceed $50,000 during such period. The rate of compensation payable to any such person shall not exceed the maximum aggregate rate of compensation payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator. Each person employed under this section in a position on the office staff of Mrs. Kennedy shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, but shall not be held or considered to be an officer or employee of such Government for any other purpose.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the United States Secret Service, is authorized to protect the person of Mrs. Kennedy and her minor children for such period of time, not in excess of two years, immediately following the enactment of this Act as she may request.

"SEC. 4. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this Act and to pay not to exceed $15,000 toward the expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, including undertakers' charges and the expenses of transportation, the sum of $65,000, to remain available until June 30, 1965. No payment shall be made from this appropriation to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services. Appropriations now or hereafter available to the United States Secret Service shall be available for the purposes of section 3 of this Act."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition in support of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when the original version of this bill was before the House 1 week ago today I raised some questions in connection with it. I pointed to language that was defective, completely unworkable language. The bill, however, was passed by the House and sent to the

other body. I regret to say that the other body did not remedy all of the defective language. Members should know that the House has before it today an almost completely rewritten bill. I am pleased to say that apparently the language now makes the legislation workable.

A week ago today I stated my regret that the legislation had not been considered by the committee to which it was supposed to be referred. At that time I stated that I had no objection to paying all proper expenses in connection with the death of the late President Kennedy and in making proper provision for his widow and family.

Had this legislation been properly handled in its inception it would not have been necessary to consider it twice in the House and twice in the Senate.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an explanation of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment will amend H.R. 9291 by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting a new text.

The first section of the amendment adds a sentence providing reimbursement of postal revenues for franked mail authorized by the section, in order to correct an omission from the bill as passed by the House and the Senate. This is a technical amendment.

Section 2 of the amendment provides a 12-month period during which the widow of the late President Kennedy will be furnished office space, equipment, and staff, in lieu of the 6-month period provided in the House-passed bill. The amendment retains the limitation of $50,000 on aggregate staff salaries as passed by both Houses, but adds a clause at the end of the section spelling out that no person employed on such staff shall be considered an officer or employee of the Government, except as to civil service retirement, disability compensation, and Government life insurance coverage. This clause is a clarifying amendment.

Section 3 of the amendment authorizes Secret Service protection for the widow and minor children for not over 2 years after enactment, in lieu of the 1-year limitation contained in the House-passed bill and the omission of any limitation in the Senate-passed bill.

Section 4 of the amendment appropriates $65,000 to carry out the purposes of the act, of which not in excess of $15,000 may be applied to expenses incident to the death and burial of former President Kennedy; prohibits any payment from such appropriation to any Government officer or employee for personal or professional service; and makes regular appropriations of the U.S. Secret Service available for protection of the widow and minor children under section 3. The $15,000 maximum for funeral expenses replaces the $5,000 provided in the Senate-passed bill.

Advice from the administration is to the effect that an appropriation is needed, rather than an authorization, because of the urgent necessity for immediate facilities to dispose of the heavy volume of correspondence and other business which will be the widow's responsibility.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further 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. 9140. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

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. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## ADDITION TO PROGRAM FOR THIS WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time because the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS], has advised that the committee hopes to bring up under unanimous consent at a later day in this week Senate Concurrent Resolution 19.

I should advise Members also that the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill probably will be called up tomorrow.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma explain to the Members of the House whether this is a Senate joint resolution or a concurrent resolution and with what it deals?

Mr. ALBERT. It is a Senate concurrent resolution dealing with the labeling of "Bourbon whisky" as a distinctive product of the United States.

Mr. AVERY. I see. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

## CIVIL RIGHTS PETITION

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to see my colleagues in this great institution form this long line to desperately and hastily sign this civil rights petition. This, to me, is indeed a sad day in the history of this House. In my 15 years here, I have never before witnessed such frantic efforts to discharge a great committee of revered and respected men. This is simply another of these recurring attacks on the Rules Committee headed by that great American and distinguished lawyer, HOWARD W. SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, this is a period of national mourning. It is a time when our thoughts should be on the Prince of Peace. This should be a time of reflection, meditation, and brotherly understanding. It is my earnest hope that a majority of the Members of this House will refrain from signing this petition. This is no time to arouse hatred and passion which may again erupt into unlawful demonstrations and violence in the streets of the Nation. This is not the time for strife and bitterness. If ever our Nation needed a rest period from agitation, it is now. We can be peacemakers and promote harmony and tranquility in our land by rejecting through this Christmas season any consideration of this ill-timed effort to stampede this bill through the House. The far-reaching effects of this bill on the lives of the American people is little known and little understood. We should have complete hearings before the Rules Committee and extended debate on this floor. Our greatest lawyers are alarmed and in doubt about some of its provisions. It needs study and clarification.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has set aside December 15 as Bill of Rights Day. The very foundation stone of our private enterprise system is the property rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. The difference between our great American civilization and that atheistic order which would destroy us is the right of ownership of property. To be free in our homes and businesses from unwarranted search and seizure. This so-called civil rights bill will curb property rights, individual liberty, and our free enterprise system—that great system which provides for the American workingman the highest standard of living in history.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly plead with my colleagues not to sign this petition. If this legislation must be considered by this House, then we should do so next year in a calm, cool, cautious atmosphere of true deliberation, becoming the greatest representative body in the world.

## SOME RESTIVE QUESTIONS ABOUT A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, practically all the data have been assembled on the fifth Captive Nations Week observance held last July. Since that month I, along with the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI and other colleagues, have furnished overwhelming evidence showing the keen and deep interest of our people across the country in the captive nations and the necessary creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. There can be no question that even the material appended at the conclusion of my remarks in itself establishes the fact that the fifth observance was the greatest and most impressive one yet.

SOME RESTIVE QUESTIONS

As this interest in the captive nations deepens and expands, uncounted Americans are asking themselves some restive questions about the apparent pigeonholing of our measure to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Their well-grounded conviction that the captive nations in toto are both a noble end of world freedom and also a powerful means for the security of the free world causes them to ask: "Why this dragging of feet on a subject that has not yet been fully explored and is so vital to our own security in the cold war?" Is it perhaps because Khrushchev would be displeased by such an exploration of the subject?

But, Mr. Speaker, there are many other questions that deserve honest answers. Permit me to enumerate them as they are constantly being posed to our Members:

First: How is it that 40 resolutions for a special committee are before the Rules Committee and they have been ignored entirely in this Congress?

This is a fair question which deserves an honest answer.

Second:

Isn't it rather mystifying that almost a majority of the Rules members have expressed their written support of the measure and several others orally, which makes up a majority, and yet the measure hasn't been brought up for a vote?

This, too, is a fair question that deserves an honest answer.

Third:

In August 1961, Secretary Rusk offered the Berlin crisis as his excuse for opposing the formation of a special committee at that time. What crisis prevents it now?

Here, too, a fair question deserving of an honest answer.

Fourth:

Isn't the complete inactivity of the Subcommittee on Captive Nations, which was set up in the Foreign Affairs Committee in 1962 as a fourth deflecting maneuver, evidence enough of the need for a special committee?

Also, a fair question demanding an honest answer.

Fifth:

In the face of broad, popular support for a special committee, as evidenced by nearly 3 years of accumulated letters from all sections of the country and the ever-increasing annual Captive Nations Week observances, who or what is preventing this first implementation of the Congressional Captive Nations Week resolution?

Still another fair question seeking an honest answer.

MORE EVIDENCE

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the pressing questions being asked of us. We can answer all of them swiftly and satisfactorily by creating now a Special Committee on the Captive Nations regardless of how Khrushchev and those few Americans who fear his displeasure may feel. There are areas of facts, truths, and data to explore in behalf of our own national security and action for the future. Only the concentrated efforts of a special committee can make this possible.

In the meantime, until we receive satisfactory answers to these questions, until we establish this necessary special committee, the full evidence of America's mounting dedication to the freedom of all the captive nations shall be offered to reconfirm the complete validity and soundness of the 40 resolutions now in the Rules Committee and to reflect the grave error and narrowness of outlook of the few who have been opposing the formation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

I, therefore, include in further support of our measure the following items at this point of my remarks:

First. An authoritative editorial on "The Five Presidential Proclamations of Captive Nations Week" which appeared in the summer issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly;

Second. An incomplete list of nationwide press items on the fifth Captive Nations Week; and,

Third. Additional examples of captive nations resolutions unanimously passed at rallies in Boston and Los Angeles.

[From the Ukrainian Quarterly]

THE FIVE PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATIONS OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The fifth obeservance of Captive Nations Week, held across the Nation in the week of July 14–20, 1963, was the most successful yet. In fact, by virtue of its results, the fifth observance represents a significant turning point in the rapid development of this American institution. For despite the fanfare surrounding the Chinese-Russian imperialist rift, the limited nuclear test ban treaty, and premature talk about a nonaggression treaty between the Warsaw Pact members and NATO, the 1963 Captive Nations Week evoked more interest on the part of our citizens and officials than ever before. The high plateau of interest attained in 1963 provides a solid basis for resounding Captive Nations Week action in 1964—a presidential year and the fifth anniversary of Captive Nations Week (July 12–18, 1964).

It isn't possible here to describe all the events and activities of the fifth observance. Most of them appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD issues of July and August 1963. Nevertheless, a fair view of the scope and depth of the annual observance can be formed on the basis of the following highlights. In addition to the President, Governors of over half the States and mayors of three dozen major cities in the country formally proclaimed the week. Internationally, the Republic of China observed the week with festivities conducted from one end of Taiwan to the other. In Turkey, Senator Fetki Tevetoglu submitted a resolution in the Turkish Senate for a similar observance. In time, there is no question that other countries will formally observe the week.

Marked by various activities and ceremonies, the week was observed in the United States in every section of the country. Concord, Boston, Hartford, New York, Rochester, Syracuse, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Tampa, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Indianapolis, San Francisco were only a few of the centers staging the observance. On radio and TV, particularly in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Washington, the week and its meanings were discussed over various stations, for example, the 285, in the Georgetown University Forum network, WPIT in Pittsburgh, WCAU in Philadelphia, WTOP in Washington and so forth.

In news and editorial coverage the 1963 week surpassed all previous ones. Before, during, and after the observance accounts appeared in such papers as the Manchester Union Leader, the New York Times, New York Daily News, New York Herald Tribune, New York Journal American, New York Post, Philadelphia Inquirer, Washington Post, Chicago Tribune, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Miami Herald, Indianapolis News, the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Dallas Times-Herald and scores of others. The National Catholic Welfare Conference press gave full coverage to the week, and papers such as the West Virginia Register, the Tablet of Brooklyn, N.Y., the Washington Standard and numerous others carried many interesting reports.

The UPI story by Neil Martin and the syndicated columns by John Chamberlain, Robert S. Boyd, Victor Lasky, Roscoe Drummond, Edith Kermit Roosevelt, and others constructively directed public attention to the week. Drummond, for example, in his column dealing with the change of atmosphere in Moscow, pointed this out: "All this makes it the more welcome and timely that President Kennedy just issued his proclamation calling for observance of Captive Nations Week as provided by a congressional resolution. It was a similar proclamation by President Eisenhower in 1959, upholding the 'just aspiration' of the peoples of Eastern Europe to recover their freedom, that caused Premier Khrushchev to turn with such fury on Vice President Nixon in the famous 'kitchen debate.'"[1]

THE ANNUAL TOTALITARIAN SQUEAL

Since 1959, Moscow and its partners in totalitarian crime have harshly denounced the resolution and the week. The fifth observance was no exception to this. In fact, early in the year a Soviet Russian weekly showed concern about the fifth observance and asked, "Is it not high time to discontinue the Captive Nations Week in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the 'Hungarian Question'."[2]

Reacting immediately to the President's proclamation of July 5, Moscow added a new twist to its attack. An article in Pravda asserts, "The President of the United States, losing his sense of reality, has declared a 'Week of Captive Nations' and is trying to turn attention away from the struggle of the Negroes for their liberation."[3] While Harriman was preparing for his trip to Moscow, the Russian imperio-colonialists hitched the week onto the race issue and stated that "racism is an inseparable part of the contemporary American system," in which they

[1] Drummond, Roscoe. "When Khrushchev Smiles," New York Herald Tribune, July 10, 1963.

[2] The New York Times, Moscow, Jan. 23, 1963.

[3] Pravda, Moscow, July 8, 1963.

also see the "closest interconnection between racism and fascism." [4]

On the first day of the 1963 week, Izvestia ran a lengthy editorial deriding the annual observance. Here are a few spicy excerpts. The week "is a propagandistic trick of the American enemies of the freedom and independence of nations." In another paragraph it says, "We well know that it is American imperialism itself which is at present the basic supporter of the decaying colonial system, which is a world gendarme. While Washington propaganda is filling the air with words about freedom, 'realists' of that very country are waving bombs and shuffling dollars in order to strangle that freedom." Now the new twist again, "When President Kennedy proclaimed Captive Nations Week, we celebrated our own week, beginning it by the publication of an article of the Negro writer James Baldwin which spoke of the tragedy of American Negroes." [5]

In this fraudulent parallel Moscow went even so far as to present over Radio Moscow supposed American Negroes who claimed that the only captive nation in the world is the "Negro nation" in the United States. It broadcasted this theme night after night at the beginning of our observance. Apparently, Moscow's own arguments of the past do not seem impressive to itself now. In desperation it has sunk to this ludicrous level of trying to confuse issues of national independence and freedom with those of internal civil liberties; indeed, to the level of de-Americanizing the American Negro.

Elsewhere in the Red jungle similar rantings against the 1963 week were heard. For example, in North Korea, which is in Peiping's "ideological" camp, the President was smeared as a "third-class clown" for proclaiming the week. Pyongyang radio aired broadcasts to this effect and quoted the newspaper Rodong Shinmoon as calling Captive Nations Week "a despicable annual campaign of the U.S. ruling circles." [6]

SPIRITED CONGRESSIONAL PARTICIPATION

Now, the exceptional aspect of the fifth observance was the deep interest shown in it by Congress. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 2 weeks of July 15–26 is replete with addresses and statements on the event. More, nearly 3 dozen Congressmen and Senators joined the National Captive Nations *Committee as honorary* members soon after the week had been completed.

The congressional observance of the week was, to be sure, impressive in every respect. However, what concerned many legislators was the toned-down character of the President's proclamation, which significantly was the earliest issued on record—on July 5, a week before the start of the observance. This was not the first time that criticism was registered against the President's proclamations. In both 1961 and 1962 the White House was chided for weak proclamations. As one publication put it, "For the third year in a row, President Kennedy threw cold water on the hopes of eventual freedom held by peoples behind the iron and bamboo curtains by issuing a Captive Nations Week proclamation which studiously and admittedly evaded reference to communism." [7]

How valid this and other criticisms are, naturally requires a careful reading and analysis of the five Presidential proclamations, not only comparing them with each other but relating all of them to the Captive Nations Week resolution itself. In the judgment of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who authored the resolution and has been chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington since 1959, each of the five has strong points but still falls short of what Congress called for. Too often critics give evidence of not having read the resolution and all the proclamations.

THE FIVE PROCLAMATIONS

Before turning to the proclamations the reader would do well to scan the ordered contents of the Captive Nations Week resolution, which was originally cosponsored by Senators DOUGLAS and JAVITS and later by 17 other Senators. As Senate Joint Resolution 111, it became Public Law 86–90. Briefly, the resolution scared Khrushchev for these major reasons: (1) It was the first time our Government officially recognized the existence of numerous captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union itself; (2) it pointed directly to the source of the threat to world peace, namely, Russia, and Russian imperialism; (3) it also cited the deceptive threat of communism; and (4) the resolution is self-renewing and requests the President "to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." The last is an impediment to Moscow's cold war zigzags, as evidenced by the test ban treaty maneuver.

President Eisenhower's first proclamation on July 17, 1959—2 days before the week—did stress "the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism" and referred to "the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations." However, as related to the resolution, this was somewhat confusing. State Department pressure was exerted to get the President away from any specific reference to Soviet Russia and imperialistic Russian communism. "Soviet communism" and "Soviet-dominated" are terms which conveyed the impression that the captive nations are only those aggressed by the Soviet Union. But what about the greater number of captive nations in the U.S.S.R. itself, and as enumerated in the resolution? This strategem definitely weakened the proclamation.

The second proclamation issued by President Eisenhower on July 18, 1960, was almost a word-for-word replica of 1959. The proclamation was made a day after the week had begun. Since the law is permissive rather than mandatory, it required some prodding to obtain this proclamation, and at that, in a presidential campaign year. To be perfectly objective, the Kennedy record shows no such tardiness in proclaiming the week.

In 1961 President Kennedy issued his first proclamation. Like the Eisenhower proclamations, his skirted not only points 1 and 2 mentioned above, but also any reference to communism; that is, point 3. His whereas clauses were fewer, and on the whole, his proclamation was weaker than the two previous ones. The 1962 proclamation was substantially no different. Both proclamations were issued 2 days before the week commenced.

The President's 1963 proclamation, however, represented a departure from all the preceding ones in two respects. First, it was issued 11 days before the observance began, on July 5. This time span is not much of a measure of Presidential inspiration, but on record it represents a difference, a departure from "established procedure." And, second, the proclamation strikes twice on "the principle of national self-determination" and "the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

Aside from the differences indicated, the five proclamations are based on parts of the congressional resolution. Indeed, their existence is predicated on Public Law 86–90. The Kennedy proclamations have eliminated the confusion created by the two Eisenhower proclamations which contained the Soviet communism and Soviet-dominated phrases. On the other hand, they have needlessly overlooked the weapon of ideological deception inherent in the term "communism" as manipulated by imperialist Moscow. They have failed, too, to bring out the imperialistic aspects of Moscow's aggression, which at least were alluded to in the Eisenhower proclamations. In short, then, all five Presidential proclamations have fallen short of the spirit and content of the resolution.

Is this fact a cause for despair? By no means. The proclamations have hewed close to the line of policy pursued by the State Department. The naive belief that the Russian totalitarians will change their stripes, that evolution will make for a transformed Soviet Russia, and that we must not irritate or provoke the Russian imperio-colonialists runs fundamentally through all these proclamations. Yet, the President, whoever he may be, legally need not issue a proclamation, and if he does, he must bend a bit toward the premisal resolution.

The significant fact is that since the institution of Captive Nations Week both Presidents have annually made their proclamations. This has reinforced the institution itself. Moreover, each year the Russian imperio-colonialists have reacted to the observance in a highly critical way. As the above belief withers away, there can be no doubt that the Presidential proclamations will reflect more poignantly and strikingly the spirit and contents of the resolution itself. This is only a matter of time—time for greater American understanding of Russian cold war maneuvers, time for the development of our own cold war strategy for victory, and time for adequate preparations toward a resounding Captive Nations Week in 1964.

---

COVERAGE PRIOR TO CNW

New York Daily News editorial entitled: "Fine Words in Frankfurt":

"'Unless liberty flourishes in all lands,' said President Kennedy yesterday in an eloquent speech at Frankfurt, West Germany, 'it cannot flourish in one.'

"Mr. Kennedy was building on a remark by the Hungarian statesman F. L. A. Kossuth (1841–1914), and the statement came as close to being true as does the average generalization.

"So how about a loud, forceful and prompt proclamation by the President of Captive Nations Week—July 14–20—of the kind President Eisenhower got out?

"Let's shout again from the White House, so that all the world may hear, for the liberation from Moscow and/or Peiping of Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, Rumania, Tibet, and the Ukraine. And this time—most fittingly—let's add Cuba to the list of captive nations that we hope to see freed some day soon."

New York Herald Tribune (syndicated), editorial entitled: "A Look at Past Record Deflates Summit Hopes":

"Now Mr. Khrushchev has indicated that he will accept a nuclear test ban (excluding underground) if we will get NATO to sign a nonaggression pact with the Eastern European nations and Russia. Well, we could accept such a pact—if the Soviets on their part would agree to free elections in all the captive nations and permit them to have governments by the consent of the governed.

"This could be the time for some real two-way negotiations."

Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin (syndicated), editorial entitled "We Hold These Truths":

"The one sure criterion of the reality of our own commitment to freedom is the agony

---

[4] UPI, "Pravda Raises Red Herring Cry," Washington Post, July 9, 1963.

[5] "The Captive Nations and Peoples," Izvestia, Moscow, July 14, 1963.

[6] UPI, Tokyo, Japan, July 15, 1963.

[7] "No Profile in Courage—J.F.K. Again Shuns Red Captive Nations," Republican Congressional Committee Newsletter, No. 27, Washington, D.C., July 12, 1963.

we feel for those who are under a foreign taskmaster's lash.

"That is why America insists on uncovering the damning truth in Captive Nations Week. It is an accursed spot which will not out that the bandits desire the world to dismiss with, 'Oh, let bygones be bygones,' as, knocking on the door of moral integrity, they now seek the recognition of respectability."

Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, editorial entitled "Captive Nations":

"If the North Atlantic Treaty Organization signs a nonaggression pact with the Warsaw Treaty states, our solicitude for the captive nations will fly out the window.

"Such a pact, demanded by Soviet Premier Khrushchev as the price for a nuclear test ban treaty, would imply acceptance of the regimes in power in the Soviet satellite states. The captive nations would be assigned to permanent captivity.

"* * * Khruhschev has been trying to persuade the United States to abolish Captive Nations Week since 1959. Our answer is that we should continue to observe Captive Nations Week as long the Soviet Union continues to renege on its pledge to hold free elections in the nations it has enslaved."

Boston (Mass.) Pilot, editorial entitled "Love of Liberty":

"For some time past, the Soviets have not been happy with America's preoccupation with oppressed peoples. Now they want to see the abolition of Captive Nations Week because they feel that it is as much a 'dead horse' as the Hungarian question. This opposition to even the call for liberty should help to rededicate our efforts in behalf of the ideas of Captive Nations Week."

Fort Wayne (Ind.) News Sentinel, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Cold War Key":

"FEIGHAN (Ohio Congressman) cited that President Kennedy has repeatedly reaffirmed our Nation's historic commitment to the right of self-determination and governments of their own choice, but that the 'Russian experts' in the State Department 'who hold the dubious distinction of misguiding no less than four national administrations, hold that the Russians are mellowing and given time will evolve out of tyranny into freedom.' FEIGHAN pertinently asks:

" 'Will the policy pronouncements of President Kennedy be put into practice, or will the entrenched bureaucracy of Russian experts in the State Department defeat these policies with their countermeasures which I have described?' "

Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet (syndicated), editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"In short, Captive Nations Week is an excellent way to tell the Communists that we refuse both burials, the fast one a la Mao and the slow one a la Khrushchev; that we shall not compromise our innermost principles; that we intend to preserve peace and insure the victory of freedom."

Williamsport (Pa.) Grit, editorial entitled "Red Captives Big Challenge to Americans":

"Says Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio: 'It is obvious that our national interests and the cause of peace are best served by nurturing the hopes for freedom and national independence among the peoples of the captive nations. Russia is sitting on a volatile human powder keg of several hundred million captive non-Russians.' "

Muncie (Ind.) Star:

"The Star is proud that it has always been—and that it will always be—among the strongest and most persistent American voices raised in defense of freedom and democracy in Soviet enslaved East Europe. For us world freedom has always been indivisible. We take the fight for European freedom as seriously as we would take a fight for American freedom. That's why we shall never approve of any 'deals' with Russia made by any U.S. administration, which would 'recognize' the Soviet conquest of East Europe.

"That's why we shall always oppose all and any tendencies, displayed by any U.S. administration, toward 'cooperating' with the murderous East European, Soviet-controlled Communist regimes."

St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"Thousands and thousands of Americans have relatives living in these occupied lands. Until they are all free, the cold war is not won; and we cannot put down our arms or the same fate will be ours."

San Antonio (Tex.) Express and News editorial entitled "Captive Nations Are Cited Again": "The fact a captive nations proclamation can cause Khrushchev to squirm is sufficient reason to continue the practice. It lets him know we are not forgetting his past misdeeds."

Elyria (Ohio) Chronicle-Telegram editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "There is evidence that Captive Nations Week observance is a 'bone in the throat' of the Communist leaders. The Soviet propaganda weekly, the New Times, asked early this year: 'Is it not high time to discontinue the Captive Nations Week in the United States? This is just as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question.'

"Obviously the Communist leaders want the oppressed people of the captive nations to feel that we are no longer concerned about their fate and are no longer willing to encourage them to hope for eventual freedom from Communist domination."

Los Angeles (Calif.) Tidings editorial entitled "No U.N. Captive Nations Week?": This editorial quoted from an article by Dr. Emil Onaca, president of the American Committee of California for Freedom of Enslaved Nations: "If the U.N. refuses to act immediately by forcing Khrushchev to hold free elections, under international control, in every captive nation, there is no use for its existence and even less for spending hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayers' dollars on it.

"A more reasonable suggestion could scarcely be made in the name of freedom, and yet not the slightest gesture in this direction has been taken by our delegates in the U.N., whereas we continue to suffer the humiliation of Soviet abuses and denunciations at every session of the U.N.

"And we fear it will always be thus so long as we pursue a policy of accommodation with the Soviets. Meanwhile more freemen will fall under the Red yoke."

Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal editorial entitled: "Will 'Captive Nations Week' Hurt Moscow Peace Talks?":

"The Russians, of course, bristle at the very thought of Captive Nations Week. A Soviet Embassy spokesman in Washington refused even to speak the word 'captive'."

Boise (Idaho) Statesman editorial entitled "In Quest of Peace":

"It's been plainly evident for a long time that peace of a sort can be obtained anytime we're ready and willing to accept it on terms prescribed by Communist imperialism.

"The way to an enduring peace through compromise which safeguards the 'principles of self-determination and human freedom'—which is the way the President seems to be trying to find and follow—is one that's fearfully beset by uncertainties, enshrouded by darkness that could lead to irreparable disaster."

Enid (Okla.) Eagle, editorial: "Our answer to the Red propaganda weekly's question should be that we shall continue to observe Captive Nations Week so long as the Soviet Union reneges on its pledge to hold free elections in the nations it has enslaved. We can best answer the question by deeds in refusing to ink the nonaggression pact as proposed by Mr. Khrushchev in exchange for a nuclear test ban."

New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, editorial: "If the Soviets really want peace, all they have to do is go home and stay there, leaving other nations to choose their own forms of government.

"Until they do, the United States will champion those they enslave, as President Kennedy has forthrightly affirmed."

Spokane (Wash.) Chronicle, editorial entitled "Kadar Goes Calling": "Kadar was a busy, two-faced operator when Russian guns were crushing the struggle of Hungarian people to gain freedom. Time and words and clever makeup have not changed either face convincingly.

"More than ever, Captive Nations Week will serve a great purpose in reminding of what happened to many Europeans, and of what has yet to happen."

Washington (D.C.) Catholic Standard, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "The Reds can easily disprove that the satellite nations are not really captives—by free elections, by abolishing the secret police, by tearing down the barbed wire and mines at the frontiers, by granting freedom to the press and freedom of religion, by permitting freedom of education.

"And until the enslaved nations are free, we shall continue to pray for them and to use all possible pressure to assure their freedom."

San Angelo (Tex.) Standard Times, editorial entitled "Goading Is Good": "Of course, there is an effort to relieve the tensions existing between the West and the East, but for our part we think Russia should never be allowed to forget the bloody crimes committed in the name of communism."

Macon (Ga.) Telegraph: "The Soviet Union depends heavily on keeping East Europe in its camp. The satellite nations are forced to contribute heavily to the Soviet industrial machine.

"Many of the 800 million people in East Europe comprise a stumbling block to the Soviet goal of overtaking American industry. It is vitally important to us that the East Europeans hold on to whatever spirit of freedom and resistance they have left."

Dallas (Tex.) News, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Call for Help":

"When we see the general acceptance of the pronouncement of our highest policy papers here that we should not be critical of the captors of the enslaved peoples, or give any hope to the people in bondage, we wonder about the genuineness of the crusade some people profess to be waging. The concern they express involves only certain people and then only selected actions of discrimination.

"Liberty and freedom should be for all men. That should be our goal, clearly expressed during Captive Nations Week."

Warsaw (Ind.) Times-Union, editorial entitled "Khrushchev's Maneuver":

"Perhaps the Soviet Union wants to end the cold war, as Anastas I. Mikoyan, First Deputy Premier, said in explaining Khrushchev's offer. But the price is too high if it freezes the frontiers of central Europe, and confirms Communist conquest there. It runs afoul of sentiment in this country, that the captive nations should be freed."

Other newspapers which ran features and editorials on Captive Nations Week before the week actually began included Los Angeles Tidings; Saginaw (Mich.) Catholic Weekly; Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic; Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun; Grand Rapids (Mich.) Times; Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News; Trenton (N.J.) Times; St. Louis (Mo.) Review; Scranton (Pa.) Times; Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal; Oneida (N.Y.) Dispatch; Grandville (Mich.) Star; Rockville Centre (N.Y.) Long Island Catholic; Albany (N.Y.) Evangelist; Palo Alto (Calif.) Times; Casper

(Wyo.) Tribune; Hartford (Conn.) Catholic Transcript; Athens (Ohio) Messenger; Oil City (Pa.) Derrick; Lancaster (Pa.) News; Miami (Fla.) News; St. Albans (Vt.) Messenger; Elkhart (Ind.) Truth; Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader; Haverhill (Mass.) Journal.

COVERAGE DURING CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

New York Journal American, editorial entitled "The Captives":

"This is Captive Nations Week, and in conjunction with the talks now going on in Moscow the timing could not be better.

"It serves to remind us that—

"1. While Premier Khrushchev may be forced by expediency into seeking some kind of accommodation with the West, the Soviet Union is an imperialistic and tyrannous power. No nation has ever accepted Communist rule voluntarily.

"2. If, as is possible, he tries to make a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries a condition of a nuclear test ban agreement he will be seeking to formalize an international crime—that being the enslavement of Eastern European nations.

"A NATO-Warsaw Pact treaty would condone on our side the captivity of the captive nations, including East Germany.

"Further, as 'Editor Report' by W. R. Hearst, Jr., said Sunday, such a treaty would imply a parallel between the two blocs, where none actually exists. NATO is a voluntary association of free nations. 'The Warsaw Pact is a dragooned clique of puppet governments whose regimented populations are kept in submission under threat of Soviet troop action.'

"We can't do much to free the captive nations. But let's not help Khrushchev make the shackles stronger."

(This editorial also appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Record American; San Antonio (Tex.) Light; Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald Examiner; Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer.

The Indianapolis Star, editorial entitled "They Know":

"Congressman WILLIAM G. BRAY urged that the United States try to obtain some relief for the imprisoned people of central and eastern Europe. He said that no nonaggression pact should be signed between Khrushchev and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization unless free elections are held in the captive nations.

"The people in the captive nations also have a better grasp of the truth about Soviet communism than our envoys. They know the Reds moved in behind the guns of the Soviet Army, and have stayed for nearly 20 years. They are captives by any definition of the term.

"The people in the captive nations also know that President Kennedy was right when he said, in Berlin, that it is not possible to work with the Communists. They know it from bitter experience.

"The captive nations and the people of those nations work with the Communists every day—with a gun at their backs. Our Indiana Representatives know this and have pointed it out.

"What a pity for the enslaved people of Europe that others in our Government should choose Captive Nations Week to ignore the unpleasant but obvious facts of international life."

Chicago Tribune, editorial entitled "An Ill-Advised Junket":

"Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming, took the Senate floor to denounce Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's current junket to Russia and four other Communist countries as ill advised and poorly timed.

"At a time when millions in Communist slavery are being told that the United States is renewing a pledge for their liberation, it will come as a shock of brutal proportions when they see an American Cabinet member, replete with wife and entourage, as the feted guest of their masters," said Senator SIMPSON.

Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week Stirs Flame of Freedom":

"The free world has nobody and nothing to blame but itself if it cannot muster the necessary determination and decisiveness to dare stand up against our aggressive enemy, which measures its present success in intimidating and softening up the Western World.

"Captive Nations Week provides one opportunity for Americans to recognize the magnitude of the gigantic world struggle and to add to the flame of freedom which must be kept burning in the souls of the oppressed.

"The hope of liberation must never be allowed to fade away from their hearts. Let us not dim the image of the Uncle Sam who rolls up his sleeves and speaks and acts courageously."

Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, editorial entitled "Khrushchev, What Now?":

"It is impossible at this time to know if Khrushchev fancies he is using the West as a counterweapon against his mutinous ally, China, but it is entirely possible that for home as well as foreign reasons the Kremlin boss really is ready for a meaningful thaw in the cold war. While we decline to be used, we can ourselves make good use of such a thaw for the extension of freedom and world security."

Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, editorial entitled "Today's Freedom Lesson: Again We Observe Captive Nations Week":

"The vast areas of formerly independent but now subjugated peoples which are controlled by Moscow are perhaps its greatest weakness.

"Captive Nations Week expresses the sentiment of the American people that these peoples should have the opportunity to decide their own political destiny. Holding it is a sound practice which should be continued in the future until they have had that opportunity."

The Boston Globe, editorial entitled "Lest We Forget":

"It means that their voices are not like a drowner's cry 'lost on the desolate wind' of indifference; and that other men and women have not forgotten them. It is a reminder that no genuinely free elections have ever stamped with popular approval the regimes now dominating Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Cuba, or the Baltic States whose cultural leaders were subjected to genocide by the Russians. Freedom does not coexist with the sepulchre."

New Haven (Conn.) Journal-Courier, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"This is Captive Nations Week, a cold war exercise intended to show this Nation's continuing commitment to the principles of national self-determination. It is aimed, of course, at Communist rule in two dozen nations including Poland, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet, and even the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. such as Armenia, Ukraine, and Georgia.

"Hardest for the Soviet leaders to take has been the suggestion that various states in the U.S.S.R. are captive nations. Even Secretary of State Rusk has argued that the U.S.S.R. is 'a historical state' and that Armenia, Georgia, and Ukraine are 'traditional parts' of that state. Imagine American reaction if the Soviets should suggest that the U.S. Government was holding captive the States of the old Confederacy."

(This editorial also appeared in the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter-News; the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Republic; the Ironwood (Mich.) Globe; Harrisonburg (Va.) News-Record; the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian; St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press; Burlington (Vt.) Free Press; Wilkes-Barre Record; Camden Courier-Post; Aberdeen (Wash.) World; Danville Evening News; Danville Commercial News * * *.)

Indianapolis (Ind.) News, editorial entitled "A Good Suggestion":

"Congressman DONALD BRUCE, speaking at the opening ceremonies for Captive Nations Week, noted that the defeat of communism 'requires total dedication and understanding of free peoples everywhere now, before it is too late. As long as we are willing to countenance and make deals with the Communists,' we stand in danger of defeat."

Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, editorial entitled "One Day in the Life of a Captive European":

"Nuclear war would be catastrophic. But the necessity of peace does not mean that free men and women must accept as permanent so bleak a life for the hundreds of millions under the Red thumb in Europe and elsewhere.

"The annual proclamation always infuriates Nikita Khrushchev. So be it."

Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News-Telegram and Deseret News, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week Works":

"The truth is the Captive Nations Week serves some very useful purposes—and evidently is making itself felt where it counts.

"First, the observance acts as a thorn in the side of the Communists. Only recently the Soviet propaganda weekly the New Times complained, 'Is it not high time to discontinue the Captive Nations Week in the United States?' The Soviets likely wouldn't raise this querulous question unless Captive Nations Week were giving them some difficulties. As long as that's the case, the observance is worth the little effort it takes."

Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune Dispatch, editorial entitled "Can This Be Victory?":

"In telling the captive peoples that all we do is to hope to improve their lot slowly through contacts with the regimes they detest, we are in danger of forfeiting their friendship. In fact, we are lending credence to Communist assertions that the West is doomed to impotence.

"Captive Nations Week provides the American people with a chance to show the peoples of Eastern Europe that they are not forgotten."

Indianapolis (Ind.) News, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"To win the cold war, the West must adopt a strategy of the offensive. This means pushing back the frontiers of slavery, and extending the boundaries of freedom.

"As with every great accomplishment, this one must begin with a firm and unwavering commitment to the ultimate goal. Captive Nations Week, obviously, is only a beginning point in a Western strategy of victory over communism. But it is a beginning fraught with hope—for freedom and for the security of our Nation."

Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer, editorial entitled "A Dead Horse?":

"In 1963, we are more mindful than ever of the double standard that has come to govern the world's view of the captive peoples and their problems.

"* * * The upshot of these circumstances is that South Africa and the United States stand before the world as the principal violators of human freedom, while the murderers of freedom in Hungary and East Germany and all the other captive states stand before the world as accusers."

The Toledo Times, editorial entitled "Captive Nations":

"There is no point in President Kennedy or anybody else mincing words when facts are facts. The rest of the free world, much of it just emerging into the light of freedom, needs reminding every now and then the true nature of colonialism today and exactly who the real colonial power is. And if the words injure Premier Khrushchev's tender

sensitivities, so much the better—and all the more reason why they should be uttered."

San Diego (Calif.) Union editorial entitled "Freedom Is Still the Goal":

"Men and women forced to live behind the crude Iron Curtain drawn by dictators always are peering. They hope to see freedom. We have it. They don't. Unfortunately, you can't buy it at a supermarket.

"Freedom must be created. This is the land in which such creation is possible. Its very concept can break the strongest bonds ever thrown about it.

"The captive nations, victims of ruthless Red oppression, will not remain captive. The millions who live there one day will reject the slave status that has been forced on them. This country and all the free world meanwhile will continue the campaign to loose the bonds of captive nations."

The New Haven Register editorial entitled "Freedom Still Burns Behind Iron Curtain":

"This is Captive Nations Week. In this period the courage of those who refused to remain captive to political ideologies repulsive to them is admired by all men who are free."

The Arizona Republic editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"This year Captive Nations Week will continue until Saturday. No one is likely to contend that it is much more than a symbol. But it remains a symbol which acts as a bone in the throat of the Communist world, as evidenced by the fact that the Soviet propaganda weekly, the New Times, asked a few months ago, 'Is it not high time to discontinue the "Captive Nations Week" in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question.'

"The Hungarian question is indeed a dead horse, insofar as officials of the New Frontier are concerned. But sweeping that question under the diplomatic rug does not end the suffering, the oppression, the violation of human dignity and liberties.

"John F. Kennedy, during the 1960 Presidential campaign, said, 'We must never—at any summit, in any treaty declaration, in our words or even in our minds—recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe.'

"Captive Nations Week gives us a unique opportunity to demonstrate our fealty to those words and to the unfortunate captives of communism."

Lafayette (Ind.) Journal and Courier editorial entitled "Freedom for All":

"So far the West has neglected to utilize this potent weapon. Russia's suggestions and demands keep the West on the defensive. The Soviets are endlessly calling upon the West to negotiate, always demanding but never yielding on an essential point.

"It is important to challenge Russia to allow captive peoples the rights guaranteed in the Atlantic Charter and in the Yalta Declaration, both of which Moscow accepted. As pointed out by WILLIAM G. BRAY, Indiana Congressman, 'the demand for free elections is one that Russia cannot openly refuse and yet can never accept and keep these people under her dictatorship.'

"Here is a golden opportunity to put the Kremlin on the defensive, and to keep it there, giving the West an advantage in the cold war which it seldom has experienced and which it sorely needs.

"The captive nations deserve their freedom. Their people are entitled to the same liberty and dignity enjoyed by people of the free West. The world, and Russia, in particular, should never be permitted to forget that millions are being kept enslaved under communism."

Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald Journal, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week: Psychological Weapon":

"Captive Nations Week is more than a sentimental gesture. It is a national declaration that these nations, are, in effect, our allies behind the Iron Curtain."

Williamsport (Pa.) Sun-Gazette, editorial entitled "U.S. Position Reaffirmed":

"We reaffirm our opposition to the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism. More than this, however, we should do.

"As a free people ourselves, we should retain the issue of Hungary on the agenda of the United Nations. We should remind the world in all our dealings with the Kremlin that the Soviet has not yet fulfilled treaty pledges to conduct free elections in Eastern Europe. And we should declare to both Khrushchev and Mao that in the forum of the United Nations we will act ceaselessly to insure the right of self-determination to the peoples of East-Central Europe—those millions whom communism treats as faceless satellites."

Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, editorial entitled "Advancing Cause of Freedom":

"Captive Nations Week should provide Americans with a chance to show the oppressed peoples of the world that they have not been forgotten. Advancement of legislation calling for the creation of a Committee on Captive Nations would serve to reaffirm this Nation's intention to preserve the peace and insure the victory of freedom for all peoples of the world."

Roanoke (Va.) World News, editorial entitled "Don't Forget Them":

"It is well to remind the world that, despite the continuing camouflage, communism, as represented by Moscow and Peiping is the real 'imperialism' and 'colonialism' of our day.

"But our protest would ring just a bit more true had not the U.S. Government only recently abandoned the brave people of Hungary by giving up opposition to the Communist government of that satellite becoming a member of the United Nations in good standing."

Martinsville (Ind.) Reporter, editorial entitled: "Now It's Our Fault":

"What has happened to the United States is that its leaders have lost confidence in their own Nation's integrity, and instead of acting from strength they put their trust in some kind of a deal. It is immoral for one nation to bargain away the freedom of another; and being immoral, it can lead only to disaster."

San Diego (Calif.) Tribune, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Observance Should Kindle Freedom Hope":

"We believe Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, sums up the feeling of most Americans with his comment. DOUGLAS was the principal sponsor of the 1959 resolution designating the observance for the third week in July.

" 'If we slacken our stand against the Communist usurpation of power,' DOUGLAS said Monday, 'or recognize the present Communist domination as either permanent or right, we really deny both our heritage and our ideals.'

"This is the voice we hope carries behind the Iron Curtain."

Springfield (Mass.) News, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"The week is intended to demonstrate our continuing commitment to the principles of national self-determination. Captive Nations Week brings to world attention the fact that many countries are still under the Communist yoke, but it also may remind us that even outside the Iron Curtain, the principle of self-determination is not always respected."

Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"Russia's East European satellites are deviating from their rigid Soviet orbits in unprecedented ways. East Europeans are traveling, talking, and trading in Western Europe particularly as never before in the post-World War II era.

"It does seem that if the special enthusiasts for Captive Nations Week could stress such things more and leave off emphasis on some of the admittedly dramatic but really unhelpful themes struck in the past, their cause would be better served both at home and abroad."

Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune:

"The United States remains honorbound by terms of the unanimous resolution of Congress to let those peoples know that its citizens still are vitally concerned with their eventual freedom. President Kennedy has proclaimed this to be the official American attitude.

"It is a week again to emphasize that word 'captive' with its connotation that sometime the 'captive' shall again be free. It is a week to scoff at Nikita Khrushchev's statement that 'history is on our side.' History, slowly as it sometimes operates, is on the side of freedom."

Chicago Sun-Times editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

This week is being celebrated as Captive Nation Week. The recognition of the nations held in captivity by communism is a cold war exercise to show the world that the United States is committed and dedicated to the principles of national self-determination.

"On Sunday the flags of 25 captive nations flew before the Grant Park bandshell to honor the fifth Captive Nations Week. Chicago has many citizens of the countries represented by those flags. They are good citizens and we are proud of them. We pray, with them, that the day will soon come when those 25 flags will fly in freedom over their own land."

Indianapolis (Ind.) Times editorial entitled "Fair Winds and Foul":

"The winds of freedom, Secretary of State Dean Rusk has noted, are blowing throughout the world.

"The winds of tyranny sweep the Latvian lowlands, the winds of oppression whistle through the Carpathians, the winds of colonialism sweep the lower Danube valley.

"We in Indianapolis must always remember that no man is fully free till all are free."

San Diego Union editorial entitled "Grapevine: It Hops Iron Curtain":

"Any type of effective foreign policy effort involves some risk. And the risk in allowing hope to die in Eastern Europe is that the Iron Curtain will become a permanent barrier.

"Feeding truth into the grapevine which covers the oppressed nations is but a small effort. But it is one which must not be overlooked."

Raleigh (N.C.) Catholic editorial entitled "Right or Wrong—Our Captive Brethren":

"But it is our conviction that, like fascism, racism, anti-Semitism, and anti-Catholicism, communism must be abolished from the face of the earth. And it can be done, just as we did away with slavery in the United States. We may have jim crow here and there, but there is no buying and selling of flesh in the pubic square.

"As Khruschev well knows, our most effective allies in this conflict are the captive peoples themselves. They will hear of our sympathy and of our revulsion for the system that enslaves them, expressed through Captive Nations Week, and it will keep alive in their hearts the ideal of liberty."

Port Arthur (Tex.) News editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week"

"Captive Nations Week, as ineffectual as it may appear, provides our Government with a peg on which to hang exploitation of Soviet cynicism and barbarity.

"It can do so by (1) retaining the issue of Hungary on the agenda of the United Nations, (2) raising the question of Soviet treaty pledges to hold free elections in Eastern Europe in all negotiations with the Kremlin, (3) placing the question of the

denial of the right of self-determination to the peoples of East-Central Europe on the docket of every session of the United Nations."

Long Beach (Calif.) Independent-Press Telegram editorial entitled "Where Is the Answering Voice?"

"How important it must be to people living as virtual slaves in their own countries to believe that the free world outside recognizes their plight and offers at least moral support to their resistance. And how important to the free world that those enslaved people continue to resist. Should Khrushchev ever decide that his colonial empire is completely subdued, the West would discover how mischievous a confident and powerful Communist dictator actually can be.

"Yet, Hungary is strangled without a finger being raised in the West, and it's not even nice to talk about that episode; millions are under the Communist yoke in Eastern Europe, but free nations continue trading and treating with the captors; Cuba is throttled by Reds, but loyal Cubans in exile are not permitted to harass them; the captives cry 'Help,' but the answering voice is not heard."

Redondo Beach (Calif.) Breeze editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week Can Serve a Purpose":

"The Soviets would like nothing better than for the United States to abandon Captive Nations Week, because it would remove another obstacle to their goals. They have achieved remarkable success by championing 'peaceful coexistence'; they are openly supporting Communist aggression in Laos, they are continuing the buildup of Cuba as a base for aggression and subversion in the Western Hemisphere, they are moving strongly into Italy."

The Houston Post editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"Neither President Eisenhower nor President Kennedy has been too enthusiastic about issuing the annual proclamation required in the congressional resolution, although they have complied. Whoever is President naturally feels that it his prerogative and that of the executive branch to conduct this country's foreign affairs and to set its policies. They instinctively object to any attempt at congressional intrusion in this field. It must be admitted that the Captive Nations Week resolution was just that. But there is no doubt that it expressed the overwhelming sentiment of the American people."

Rockford (Ill.) Star editorial entitled "Still Captive":

"It is discouraging to people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains when the United States recognizes Communist regimes which have committed brutal atrocities against their people.

"Elevation of the Russian-dominated regime of Premier Kadar of Hungary to a position of international respectability through U.N. membership would serve as a tremendous blow to the freedom aspirations of the other captive nations of Eastern Europe, which have long counted on moral support from the United States.

"The United States could offer new rays of hope for the millions of Communist-enslaved peoples if, during this week's observance of Captive Nations Week, legislation calling for a special committee on captive nations could be advanced in Congress."

Columbus (Ga.) Ledger, editorial entitled "This Observance Sends Them Into a Rage":

"Hardest for the Soviet leader to take is the truth: That various states in the U.S.S.R. are captive nations."

Meadville (Pa.) Tribune, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"Captive Nations Week is alive and kicking. Its significance now is more important than ever with the existence of a captive nation, Cuba, on our very doorstep. But our concern for the people of captive nations should not be limited to 1 week a year. The observance has meaning only if Americans continue to support a stern policy that resists the surrender of freedom anywhere."

Dayton (Ohio) News, editorial entitled "Captive Nations":

"People as brave as these can live for a long time on hope that is genuine, even if deferred. They will lose heart only if they are betrayed once too often by false promises."

New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week Is 'Watered Down'":

"There are 17 million Americans born behind the Iron Curtain, plus additional first generation Americans from Eastern Europe who are anti-Communist. Not to stand fearlessly for freedom of captive nations in this annual observance robs millions of people behind the Iron Curtain of their hope and faith in America. During Captive Nations Week, let's fly the Stars and Stripes, and have every mayor in Indiana proclaim Captive Nations Week observance."

Petersburg (Va.) Progress Index, editorial entitled "Cold Comfort for Captives":

"The official problem has been described as one of trying to keep hope and spirit alive among the peoples of such countries, but without stirring them to attempt revolts which would be brutally crushed. The facts being what they are, any comfort which the captive nations may derive from the observance of Captive Nations Week may be on the cold side. They are remembered, and that is about it."

The Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times, editorial entitled "A Constant Reminder":

"The existence of captive nations in the Soviet bloc is a constant reminder of the only face which the Russian Communists have worn in dealing with the rest of the world. This cannot be forgotten, and Captive Nations Week is assurance that it will not be."

The Evening Press (Binghamton, N.Y.), editorial entitled "Captive Nations Total Grows":

"The peoples of the captive nations look to the United States to find a way to free them some day. But Hungary, deserted by the West and the United Nations in its anti-Communist revolt 7 years ago, is still in Communist chains. And current administration policies hold little consideration for the principles of self-determination as they may apply to Cuba, the latest of Communist conquests. Other Latin countries may be added to the total of captive nations."

Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette, editorial entitled: "No Satisfying Substitutes":

"The city commission has asked the people of Kalamazoo to observe a minute of silence Tuesday at 11 a.m. in the hope that all will participate in the commemoration.

"It is fitting that all lovers of liberty—those now enjoying it and those aspiring to it—mark this week with a renewed pledge of support for the preservation or restoration of those political, personal, and religious freedoms for which there are no satisfying substitutes."

Rock Island (Ill.) Argus, editorial entitled: "Remember the Captive States":

"While it is true that the chance of freeing any of these states is not great at the moment, much is to be gained by keeping the world aware of the Communist perfidy and terror which brought about their enslavement.

"The world needs a frequent reminder of the way the Communists operate and their regard for their pledged word. The people in the captive lands need to be shown that they aren't forgotten. If the truth can arrest the advance of communism, it can eventually liberate the victims. We need the support of these people in event of hostilities between Russia and the Western World. They would be a thorn in the Russian flesh from the beginning. Indeed, knowledge of the trouble they could expect in captive lands is one of the leading deterrents to Soviet aggression in Western Europe."

Features and editorials on captive nations of the world also appeared in the following newspapers: Newport News (Va.) Times Herald; Scranton (Pa.) Tribune; Woonsocket (R.I.) Call and Reporter; Cut Bank (Mont.) Pioneer Press; Buffalo (N.Y.) News; New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times; Mamaroneck (N.Y.) Times; Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier; Corpus Christi (Tex.) Times; Rutland (Vt.) Herald; Troy (Ohio) News; New Iberia (La.) Daily Iberian; Sharon (Pa.) Herald; Bradenton (Fla.) Call; New York Journal American; Spokane (Wash.) Inland Catholic Register; Huntington (Ind.) Messenger; Detroit (Mich.) News; Boston (Mass.) Record American; Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times; Chicago's American; Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat & Chronicle; Lafayette (La.) Advertiser; Times Union of Albany, N.Y.; Austin (Texas) American; Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune; The Courier-News (Plainfield, N.J.); Freeport (Ill.) Journal-Standard; The Bridgeport (Conn.) Post; Los Angeles Evening and Sunday Herald Examiner; San Francisco Examiner; Des Moines (Iowa) Register; the Jersey (N.J.) Journal; Poughkeepsie (N.Y.) Journal; North Tonawanda (N.Y.) News; Chicago (Ill.) News; Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press; Niagara Falls Gazette; Jamestown (N.Y.) Post-Journal; Oswego (N.Y.) Palladium-Times.

---

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE FREEDOM RALLY HELD ON THE OCCASION OF THE FIFTH OBSERVANCE OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN BOSTON, MASS., ON JULY 20, 1963—SPONSORED BY THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE, INC., AND THE NEW ENGLAND CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE, MILTON, MASS.

Whereas President Kennedy and Governor Peabody proclaimed the week of July 14 to 20 as Captive Nations Week in accordance with the Captive Nations Week resolutions passed by Congress in 1959; and

Whereas the Soviet Government continues to annihilate the national, cultural, and political identities of the captive non-Russian nations through Russification and deportations; and

Whereas Russian communism made its way to Cuba, making Cuba an armed outpost in the Western Hemisphere in violation of the Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas many millions of citizens of the United States of America are linked by family and cultural bonds with those who live in the captive countries under the tyranny of communism; and

Whereas the United States has failed to develop effective policies toward the captive nations to regain freedom and independence: Now, therefore, we assembled at the fifth observance of the Captive Nations Week in Boston, Mass., on July 20, 1963, do hereby *Resolve*—

1. Urge the U.S. Government to declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries adopted by the U.N. on October 14, 1960, its support on the right of self-determination of all peoples held in Communist captivity and, consequently, make this issue the permanent concern in all negotiations with the Soviet Government; and

2. Urge the House Rules Committee to speed action on the pending Flood resolution (H. Res. 14), Derwinski resolution (H. Res. 15), and other resolutions calling for the establishment of a Permanent Committee on the Captive Nations which will advocate a progressive program to aid captive nations to restore their historical freedom and independence; and

3. Compliment all Congressmen for their resolutions and support; we commend all

Americans who voiced their support for the establishment of the Captive Nations Committee; and we urge those who did not lend their support to do so now; and

4. Deplore the State Department for not supporting the establishment of the said committee and urge our State Department to endorse and support the passage of the Flood resolution in its entirety.

RESOLUTION AT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS RALLY, JULY 10, 1963, LOS ANGELES

Whereas Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, mainland China, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Tibet, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others have been deprived of their national independence by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the tyranny and oppression of the Communist regime have enslaved the peoples of these captive nations and suppressed their individual liberties and freedom; and

Whereas the subjugation and domination of these peoples by an alien power constitutes a denial of their fundamental human rights and is contrary to the charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas the captive peoples have never ceased to strive for freedom and the right of self-determination; and

Whereas it is vital to the security of the United States and the free world that the desire for freedom on the part of the peoples of the captive nations be steadfastly preserved; and

Whereas the people and the Government of the United States share the aspirations of the captive peoples to be free and independent: Therefore be it

*Resolved by all those assembled here,* That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the denial of self-determination to the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Cuba, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others, with a view toward assuring—

1. That all Communist troops, agents, colonists, and controls are withdrawn from these countries;

2. That all exiles from these countries are returned from Siberia and released from prisons and slave labor camps;

3. That free elections are held in these countries under United Nations supervision.

## FORMER PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S INTEREST IN THE RECLAMATION OF THE ARID REGIONS OF OUR LAND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of John F. Kennedy has had an influence on all we do or say here in Congress, and his spirit will forever be with us. One of President Kennedy's growing interests was in the reclamation of the arid regions of our land. Just last October I was with him on a tour of some of the great projects in the Pacific Northwest which will produce wealth for my region and the country, and he saw clearly the ever-increasing need for full development of all our land and water resources.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the constantly expanding demands upon our food and water supply did not die, or even hesitate, when we lost our great leader. We are blessed that President Johnson is also a longtime friend of reclamation. His Western background and his long service in the Congress have given him a full appreciation for our Nation's dependence on the wise use of our natural resources.

Much is being said about the President's determination to eliminate all unnecessary expense, and to keep the Federal budget within tight limits, and I wish to state my full support for his efforts to end waste and extravagance. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that in our attempts to economize we avoid the temptation to cut back on our present minimum program of investment in resource development. We sometimes hear charges that these investments, in the form of dams, irrigation projects, reforestation, soil conservation and so on, are saddling future generations with a great debt. How completely opposed to the truth that is, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that if we neglect our duty to conserve our resources today, tomorrow's generations will look at depleted forests, needless wastelands, and undeveloped river systems, will see the tragic poverty that could so easily have been avoided, and will rightfully condemn us for our neglect and shortsightedness.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want my grandchildren to say of me that I let their heritage go to waste. For that reason I will continue to support to the best of my ability every sound program of resource development, be it a dam in the West, a research center in Georgia, a forest laboratory in Wisconsin or a project to harness the tides in New England. I have confidence that our President, in his drive for economy, will realize the necessary place of national investment in any true effort to get full measure from Federal dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third in a series of speeches calling attention to the great benefits of reclamation. Previously I have spoken of the Columbia Basin project of California. Today I wish to call attention to the Yakima project in the State of Washington.

YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

The reclamation program has proved its worth to the Nation many times and in many places, near and distant. You need only go to the corner grocer or the supermarket down the next block, and you will find fruits, nuts, or vegetables which were produced with irrigation water furnished by a reclamation project. If you want to see the projects which make this production possible, however, you will have to travel west with the sun.

It is the West which has the sun. But it is the West also which barely sees a raincloud when the sun is hottest. Without the rains, or without artificial means to bring water to the soil, the crops will wither and die. Here lies the value of irrigation and of reclamation works which make such irrigation possible. It is only through irrigation that most of the West can have agriculture at all. And public expenditure in this field of water conservation produces results, not just promises.

To acquaint you with some of these results, let me cite the experience on a project in the State of Washington, the Yakima project. The American public owns nearly $63 million worth of project plant, property, and equipment on the Yakima project. The irrigation water furnished by these facilities to 382,000 acres of prime land in 1962 produced crops valued at nearly $81 million. Since 1907, the year in which production was first reported on, the project has grown more than $2,028 million of crops, or 32 times the $63 million of stock held by the taxpayer.

In addition, this $63 million taxpayer asset is itself being repaid by the water and power users on the project. As of June 30, 1962, $17.3 million, or more than than one-fourth of project costs, had been repaid to the U.S. Treasury; about 95 percent of the sums repaid to date has come from project irrigators, the remainder from net revenues accruing from the sale of project-produced hydroelectric power.

Construction of the Yakima project began in 1906, and continued on through several decades, with the last major division being authorized for construction as recently as 1948. Project facilities include 6 major storage dams and reservoirs, 5 diversion dams, 2 powerplants, 30 pumping plants, and hundreds of miles of canals, laterals, and drains. These works make it possible to provide irrigation water to thirsty lands extending 175 miles on both sides of the Yakima River. Highly fertile lands in the four Yakima Valley counties of Benton, Franklin, Kittitas, and Yakima receive either a full or supplemental supply of irrigation water, whenever it is needed.

Also known as the Fruit Bowl of the Nation, the Yakima Valley area has taken tremendous economic strides through irrigation farming. At the turn of the century, the four-county area produced only about 40,000 bushels of apples, cherries, peaches, pears, and plums and prunes. In 1959, Yakima County alone ranked 1st in the Nation in the production of apples, 3d in pears, 8th in plums and prunes, 9th in peaches and cherries, and 11th in sugarbeets. Overall, in terms of value of fruits and nuts sold, the county ranked sixth in the Nation in 1959.

The irrigated lands served by the Yakima reclamation project facilities in 1962 alone produced apples valued at more than $13 million—enough to furnish a full year's fresh supply to about 25 million people. The project also produced a full year's fresh supply of pears for 56 million people, peaches for 11 million, and cherries for 55 million people.

Many other important high-value specialty crops are produced on the Yakima project year after year. In 1962, these included almost a million crates of asparagus, 25,800 tons of sweet corn for processing, 267,000 tons of sugarbeets,

6,257 tons of hops, and 1.2 million pounds of peppermint and spearmint.

By making irrigation water available to these wealth-producing lands, reclamation has made important contributions to the prosperity and economic growth of the Pacific Northwest in particular, and the Nation and the West in general. If these lands had not received the water to render them truly productive, alternative patterns might well have included the production of wheat and other crops presently in surplus.

Without irrigation, these lands could not support the nearly 67,000 persons who derive their living directly from Yakima project farms; nor could economic opportunities be found for approximately double that number of persons in nearby towns and communities whose livelihood depends directly on the demand for trade and services generated by the project.

Without irrigation or without the project, the four-county area could not have supported—much less induced—the population increase of 153,000 additional persons who came to settle there since 1920. Nor would there have been the demand for project water service to the urban, suburban, residential, commercial, and industrial lands which satisfied the water needs of nearly 64,000 persons in 1962. Indeed, in the absence of the project, it is doubtful if area retail sales would even have reached any significant level—much less the $356 million estimated for 1963.

Reclamation encourages intensive local agricultural land use. The result is increased productivity and a high degree of flexibility in the choice of crops. Intensive irrigation farming also creates economic opportunities in distant areas and States by stepping up the demand for tools and machinery used in the crop production process. Untold millions of dollars of business thus have found their way from the Yakima project to States whose citizens have never seen an irrigation ditch.

But the benefits accruing to reclamation water resource development do not stop there. The development of recreational resources and the enhancement of fisheries and wildlife are an important adjunct of the multipurpose reclamation program. Reports for 1962 indicate that almost half a million days of recreational use were made of the 31,000 acres of water and land surface devoted to outdoor recreation on the Yakima project. Project-constructed storage reservoirs have created nearly 100 miles of shoreline for recreational pursuits. Rapid population growth and increased demands for recreational opportunities throughout the Nation will translate into substantial new business for the Washington recreation industry.

## RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ISSUE STAMP HONORING THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on December 3, 1963, the Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N.Y., adopted a resolution which was introduced by the Honorable Daniel A. Buczynski, memorializing Congress to issue a stamp honoring our late President, John F. Kennedy.

Supervisor Buczynski was an active participant in the Casimir Pulaski Day parade which took place in Buffalo, N.Y., October 14, 1962. After President Kennedy had concluded his very inspiring address, the supervisor asked the President to sign one of the brochures. The President in his gracious manner complied with the request, and today Supervisor Buczynski and his wonderful family cherish the brochure as a remembrance of the President.

The above-mentioned resolution follows:

Whereas on November 22d of this year this Nation and the entire world was shocked and horrified by the assassination of President John F. Kennedy; and

Whereas there are actually no words with which to describe the sorrow and grief which we all feel about this tragedy; and

Whereas it seems only fitting and proper that the U.S. Post Office Department publish a memorial postage stamp in honor of our deceased President John F. Kennedy: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this board forward a certified copy of this resolution to Congressman THADDEUS J. DULSKI in order that appropriate action may be taken for the adoption by the U.S. Post Office Department of a memorial stamp honoring our late President.

DANIEL A. BUCZYNSKI,
*Supervisor of the 10th Ward.*

Attest:

WALTER A. HOLZ,
*Deputy Cerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.*

## THE STUDEBAKER CORP.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the following is a joint statement of Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana, and myself, today with respect to the news that the Studebaker Corp. will end automobile and truck production in its plant in South Bend:

We are disappointed to learn that Studebaker Corp. has decided to terminate the production of automobiles and trucks at South Bend. We are concerned about the thousands of Studebaker employees and their families. We are concerned as well about the serious effect this decision has on the economy of South Bend and the many other Indiana communities whose local industries serve as suppliers to Studebaker's automotive division. And finally, we are concerned that this fine old producer of cars and trucks is leaving the automotive field.

This curtailment of Studebaker production comes despite every effort on our part to secure assistance in the form of Government contracts.

Since 1961 Studebaker has received more than 80 contracts from tl Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the Post Office Department which have an aggregate value close to $200 million, according to Studebaker. Studebaker's present backlog of Government orders to be produced is close to $90 million.

We have been highly pleased with Studebaker's phenomenal record of success as a Government contractor. The firm has become a major supplier in just 2½ years. Unranked on the Army's list of top 50 producers until 1962, Studebaker made that list in 43d position that year and jumped all the way to 12th on the Army procurement list in fiscal 1963. There was every indication that Studebaker would continue to be one of the Army's top procurement companies.

Three reasons for this success stand out. First, Studebaker had an excellent record of production and on-time delivery for the Government, a tribute to the skilled labor force and operating management in South Bend. Second, Studebaker seemed to have a complete understanding of defense procurement and, in bidding and agency contact work, was able to do a better job than competitors. Third, Studebaker obviously received sympathetic consideration on the part of the present administration.

We have been proud to do all in our power to assure that Studebaker has received fair consideration in Government procurement work.

Studebaker has been an outstanding supplier of trucks to the Army and to the Post Office. Their work in development and design led to their selection as prime supplier of the Post Office Department's most important new mail delivery truck. In the Department of Defense they have been a leader in the field of heavy duty trucks. They have supplied 2½-ton trucks to the Army for 3 years. They have been successful in securing a contract to produce 8,000 5-ton trucks with production scheduled to begin in May of 1964. Defense Department sources suggest that, because of experience and thorough production ability, Studebaker could well have been the successful competitor for a procurement of 28,000 2½-ton trucks being purchased on a 3-year procurement in late winter.

This Government work has been an important factor, not only to Studebaker, but to the Indiana economy as well. It is estimated that nearly 2,000 Studebaker employees have been working and are scheduled to work on contract with the Department of Defense and General Services Administration.

All three of us have worked very closely with Studebaker Corp. officials and have assisted them in every possible way. Only last Friday, for example, Congressman BRADEMAS invited Studebaker President Byers Burlingame to confer with Senators HARTKE and BAYH and himself as soon as possible in an effort to assist Studebaker.

We must now turn our attention to the problems of these thousands of Studebaker employees who are out of work because of this decision.

We are in touch with the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, and other Government officials, and they assure us of their complete cooperation in our efforts to help solve these problems. We share a great confidence in the people of the South Bend area. We are determined to work with them to meet this new challenge.

## ACTION POLICY NEEDED IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the kidnaping of American citizens and officials by a group of Castroite Communists in Bolivia, following as it does a similar kidnaping in Venezuela, calls for the strongest action on our part. The President has already offered to the local government our full cooperation by any means necessary. This quick action is in keeping with the traditional American policy of speaking softly but carrying a big stick. It now may be time to use that stick and to do so with the determination that will impress all those who might have similar ideas about using our people as hostages for their own political motives.

The outcome of the election in Venezuela was a bitter defeat to the Communist cause, particularly Castroism. They may become more desperate in the days ahead. The United States must be ready to meet any challenge and must be ready to protect our citizens. U.S. citizens must be safe to travel abroad, and our Government officials must be safe to work in countries which they are trying to assist. If these governments are not willing or able to provide for their safety, then that responsibility rests with us.

We hope that President Johnson, in offering our help, is foreshadowing an important turning point in our foreign policy toward Latin America. There has long been a need for treating each problem in Latin America as an individual case, rather than the tendency to lump them all together as one. They may, in fact, be interrelated, but they are also separate and distinct, which often can best be met with separate and distinct moves on our own part. Individual action, in cooperation with one government or on our own, is the only decisive way to meet problems demanding immediate solution.

We can hope to see a further development of this policy in the days ahead. Of course, the immediate problem is the safety of our people being held in Bolivia. To the President's pledge of assistance we can only add that we should not wait too long for a call from the Government of Bolivia if they are unable to guarantee the safety of our citizens.

---

## BLAME AND GUILT FOR THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, there has been, since the hideous, tragic, and outrageous moment in Dallas, a gathering of voices which say that the Nation as a whole and especially the city of Dallas must share the blame and the guilt for the assassination of our President. The rationale for this theory is a premise that hatred, suspicion, and bigotry pervade the land. And there is, on the part of some, a tortured attempt to equate it all with rightwing extremists. There are rightwing fanatics and there are leftwing fanatics and both ignore the responsibilities of freedom while indulging themselves in all its privileges. Hatred, suspicion, and bigotry are no doubt a part of their affliction, but I do not believe that that affliction is indicative of the mind of the American people and neither do I believe that the affliction pervades the Nation.

Thousands upon thousands of Dallas citizens thronged the streets—as have the citizens of other American cities—to see and to cheer and to wave at the President and the First Lady, and hundreds at the Dallas Airport crowded closer hoping for the rare privilege of a handshake. When the populace of the city crowds the streets to honor their President, it seems to me that this more accurately reflects the temper and character of that city than does the evil act of an evil mind of one solitary individual.

Virtually the entire population of 180 million Americans was filled with shock, dismay, and revulsion by the assassination of the President. These are the same Americans who join together in United Fund and Community Chest drives for the purposes of aiding the unfortunate and making their respective communities better places to live; who respond quickly in times of disaster and hardship at home and abroad with voluntary donations of food, clothing, money, and helping hands; who support a broad variety of charities, schools, churches, and worthwhile community projects and programs; who join labor unions, service clubs, and fraternal organizations to work for the betterment of all; who undertake to sponsor pageants, ceremonies, and testimonial dinners to honor their heroes, compatriots, contemporaries, and neighbors. These are common, everyday characteristics of American people.

The list could go on and on, and it most certainly does not suggest that hatred, suspicion and bigotry pervade the Nation. To insist that the American people themselves must share a portion of the guilt for the act of one madman suggests, I think, a lack of faith in the decency and integrity of the American people. It is a mystery to me how anyone can rationally turn the assassination into an assault on the whole character of the American people. It is also puzzling why so many of those who speak so self-righteously about hate and bigotry seemingly seek to lay it all at the door of the far right—as if they refuse to believe that the accused assassin was, from the time he was 15, an extremist of the far left, a loner and misfit who had gone to Russia where he renounced his allegiance to the United States.

If it is necessary to seek someone or something to blame, let us not forget that it has been, from the beginning, Communists and communism who have preached and dealt in hatred and violence; who have conspired in treachery, subversion and lies; who have sought to thwart justice and to disrupt law and order wherever they have seen an opportunity.

No one would deny that there are haters and bigots at work in our country. They stand on the outer fringes of both sides of the civil rights question, on both sides of ideological cold war issues and on inconsequential things that have nothing whatsoever to do with political thought or philosophies. But this is only a small eddy, and not a part of the mainstream of American life. And so I do not think it serves the Nation to insinuate that our people are consumed with hate and rancor. Indeed, I wonder if it does not help but to confuse.

When our new President called for unity and support, the people everywhere responded immediately and willingly—and I am sure they would have done so even in the absence of such an appeal. As free Americans we hold a right to our individual convictions, opinions and judgments, but we also stand first for our flag and country.

Perhaps it may prove a special blessing that we are moving into that season of the year when talk and thoughts of hate fade away and good will fills hearts and minds. Christmas, 1963, will find a nation conscious of its sorrow. It will also find the Nation blessed with a renewal of our faith and a reemphasis of good will toward others, and I would like to believe that we will go forward, strengthening and fulfilling the ideals that other generations have fostered and preserved for us.

---

## FEDERAL EXPENDITURES: EVALUATING THE ISSUES

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a speech delivered at the Tax Foundation Conference, Roosevelt Hotel, New York City, December 3, 1963. A companion speech was delivered 2 days later which I am also placing in the RECORD.

So much effort has been spent in post-World War II years debating governmental monetary and fiscal policies as they might relate to economic growth that governmental expenditures policies have been neglected. Yet, unlike monetary and fiscal policies, there seems to be no dispute that expenditure policies should be used affirmatively to effect economic health and growth even though there is great dispute over the specific governmental expenditures proposals.

I guess the promoters of the thesis that governmental monetary and fiscal policies should be used, beyond their primary functions, directly to promote economic health

and growth, think they have found an axiom. Otherwise, how can they conclude they do not have to prove their thesis or rebut the points of those who disagree with it?

In this kind of intellectual climate I find it necessary to at least restate for the purposes of clarification, and to let the scholiasts know there is dissent, the opposing thesis about monetary and fiscal policies, even though I wish to discuss expenditure policies in this paper.

It is my belief that monetary policy should be directed exclusively to establishing and preserving a weight and measure, if you please, of economic values of goods, services, labor, and savings. In this way it can best be a medium of exchange and an accurate base for economic statistics to tell us what is happening in the economic crucible. Anything that distracts monetary policy from achieving this most difficult and, like an ideal, unattainable goal, in the long run, is detrimental to the economic health and growth in the society.

It is likewise my belief that fiscal policy, taxation and governmental debt should be directed exclusively to raising as efficiently as possible the revenue necessary to pay for the goods and services demanded by and for the society through governmental expenditure policies. Anything that distracts fiscal policy from achieving this difficult goal in the long run is detrimental to the economic health and growth in the society.

However, in the proper use of these two great governmental powers one constantly sees economic health and economic growth being affected. It is a great temptation to conclude that this is a simple operation of the law of cause and effect, so that all we have to do is reach in to produce immediate effects which seem so clearly to be in the interest of economic welfare. This is like assuming we can gain the moon because we can see it. Self-discipline accompanied by a bit of humanity is necessary to resist this temptation. I suppose this human temptation to tinker with things we do not fully understand has come to us in economics as the result of the newly emerging science of economic statistics. It is my judgment that this new science is at the stage of development astronomy and chemistry were as they were emerging from astrology and alchemy.

I think governmental expenditure policies should be determined by forthright political decision after proper congressional study and debate of the needs and desires of a society. Governmental expenditures should be limited by fiscal policy only, and hopefully, on a temporary basis, when these needs and desires exceed the fiscal abilities of the society. A society should consider well in establishing expenditure policy that it has available for the purpose two basic mechanisms, the marketplace mechanism and the mechanism of political government. After all, the base for governmental revenues is the nongovernmental sector, unless we are to have a totalitarian state in which the political and the economic powers are merged.

Let me digress a bit to stress that while the proper economic goal of a society is to free its people as fully as possible from the physical laws of nature, this is of no avail to the majority of them if the shackles of the physical world from which they have been freed are replaced by social shackles. It is my faith, because I cannot yet prove otherwise, from history or logic, that sustainable economic advancement is dependent upon men cooperating with each other and not being shackled by other men. Some people think they can prove that a society of freemen is more productive and advances further than a society where the aristocrats are free but the bulk of the people are slaves, in the public meaning of the word "slave." Others think they can prove the opposite.

At the latter part of the 18th century, our political philosophers, believing in the importance of human freedom to social advancement, if not for religious reasons, sought to guard it against the social shackles from which it had recently emerged in certain parts of Western Europe. Herein lies the idea set forth in the U.S. Constitution for the separation of the powers of government into legislative, executive, and judicial, and into the three tiers of government—local, State, and Federal. Herein lies the idea for the separation of those two great social powers, government and religion, and our Bill of Rights protecting the individual in certain areas from any political action whatsoever of the majority.

Economic power had not been greatly developed at the end of the 18th century. There were only about seven corporations in all America at the time of the Constitution. Eli Whitney had not yet developed his guns with interchangeable parts which became the essence of mass production and human specialization. Steampower had not yet replaced waterpower. Electrical power was a parlor trick and atomic power was not even a fantasy. There being no mass production, there was no need for mass advertising. In other words, economic power was so diffuse and so weak it was not thought of in terms of a dangerous social power, as were governments and religions, so long as the main source of economic wealth—land—was diffused, which it was in the Thirteen Colonies and in the untamed wilderness to the North, West, and South.

However, today with our intimate knowledge of the existence of what we call totalitarian states, wherein economic and political powers are merged, we should be acutely aware of the importance of keeping separate these two great social powers—economics and government—in order to protect human freedom.

So governmental expenditure policy, although directed to social needs and desires, must be limited by a basic regard for the importance of the separation of economic and political powers in order to preserve freedom even at the sacrifice of efficiency. I happen to believe that freedom and economic efficiencies go hand in hand and are not in conflict, but I leave that debate with those who seek that will-o'-the-wisp efficiency of totalitarian states, for another time.

To get back to the question of the limitation of governmental expenditure policy by fiscal policy, I have suggested that whatever limitation there may be should be temporary. In other words, if a governmental expenditure has been deemed needed or desired and it is most efficiently attained, with a proper regard for the balance of economic and political power through the Federal political mechanism, then it is just a question of how and when we most efficiently finance this expenditure. In other words, fiscal policy should be based upon the needs expressed in expenditure policy.

Fiscal policy must be based upon long-term considerations. The economic and social impact of a particular tax structure and tax take upon the tax base must always be a matter of concern to those who set tax policy. If the tax structure and tax take weakens the economic structure upon which it is based, then the economic impact of the total expenditure picture must be weighed with this economic impact and the net result calculated. In order to reach total Government policy it may be necessary to establish priorities among desirable expenditures, even needed expenditures, so as not to overburden the tax and debt structures.

I am happy that today the neo-Keynsian economists have joined the tax neutralists who have been saying for many years that our Federal income tax structure is undermining our economic structure and damaging economic health and future economic growth.

However, tax policy is only one part of fiscal policy. When we fail to obtain the revenues necessary to meet our governmental expenditures we must then resort to deferred taxation, issuing Government bonds.

It is important when considering the soundness of a tax structure and its economic impact to consider it in its entirety, which is debt and taxation, both the present and future abilities of the tax structure to produce revenues. So, although the neo-Keynesians have reached the same conclusions which the neutralists reached sometime before them, about the deleteriousness of the amount of revenue take by means of our Federal tax structure, they are by no means in agreement with the neutralists' conclusions that the amount of Federal debt is equally, if not more, deleterious to our economy.

I believe our Federal debt, our debt, policy is seriously undermining our economic health and economic growth. It is my thesis that probably it is more economically damaging than our immediate tax take. If this is true, it does no good, and does great harm, in seeking to relieve the damage being created by our immediate tax take to reduce the taxes of today and defer the amount of the reduction to be paid out of future tax revenues.

In other words, I have contended that it is necessary for those of us in the Congress who are charged with studying and evaluating fiscal policy to advise that our tax structure and the amount of accumulated debt (deferred taxation) is at a point where we cannot provide revenues through taxes or Government bonds to meet the President's total expenditure estimates for fiscal 1964 without creating serious economic damage.

The administration can attempt to refute this conclusion in one of two ways, or in a combination of both. (It has abandoned a third possible refutation that our Federal tax structure is not undermining our economic health and growth. The administration spokesmen have agreed that it is, and like many a new convert, have become more zealous in seeking the reform more massively and quickly than the original believers.)

The administration could argue that the amount of accumulated debt, deferred taxation, along with the increases of debt which will result in the interim period while we are reaching a balanced budget, under its economic theory, will not create greater economic damage.

Or the administration could argue that the Federal expenditures which it advocates will create economic benefits sufficient to counteract the deleterious economic effects stemming from the amount of the debt.

The administration has not sought to debate the first point. Indeed, every attempt to have its spokesmen debate the economic impact of the present debt, let alone the economic impact of the increased debt resulting from the planned deficits, has met with no response. The most I have been able to get out of Dr. Heller, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, is that he agrees that to the extent the new debt securities to replace the revenues lost from the tax cut are sold to the private sector the beneficial effects sought from the tax cut will be diminished. And that to market these securities through the Federal Reserve System will not create inflationary pressures which cannot be contained because there is a high incidence of unemployment and underutilized plant capacity which will sop up any new money and increased purchasing power resulting therefrom.

To resolve this latter part of Dr. Heller's thesis, we must analyze the consistency of the unemployed and of the so-called underutilized plant capacity. If the unemployed are largely those with limited and obsolete skills, which I believe to be the case, and

the underutilized plant capacity is largely obsolete, inefficient, and unwanted plant capacity, which I believe to be the case, then inflationary forces would not be contained. We would have to evaluate the effect of these forces upon our economy at this time, troubled as it is with an unfavorable international balance of payments, an already relatively high incidence of unemployment, and unusually high investment liquidity.

Neither Dr. Heller nor anyone supporting his thesis of planned deficit financing through tax cutting unaccompanied by Federal expenditure cuts has undertaken to make this analysis. Not one person spoke on the House floor during the debate on the recent tax cut bill in favor of any aspect of this economic theory. Indeed, all who spoke paid great respect to the immediate need for expenditure reform. The debate centered on whether the Congress should or should not rely on the Executive's statements that expenditure reform was to occur. In other words, the theory that aggravating the problems already existing in the field of debt measurement by increasing the debt would create more economic loss than the tax cut could provide in gains was uncontested.

In this respect, the administration has even abandoned its second point of possible refutation, that the affirmative expenditure policies would produce sufficient economic gains to counteract whatever deleterious effects came as the result of increasing the Federal debt.

However, even though the administration has had no advocate in the Congress willing to defend its policy of tax cuts and planned deficits by arguing the benefits it claims will be gained from its expenditure policies, some of the spokesmen in the administration and many of its outside supporters who have access to the public relations media have sought to advance this thesis, albeit obliquely.

Obliquely in two senses of the word. In the first sense, through the use of speeches and press releases which are not subjected to rebuttal or the affirmative case against them. In the second sense, by creating strawmen to demolish and so avoid the real points of disagreement.

It is very difficult for any audience outside the Congress to comprehend what I have been saying. The congressional world is limited to 535 Members and the limited audience the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might reach. When we contrast this audience with the audience reached by the national media of newspapers, weekly magazines, the syndicated columnists, radio and television with its national networks of news commentators and editorialists which has carried the administration's one-sided presentation and buried the congressional debate and the opposition's syllogisms, it is understandable how the popular picture can be just the reverse of the true one. The retreat from the forum which the Congress provides where equal debate may be had, with rebuttals available to both sides, has been on the part of the administration theorists, not the neutralists.

The administration has sought only cursorily to point out the economic benefits it claims will be derived from the components making up its total expenditure package. It is these components which should be debated and resolved. Many Federal expenditure programs, of course, can be justified and some of them will bring economic benefits. Others, which may be beneficial for other than economic reasons, may not bring economic benefits. Certainly the whole must be evaluated on the basis of its component parts.

However, the administration has sought to win its point on expenditure policy in terms of aggregate economics, not on the basis of the sum of the components. Here the administration theory is even more vulnerable to refutation.

The administration bases its case upon the need for increased total expenditure in the society. Total expenditure is composed of private plus governmental expenditures. According to this theory, and in opposition to the theory which the administration congressional supporters settled for with the administration's approval in obtaining passage of the tax bill in the House, we cannot cut back on Federal expenditures to make up for the tax revenues lost from the tax cut. The net increase in total expenditures would be nil.

It is interesting that the administration spokesmen do not make the point which seems to be true that the multiplier effect which they talk so much about is greater in private spending than it is in Government spending and that, therefore, a mere shift of spending power from the governmental sector to the private sector through a tax cut accompanied by Federal expenditure cuts would be beneficial even if total spending power remained the same. Perhaps the administration economists do not agree that the multiplier effect is less in Federal Government spending than it is in private spending. This is a fair subject for debate. To resolve it we should get into the components which go to make up governmental spending—expenditure policy—and private spending.

One of the many difficulties of the administration's total spending theory in these times is that consumer purchasing power and consumer credit have never been higher. Furthermore, corporate liquidity and investment money to deter it from going abroad. plentiful. So plentiful is corporate investment liquidity that for other reasons, balance-of-payments reasons, the administration is seeking to impose an excise tax on investment money to deter it from going abroad.

Our problem today in the private sector is not ability to spend, but motivation to spend. Our primary problem in motivation to spend is not consumer spending, which still seems to be amply motivated by the new goods and services in the market, but rather in motivation to invest.

It is important to stress that investing money is spending money. Investing is spending money for buildings and machinery, in training manpower and putting manpower together into an economic team and for research. This kind of spending has the highest multiplier effect of any expenditure. It is this kind of spending which creates jobs, maintains economic health, and promotes sustainable economic growth. This kind of spending encourages consumer spending, not only by increasing consumer purchasing power through creating jobs, but by creating consumer spending motivation through developing new goods and services in the marketplace. This is the kind of spending that promotes real economic growth which is increased standard of living, more leisure time, greater skill and knowledge of the people, lower costs for goods and services and of higher quality. This is the kind of expenditure, however, which is made only when it is anticipated that real economic growth will result based upon realistic cost accounting. This kind of expenditure must anticipate an economic return in interest and dividends for the investment. This kind of return can only come if new wealth has been created by the expenditure.

There is one point on which I would agree with the administration economists if they would ever seek to make it; hoarding retards economic growth. I have never heard the administration theorists speak out against hoarding, but when they complain about inadequate total spending in our society I would think that they would be concerned about the amount of hoarding that presently exists and that they would wonder about its causes. Certainly they should have some theories about the high incidence of investment capability today, even if they do not agree that the cause lies in dampened motivation to invest.

Economic hoarding is not limited to gold in a sock. If we are to understand it, we must relate it to the failure to use assets and available credit. Economic hoarding encompasses loafing instead of working. Unemployment can result from lack of sufficient motivation as well as from lack of sufficient jobs.

What stimulates the motivation to hoard rather than to invest? What creates the motivation to save a dollar rather than to spend a dollar? After all, investment expenditures comes from someone's savings, one's own and what one is able to borrow from others.

The motivation to save and then to invest the saving rather than to hoard it comes essentially from the security of the investment and the return that one anticipates from the saved and invested dollar. It is saved if it receives interest for exercising this discipline, this denial to spend on oneself. It is invested, spent at risk with the hope of creating economic wealth, if it can anticipate a return for the risk in proportion to the risk.

Governmental monetary and fiscal policy have more to do with creating the climate for saving and investing and, conversely, the climate for hoarding than any other factors. If the administration, through pursuing a policy of deficit financing, creates an incentive to hoard, rather than to invest, its own theory of stimulating increased total spending in the society is, of course, defeated. This is exactly what I believe is the case.

I suggest that the key to the debate on the novel theory of deficit financing we find embodied in the administration fiscal policy, which includes tax cutting without expenditure cuts, lies in the answer to this question of what makes men hoard.

Inflation may make consumers spend money and even borrow money where they can at whatever price and investors to acquire and hold tangible assets, and it may cause money to move more rapidly, but it certainly doesn't make men sell or utilize tangible assets, particularly real estate, which is still the basic item of economic wealth. The hoarding of physical assets during times of great inflation, of course, makes the monetary inflation feed on itself. Or we can have that which is possibly worse—deflation—where hoarding is more obviously the base.

I would be happy to discuss debt. The administration has created a strawman when it says those who oppose its novel fiscal policy of deficit financing just don't understand that debt can create wealth. Of course, borrowing someone else's savings to spend them in the hopes of creating wealth can create wealth. No one has ever disputed this fact. On the contrary, the private enterprise system is based upon creating wealth by spending savings, one's own combined with others. The key question is—what is the money realized from the debt to be used for?

Investing in creating wealth can be financed from one's own savings and from borrowed savings. So an important ancillary question about debt is: What should the optimum mix be? Most financing of new economic ventures is a composite of one's own savings and the borrowing of other's savings. Our country was built upon our own savings and some borrowing from outside our own society, but it was all invested in relation to specific expenditures. Hence, we come right back to expenditure policy.

Now, let us see why Federal debt is not like private debt or even like local and State governmental debt. Private debt, whether personal or corporate, is related to specific expenditures. The debt itself is related to two things singly or composite: security of the asset itself, earning capacity of the asset

or the borrower to repay the debt and to pay the charge for the loan. In other words, it is directly related and, indeed, based upon the assumption that it is going to create economic wealth.

Local and State debt is similar to personal and corporate debt. Most municipalities and counties float bonds for capital improvements, schools, roads, bridges, sewers, and what have you. All increase the wealth, measured in real estate values, if nothing else, of the community which is the primary tax base for local governments. These debts relate to specific assets; they relate to the tax base, the ability to pay. State debt is quite similar.

Only Federal debt differs. It relates primarily to the defense of this country—a service which we badly need, but a service which is economically barren. Defense expenditures do not create wealth in the assets purchased; the missiles, the aircraft carriers, the atomic bombs, etc.—even military buildings have little asset value. They are mostly single purpose, nor do they bring in revenue. That portion of the Federal debt which does relate to creating economic wealth except for the traditional public works projects relates to the very area where most of the debate lies as to whether the Federal governmental mechanism is the best mechanism in our society to direct this expenditure. Indeed, I would argue that where a wealth-creating expenditure is involved the presumption is quite strong that the expenditure would be better and more efficiently handled by the private sector through the marketplace mechanism, and if other factors suggest that the mechanism of Government be used, by one of the other two tiers of government, State or local, rather than by the Federal Government.

The Congress has developed the mechanism for dealing with only one phase of expenditure policy. Congress, though its authorization process of the legislative committees and its appropriation process of the Appropriation Committees, passes upon the desirability and the need of the components which go to make up total spending. The mechanism needs to be improved and better policy guidelines need to be established. But at least Congress has the necessary machinery.

Congress does not have the machinery to make policy decisions on the optimum size of the Federal debt. Congress makes little effort to establish priorities between needed programs when the tax revenues and the optimum bonded indebtedness are exceeded by the total of expenditures. Some of us have tried to develop the debt ceiling legislation into a mechanism whereby the Congress can make such judgments. We also tried to use the recent tax cut bill as a vehicle for expressing congressional judgment on expenditure levels.

Let me illustrate my points by reference to the Federal budget for fiscal 1964, presented to the Congress in January of this year. The administration requested new obligational authority to spend of $108 billion. However, only about 40 percent of this new obligational authority is scheduled to be spent in fiscal 1964; the balance is scheduled to be spent over the next three or four ensuing fiscal years.

The 1964 budget set out that on July 1, 1963, the beginning of fiscal 1964, there would be a carry-over balance of unused authority to spend granted by the Congress in previous years of $87 billion. In other words, if the Congress through its appropriation bills granted to the President his request for $108 billion of new obligational authority, he would have a pool of $195 billion of authority to spend in fiscal 1964. Of course, the President had no plans to spend this amount of money in 1 fiscal year. Nonetheless, he alone has the discretion to set the expenditure level for fiscal 1964. In his 1964 budget he set that level at $98.8 billion.

All Presidents have properly frozen programs, accelerated programs, and decelerated them in accordance with changed circumstances occurring after the authority to spend had been granted and scheduled in the congressional appropriation bills.

Congress has an obligation to express its judgment on total fiscal policy, and to do this, it must make its determination of what the expenditure rate should be in light of the revenues anticipated for each fiscal year. Failing to do this, Congress has no way of expressing its judgment on the debt aspect of fiscal policy.

The most the Congress has been doing to set budget and policy is through its control over grants of new authority to spend, but this has a very limited effect upon the expenditure level of the current fiscal year.

The slowdown of the present Congress may be attributed to its making one further effort to cut the expenditure rate for fiscal 1964.

Fiscal year 1964 began on July 1, 1963. With 5 months of fiscal 1964 already passed, the bulk of the fiscal 1964 appropriation bills are not yet law.

Congress has kept the Government bills paid by passing each month what are called continuing appropriation resolutions. The popular congressional notion is that under continuing resolutions of this sort the Executive can spend only at the level of the preceding fiscal year, which was $92.6 billion for fiscal 1963.

If these continuing resolutions achieve what they are believed by most Congressmen to achieve, the expenditure level for 6 months of fiscal 1964 will be $92.6 billion and not the $98.8 billion in the President's budget.

Regretfully, I am afraid my colleagues are due for a rude awakening about the real import of continuing resolutions. I fear that the rate of spending for the past 5 months has not been kept to a $92.6 billion annual rate. I suspect it will turn out to be about $97 billion annual rate.

However, out of all this turmoil I believe the Congress will develop adequate machinery whereby it can pass judgment upon the budgetary policy.

The art of budgeting on the expenditure side of the ledger, I have often remarked, is not so much concerned with cutting out waste, extravagance, and inefficiency, as much as it is with establishing priorities between needed and efficient programs. Cutting out waste, extravagance, and inefficiency is a matter of identification. Establishing priorities between good programs requires judgment and political fortitude.

I hope Congress will get on with the job.

---

## GOVERNMENT TAX POLICY INCLUDES DEBT MANAGEMENT

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this is the companion speech to the one I previously placed in the RECORD entitled "Federal Expenditures," delivered before the California State Chamber of Commerce, on December 5, 1963, in Los Angeles, Calif.:

It should not be necessary to point out that the Federal debt is a part of our system of Federal taxation. It is merely deferred taxation. Certainly the members of the House Ways and Means Committee are acutely aware of the fact that when sufficient tax revenues are not provided to meet the Federal expenditures it is necessary to print and market additional Federal bonds to make up the deficit.

From time to time the Congress is called upon to raise the limitation on the amount of Federal bonds that may be issued at any given time because the Federal Government rather consistently has failed to live within the limits of its tax revenues in the past decades.

Now economists and political scientists of all shades of belief have joined to say that even this amount of tax take although it is inadequate to meet expenditures is causing economic damage and we must cut Federal taxes in order to allow the economy to grow. The theory is that as the economy grows the tax base is expanded and the tax revenues will increase, making up for the additional deficit caused by the immediate cut in revenues.

This theory certainly requires us to take a hard look at the economic impace of the Federal debt. Is it possible that the present size of the Federal debt is causing economic damage equivalent to the damage the economists see resulting from our Federal tax system?

I think so. Indeed, I maintain that the present level of the Federal debt is causing even greater damage to our economy than the much heralded damage being caused by our Federal tax structure.

If my thesis is anywhere near correct it is foolhardy to follow a fiscal policy of cutting taxes and increasing the Federal debt to make up for the deficit. Whatever the soundness of the theory may be that we gain increased economic growth by decreasing Federal taxes it must be weighed with whatever economic damage may result from increasing the Federal debt.

Now why has the administration failed to consider and discuss the debt management aspects of its novel theory of planned deficit financing designed to increase economic growth? Why have some eminent businessmen notably those on the Ford Committee allowed their names to be used to help push through the tax cut bill without facing up to the important consideration of debt?

I can understand economic theorists becoming bemused with their economic models to the extent that they fail to deal with the entire aspect of tax policy and leave out debt management. I can even understand politicians following the economic theorists in this half-baked approach to things, but I cannot understand businessmen who have to deal with realities doing so.

One economic reality about our present Federal debt that is hard to ignore is that it costs almost $11 billion a year just to pay the interest charges. This is one-tenth of our total annual expenditure budget.

Another ever-present economic reality about our Federal debt is the need for the Federal Government to go into the capital market each year to refinance the debt and finance the additional increments to it to the tune of about $70 billion. It is hard to calculate the effect this has on our capital markets, but it is considerable.

Another important fact about the Federal debt is that it has become an integral part of our Federal monetary machinery. This has direct bearing on both our domestic business operations and our international business operations.

We have failed to discuss even the basic question of Federal debt policy. Should our optimum policy be to have no Federal debt at all? This is perhaps excusable, inasmuch as it seems to be such an academic question. The Federal debt has become such a basic part of both fiscal and monetary policy of the Federal Government.

However, we certainly should be discussing what the optimum Federal debt should be and in this discussion certainly it helps to consider whether there should be any Federal debt at all.

In this discussion we should be searching for the criteria we should use as guidelines in order to determine the optimum Federal debt.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers in its endeavors to allay any fears on the part of the Congress and the public about the size of the Federal debt has suggested some of the criteria we might utilize, albeit most of these suggestions are advanced in a defensive or negative way rather than in a positive manner.

It has said that we need not worry about the size of the Federal debt because it is a less ratio of gross national product than it was in 1946. Using the ratio of Federal debt to gross national product seems to be one good criterium for evaluating the optimum size of the debt. Accordingly, let's determine what the optimum ratio might be. Does the administration think that the ratio of 1946 is the optimum on which we should set our sights?

I doubt very much if they would argue such a point; 1946 was the year at which the ratio of Federal debt to the gross national product was the highest in our history, having reached that point after the massive deficit financing we employed in order to win World War II. Even the peacetime ratio of Federal debt to gross national product immediately preceding World War II is a questionable optimum to shoot for. inasmuch as the period from 1929 to 1940, when this ratio was rising so fast, was a period of negative economic growth.

If we review our history, we find that economic growth was the greatest during periods when the Federal debt was below 20 percent of gross national product, a far cry from the 53 percent we have today, 17 years after the end of World War II, and the 40 percent we had at the beginning of World War II, after the great deficit financing engaged in during the Roosevelt depression.

Furthermore, it is important to consider that 70 percent of the decline in the ratio of Federal debt to gross national product, which has occurred since the high water mark at the end of World War II was reached, occurred in the first 5 years immediately following the war. This resulted neither from decreasing the debt nor increasing the gross national product, but almost entirely from the heavy devaluation of the dollar. The debt, of course, was measured in terms of the 1946 dollar, while the gross national product was measured in terms of the inflated dollar of 1951. Since 1951, the decline of the ratio of Federal debt to gross national product has been very slow. Since 1961, it has been less than one full point per year.

We can always lower the ratio of Federal debt to gross national product through inflating the dollar, but I trust that this is not the policy that anyone would seriously advocate.

The administration has suggested another criterium for evaluating the size of the Federal debt. It is completely negative and so questionable I hesitate to mention it. It is the argument that the Federal debt may be bad, but other debts are worse.

However, the point has been advanced and therefore it should receive some discussion. The administration has said that the Federal debt has grown less than State and local governmental debt and less than corporate and private debt since 1946. Well, let me ask the question again, Is the ratio of the year 1946 the optimum we should seek if we are to use the ratio between these various kinds of debt as a criterium? I hardly think so. During World War II we deliberately directed as much of our national effort as we possibly could through the Federal governmental mechanism in order to win World War II. Indeed, we deliberately stunted the private and other governmental sectors. We imposed credit controls on the private sector and through material and manpower controls, not to mention price controls, further diminished the efforts of the private sector and slowed down the activities of local and State governments. The ratio of Federal debt to local and State debt and to private debt was the highest in our Nation's history in 1946. If we are going to use this ratio as one of the criteria in determining our optimum Federal debt we should examine the ratios in peacetime years and particularly in those years when our country advanced the most rapidly economically, and in peace and in freedom. When we make such an examination we find that the ratio which exists 17 years after the unfortunate peak we reached in 1946 as the result of World War II is far short of the optimum peacetime ratios. The adjustment of the ratio of State and local governmental debt and corporation and private debt to Federal debt back to the optimum years of peace and growth which has been going on in the 17 years since the end of World War II should have been much greater than it has been. The better way and quicker way to get back to our optimum ratios is not as we have been doing, to increase the other debts more rapidly than the Federal debt, but rather to decrease rather than increase the absolute size of the Federal debt.

Another criterion suggested by the administration is to relate Federal debt to the creation of wealth. This suggested criterium has also been advanced by the administration in an oblique and negative fashion. Instead of pointing out specifically where the Federal debt has created new wealth so there can be forthright consideration of the allegation, it points out that local and State debt and corporate and private debt creates wealth and by inference so does the Federal governmental debt. Certainly the creation of new productive wealth is a splendid criterium in evaluating debt.

And it certainly is true that most State and local debt and corporate debt is for the purpose of creating new productive wealth. Indeed a great deal of private debt also might very properly be said to create new wealth particularly as it relates to homeownership and purchase of automobiles and other labor saving consumer durables.

However, almost the exact opposite is true of Federal debt. The bulk of Federal debt occurred to provide for the defense of the country. Military hardware and installations are not wealth-producing resources. Their book value must be set at $1 not at the billions of dollars they cost, inasmuch as they are single purpose and purely governmental items of little or no economic value in the marketplace.

Some Federal debt has been incurred for the purpose of creating new productive wealth, but it is a very small portion of the total debt. As a matter of fact, the areas where this kind of Federal debt has been incurred are those where most political controversy occurs today over whether the Federal Government is outside its field of proper activity, constitutionally and from the standpoint of efficacy.

However, it is in this area of purpose of the debt where we should find our basic criteria for deciding how much and what Federal debt should be created. This is the area of governmental expenditure policy which has been so neglected in public debate in recent years.

When we get into discussing the purposes for which debt is created we find our best criteria. If debt helps to create new productive wealth it has a plus factor. However, new productive wealth can be financed by current income and one's own savings; it need not be financed by debt, although almost invariably it is created through the capital expenditure of society's aggregate savings.

The administration has endeavored to create its own strawman to attack and to demolish in order to distract the public's attention from the real debate. The administration says how foolish is our opposition when they say all debt is bad.

Well, I have never heard anyone argue that all debt is bad even though it isn't as good as one's own savings. Quite the contrary, most people who deal with the economic mechanism of debt either as a creditor or debtor, and that is most of us, are almost totally concerned with the purpose for which the debt is to be created. A good bit of debt is simply a method to provide liquidity and is secured by present rather than assets to be created. It is the expenditure purpose for which the debt is incurred that reveals whether new productive wealth will be created so that (1) the debt can be paid off; (2) that the interest charges of the debt can be met.

In using savings to create new productive wealth we are usually concerned with a mix between current income, savings of our own, and savings borrowed from someone else. The optimum mix of current income, one's own savings and borrowed savings varies greatly with the purpose of the debt. Yet it is the mix that becomes the focal point of much of the economic evaluation of debt. This focal point has been ignored by the advocates of planned Federal deficit financing except to dogmatically state that the proposals they make have the optimum mix.

Furthermore, debt is a mechanism for spreading the payment of the cost of a capital asset over its usable lifetime. Both Government and private institutions find debt to be a very helpful economic device to accomplish this purpose. Federal debt policy like any debt policy must be set to some degree upon the policies set for the component borrowings that go to make up the total debt. However, Federal governmental debt has an important policymaking factor unlike any other that goes beyond the whole of the parts.

Only the Federal Government has a power beyond fiscal policy, immediate taxation and debt creation, which can be used to assist it in meeting its expenditures. It alone has the power to create new money. By creating new money beyond the earned needs of the economy it can pay for some of its expenditures.

However, I believe that monetary policy should never be used for this purpose, because in so doing Government defaults on one of its basic obligations to the people to establish and to preserve that basic weight and measure of the marketplace, a medium of exchange to measure the value of goods, services, labor, and savings. Tampering with this weight and measure strikes at the very heart of the process of economic stability and growth.

The administration is really advancing no novel theory when it presents planned deficit financing. It is merely advancing the old and discredited theory that inflation creates growth in new and sophisticated economic phraseology. The administration theory is based upon the assumption that if total purchasing power in the society is increased total spending will increase. If total spending increases axiomatically we will have increased gross national product. Increased gross national product is assumed by these theorists to be the equivalent of true economic growth, which it may or may not prove out to be. Increased gross national product means increased Federal revenues.

There are many flaws in this syllogism supporting the theory of planned deficit financing aside from the fact that the increased purchasing power is merely printing more money. The basic assumption is that increased purchasing power means increased spending. However, interlying between the ability to spend and actual spending is the motivation to spend.

I do agree that the failure to spend, to hoard, does dampen and damage economic growth. The point that investing is spending, not hoarding, needs to be emphasized. However, investment spending, to create new plant and machinery, to train men in new skills, to weld together a business organization, to conduct research and the development of the results of the research, is the type of spending that has the greatest multiplier effect of all spending.

What is the impact of using monetary policy either through creating more money than the size of the economy warrants or manipulating the cost of borrowed money in the marketplace, in order to pay for Federal expenditures—what is the impact of this upon the motivation to save and to invest, not hoard, the savings in capital expenditure? I believe it has a most deleterious impact. It does more to encourage hoarding than any single factor or a bundle of other factors.

The size of our Federal debt today is such that it already is encouraging hoarding among many of our enterprising people. It seems clear to me that the Federal income tax is taking so much out of our economy that it is encouraging hoarding. The administration economists, though agreeing that the Federal income tax is creating economic damage may not agree that this is the reason. However, I would point out to them and all of us that consumer purchasing power and corporate liquidity has never been higher than it is today. Obviously it is not ability to spend that is holding us back but motivation to spend. Then I would further point out that it is not motivation to spend the consumer dollar, but motivation to invest the investment dollar which is lagging.

Let us look into the impact of the Federal debt and I believe we will see that pulling the tablecloth to cover the bare spots caused by tax policy merely reveals more and uglier bare spots caused by deferred tax policy, Federal debt.

The way out of our seeming dilemma is really quite simple. Get our Federal expenditures down to a level that is less than the tax revenues we can derive from a sound Federal tax system. This means aside from moving in more vigorously on waste and extravagance, which President Johnson now keynotes, we must begin to establish priorities for some of our desirable and possibly some of our needed Federal programs. We can't afford all the goodies we may desire at the same time.

My own judgment is that in the long run we may not have to establish priorities but only establish proper criteria of what programs the Federal governmental mechanism most efficiently and constitutionally can handle and then stick to this criteria. The real debate which should be going on in Washington today is over expenditure policy. Correct expenditure policy could solve our monetary, tax, and debt policies quite readily. If we were to establish these proper Federal expenditure criteria, I think we would also find great economic gains derived from the greater efficiencies the marketplace has over any political bureaucracy in allocating our resources.

However, those who have proposed the novel theory of planned deficit financing seem to be more interested in increasing Federal governmental expenditures, not decreasing them, as a method of increasing overall spending in our society, than they are in fiscal or monetary reforms.

They argue that the Federal Government will spend the money when the private sector might not, even if given the power to spend through a tax cut. They see no danger signals in the lack of motivation to spend in the private sector. They seem to have no regard for how efficiently the money might be spent and for what social purposes other than to imply without justification that the private sector would buy "tail fins" while the bureaucracy would buy education.

Note the ominous note in the Presidential message early this year advocating the tax cut as a method to stimulate our economy. If this method does not succeed, if the private sector does not respond by spending, then we will have to go to the governmental sector and increase Federal spending.

This is a basic quarrel between those in our society who think that the Federal governmental mechanism utilizing civil service employees with a veneer of politically selected supervisors can more wisely allocate our economic resources than can the people themselves through the mechanism of the marketplace and those who believe the other way around.

I disagree with these neofederalists fundamentally. Economically this will not further free our people from the shackles of physical laws, and socially it will result in more shackles being imposed upon them by their fellowmen through the powers of government.

Now is the time for all men who believe in the private enterprise system and in the system of representative government to come to the aid of whatever party or those within any party who will espouse this cause.

---

## HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, as Governor of New York, Director General of UNRRA, U.S. Senator, and above all, as a fine human being, Herbert Lehman served his country and the American people well and nobly.

His sense of principle—always actuated by personal humility and public courage—will long serve as an inspiration to all who knew him. His character was illuminated by a warmth of heart—shown to men and women in all walks of life and most especially in his love of children.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Lehman and the family and join my colleagues in expressing our sincerest condolences.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that editorials in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune—well characterizing Herbert Lehman—be included in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HERBERT H. LEHMAN

A second riband of mourning now hangs on the American flag. For the death of Herbert H. Lehman closes the active career of an indomitable national and international servant. As Governor of New York, U.S. Senator, and Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, his life and activities soared in example and significance far beyond the borders of this, his native city.

He lived a private and public life that moved in a straight and true line. In the richest sense of the words, he was a liberal and humanitarian. Against the enemies of the Republic, he saw service in the U.S. Army in the First World War and resigned from the Governorship in the Second World War to direct foreign relief operations for the State Department. Wherever human distress existed, all over the globe, there could be found Herbert Lehman, saving lives as a representative of the best instincts of the United States and the United Nations.

Reform, sound administration, and courage marked his political career. He entered politics at the side of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, serving one as campaign chairman and the other as Lieutenant Governor. As Governor for 10 years from 1932 until America's entry into the war, he brought the State distinction and honor during difficult years for the people and Nation. All this time he was a stalwart New Deal Democrat, closely affiliated with the programs of President Roosevelt.

The refinements of the Fair Deal nationally saw him in the service of New York as U.S. Senator, often as a quiet but not small voice speaking for legislation favoring all Americans. In Washington, he became the conscience of the Senate. When others quavered before the onslaught of McCarthyism, it was Herbert Lehman who offered the resolution for the removal of the Wisconsin demagog from his committee chairmanships. On matters close to his heart—immigration to continue the American dream and civil rights to uphold the American Constitution—he battled relentlessly against the troops of evil.

Together with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman continued to stand for the reform movement in State and National Democratic politics. After he had passed his 80th birthday, he could be found in rain and cold carrying on his crusade for political decency in every section of the city. At the end of his life he was still standing in the forefront of many charitable, welfare, and humanitarian causes. This great man of private heart and public courage was not just a symbol, but an activist of noble aims and accomplishments to his last moments. These live on.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HE SERVED THE PEOPLE WELL

The death of Herbert H. Lehman leaves all of us poorer. For in our time there have been few public servants so universally respected, admired, and beloved.

The life of the former Governor and Senator was a long one. It is hard to remember now that he was first elected to office as long ago as 1928, as Franklin D. Roosevelt's Lieutenant Governor. But he was than already 50, a man of great wealth turning from private pursuits to new and broader arenas.

In this career Mr. Lehman was four times elected Governor of New York, and later twice chosen to the U.S. Senate. During the war he served as the first head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. And in recent years, when he was already in his eighties, Mr. Lehman led the reform storm in the local Democratic Party.

Thus he covered more than a third of a century in city, State, National, and international performance, all of it done with courage and competence.

The strength of Herbert H. Lehman was in character. Few public figures were so consistently on the right side of the great issues. He was a social idealist, yet also an industrious man of action. He stirred few antagonisms, but in his undramatic way he got things done. This is perhaps why one hardly

thinks of Mr. Lehman as a politician, although he was this State's prime votegetter.

There was about him the assurance of nonpartisanship, of quiet but determined conscience, that made for popularity. He knew what was right, and did it. That he did it so unspectacularly is probably the true mark of Lehman quality, although in later years he became increasingly a bold crusader.

But the important thing is that at all times Herbert H. Lehman served the public interest well. By spirit, integrity, and efficiency, he inspired trust and devotion. And he gave of himself in many ways to the very end of his admirable life. This is an example to cherish.

## NEW PROPOSALS FOR MEMORIALS TO THE LATE PRESIDENT

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, we read every day of new proposals for memorials to the late President. They vary in nature, but most of them take shape in tangible forms, in concrete or steel. Some are good proposals, some are less good. It seems to me that the greatest memorial that can be created to the memory of John F. Kennedy would be the bettering and strengthening of institutions and processes by which this Nation may conduct itself under the rule of law, by which justice is done, by which tyranny is shut out, and bigotry and hatred erased.

It is difficult, and in many ways distasteful, to reconstruct in one's mind the whole incredible miasma of police behavior in Dallas. What happened following the awful event of President Kennedy's assassination was a stain on our system almost as indelible as the shattering and shameful act that preceded it. When injustice is done to anyone, no matter how high the crime of which he stands accused, our society is degraded and injustice is done to all.

I can think of no more fitting memorial to the late President than a national rededication to the rule of law and to the strengthening of institutions which embody and safeguard basic concepts of justice.

I wish to bring to the attention of this House and the country an extraordinary memorandum opinion handed down on October 8, 1963, predating Dallas, by the justices of the appellate division of the New York Supreme Court, first department, Presiding Justice Bernard Botein and Justices Charles D. Breitel, Benjamin J. Rabin, Samuel W. Eager, and Aaron Steuer.

The memorandum opinion decided a petition for removal to another jurisdiction of a case involving an indictment of two 16-year-old men for murder. The brief memorandum opinion reads as follows:

Defendants have been indicted for murder in the first degree. They move this court (Code Crim. Proc., sec. 346(2)) for a change of venue. It appears by affidavit without contradiction that both defendants, 16 years of age, were arrested and brought to the 24th precinct, where they were booked. The proceedings before the police lieutenant were filmed and the film was continued as the defendants were taken to the patrol wagon. On the way to the patrol wagon both defendants were questioned by reporters of the American Broadcasting Co. and both the films and the questioning were telecast over channel 7. It further appears that a deputy police commissioner had directed the police officers of the precinct to give as much cooperation to the press and television reporters as possible and specifically authorized the filming. Detectives engaged in the arrest were authorized to submit to interviews. While the exact figures of the number of people who saw the telecast is in doubt, there can be no doubt that it was a very large number and that the potential for influence on possible talesmen is significant. The effect of the telecast cannot but be prejudicial. The deputy police commissioner defends his action on the ground that the police should keep the public informed through the various news media; and further that the police should not prevent defendants from giving any statement to the representatives of these media that they might care to give. As applied to this case, the explanation is ingenuous. Here two very young men, after first being conditioned by being photographed without their consent, are allowed to be subjected to the insistent questioning of reporters bent on getting sensational details. Defendants far more experienced than these two would get the impression that their inquisitors were approved by those that had them in custody and that to rebuff them would not be advisable. To call this giving them an opportunity to state their version is an exercise in naivete. The practice defeats the very purpose of police work. People are not arrested to provide news stories or telecasts. They are arrested to be brought to justice. Any police conduct that prevents a fair trial could allow the guilty to escape conviction. Good public relations have their importance but being on good terms with the press at the exepnse of a scrupulous performance of the department's functions is hardly commendable. The motion is granted. Settle order on notice. If defense counsel and the district attorney can agree on a county for trial, the same may be inserted in the order.

Mr. Speaker, bar associations and citizens groups through the country should take a close look at their local police procedures and at their machinery of justice. I suggest also that this subject is of sufficient importance as to be entitled to a White House conference. There have been White House conferences on narcotics, conservation, problems of the elderly, and other important subjects. In our entire Anglo-Saxon heritage there is nothing of greater importance or which more needs watchful review than our police and judicial processes and our commitment to principles of equal justice under law.

Cities and communities must examine the nature of police procedures in their areas. So must the Federal Government in those areas where it has jurisdiction. But as the foregoing memorandum opinion indicates, there has been an erosion of an ancient heritage in our country. This has occurred even in jurisdictions which have always prided themselves on "the finest." In New York City we do have the finest, and yet it was necessary for the Court to hand down this opinion. Whether this erosion comes from a failure of our citizens to be vigilant, whether from compromise—a bending to the pressures of a modern day and mass media—or whether from other causes, it makes no difference. The fact is that it has happened, and it has happened to our shame. "No government can stand," said Aristotle, "which is not founded upon justice."

The best memorial, then, to John F. Kennedy, would be a recommitment to and a reaffirmation of our determination to build a society based on firm and tested principles of justice and on the rule of law, for which men of earlier generations also gave up their lives.

## THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include the response I have received from the State Department on questions I asked on Vietnam in the House of Representatives on Wednesday, November 4.

Regrettably, the letter does not represent a satisfactory reply to my questions, but is largely an exercise in State Department gobbledygook. In all fairness it must be understood, however, that all the facts could not be made public at this time.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, D.C., November 26, 1963.*

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI: I am writing you in response to the questions you raised regarding Vietnam on the floor of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, November 6.

I shall list in sequence each of the questions and then provide a response based on the Department's best knowledge and judgment of recent developments in Vietnam.

1. "Was the advisability of a coup against Diem and the U.S. role in such a development the subject of high level discussions subsequent to the August 20 raid of Buddhist pagodas?"

Coup reports have been endemic to the Vietnam situation for at least 3 years; their frequency increased in the period of tensions between the GVN and Buddhists leaders. The U.S. Government has regularly sought—even at the highest levels—to evaluate the credibility of such reports.

The coup d'etat of November 1, 1963, was a thoroughly Vietnamese affair. Although we were well aware of increasing Vietnamese dissatisfaction with repressive measures taken by the Diem regime and had received reports of various coup plottings, we had not reached a determination on the basis of available information as to whether any of these reports would prove to be correct.

2. "When the decision was made to curtail U.S. economic and military assistance to the Diem regime, was consideration given to the effect such action might have in encouragaging the military to perpetrate a coup?"

Following the visit of Secretary McNamara and General Taylor to Vietnam, certain of our aid programs were put under review. The purpose of these actions was to carry out President Kennedy's declared policy of

support for those things that furthered the war effort against the Communists and of opposition to those things that impeded the war effort; and to indicate to President Diem the increasingly urgent need to use our aid more effectively and to take measures to regain the dangerously waning support of his own people in order to pursue the war effort successfully. To be sure, our aid curtailment involved a calculated risk that our actions might encourage coup plotters. Given the circumstances, however, this was a risk that we were obliged to accept in the light of the greater risk that the war would be lost if we took no action.

3. "How can our policies toward the ruling junta in South Vietnam be squared with our policies toward ruling juntas in the Dominican Republic and Honduras?"

There is little similarity between the situation we face in Vietnam, where an active war against communism is in progress, and that prevailing in Latin America, where our relationships are influenced by our commitments as a member of the Organization of American States.

The Revolutionary Council in South Vietnam displaced an increasingly authoritarian regime; it has committed itself to free elections, religious liberty, a free press, and constitutional government. The new Cabinet is essentially civilian in composition; it is made up of 11 civilians and 4 military personnel. In addition, the Revolutionary Council has established a "Council of Sages" which will act as an advisory group in the political field. Martial law has been lifted, the press has been given greater freedom, and the curfew restrictions have been ended. Immediately after the coup all Buddhist prisoners and most other non-Communist political prisoners were released.

On the other hand, the coup d'etat in the Dominican Republic involved the overthrow of President Juan Bosch who had been elected President by the Dominican people in December 1962. These elections were remarkably free of violence and fraud, according to OAS observers. As the constitutionally elected President, Bosch had the full support of the U.S. Government. He had been in office only 7 months when his administration was overthrown by a military coup on September 25, 1963. On October 4, Secretary of State Rusk stressed the importance of representative democracy in the attainment of the goals of the Alliance for Progress and as a requirement for normalization of relations between our two countries. As reported by the President in two recent news conferences, we have been in consultation with authorities in the Dominican Republic with a view toward their taking steps to bring about more representative government which would enable the United States to reconsider its position on nonrecognition. To date, these conversations have not yielded results that would make it possible to reconsider our position.

In the case of Honduras, the military deposed a civilian representative government which had been in office since December 1957, and under which there had been substantial progress, particularly since the initiation of the Alliance for Progress. The military action was taken to prevent the elections scheduled for October 13, 1963.

As you may know, in his statement of October 4, 1963, Secretary Rusk pointed out that the events in the Dominican Republic and Honduras had created a situation in which there is no opportunity for effective cooperation with the United States under the Alliance for Progress or for normalization of diplomatic relations.

We are now engaged in an extensive dialog with the principal elements in Honduras in order to develop a reasonable basis for restoring normal relations.

4. "Is it not the policy of the United States to extend asylum to save those whose lives are in danger? Why was Ngo Dinh Can surrendered to the military after the Diem-Nhu experience?"

When an individual is granted refuge in an American Embassy or consulate, he is not released until adequate assurances have been received regarding his personal safety. In the case of Ngo Dinh Can, Vietnamese authorities gave assurances to Ambassador Lodge guaranteeing Can's physical safety and promising to deal with him "legally and juridically." On the basis of these assurances Can willingly departed from the American consulate in Hue and was flown to Saigon in an American military aircraft, where he was released to Vietnamese authorities.

5. "Did Ambassador Lodge go to Vietnam with any instructions which might have made him sympathetic to a coup attempt?"

Ambassador Lodge did not go to Vietnam with any instructions to show sympathy toward a coup attempt.

6. "What effect will these developments in Vietnam and U.S. involvement in the coup have on our allies in SEATO, in Europe, and most particularly in Central and South America?"

So far, all of our allies in SEATO and in Europe, as well as in Central and South America, have shown a positive response to the assurances that the new regime in South Vietnam will strive to set up a democratic form of government. Some of these countries recognized the new government before the United States did, and almost each day brings official statements of recognition from other countries which recognized the preceding government in Vietnam.

7. "Is there any evidence that the CIA and the DIA might have been working at cross purposes, with one of the agencies favoring a coup and the other opposing?"

No.

8. "Does there not seem indeed to be a need for a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence to look into these matters?"

The Department of State has previously expressed its views on this matter. In our judgment, recent events in Vietnam provide no basis for altering these views.

I hope that this information will be of assistance to you. Please let me know if we can be of further help on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
*Assistant Secretary.*

Concerning the situation in Vietnam itself, I regret to see that recent developments tend to confirm the fears I expressed in early November after the military coup and brutal assassination of President Diem.

My major concern at that time was that the new military government in Vietnam, by its initial acts of violence, had jeopardized its chances of obtaining the broad popular support so necessary if it is to rule effectively and carry forward the campaign against the Vietcong.

Let me assure those of my colleagues who have expressed to me their own concern over this issue that the Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific of the House Foreign Affairs Committee will continue to study the situation in Vietnam. In that regard, the subcommittee will, from time to time, hold hearings beginning tomorrow with 2 days of executive hearings. It is my hope that the testimony received in these hearings ultimately can be made public.

As in the past, press comments on Vietnam are conflicting. There does seem, however, to be rising criticism of the policies of the new military government. Therefore, I requested permission to include articles from the Milwaukee Journal, the Washington Star, the Washington Post, and the New York Times at this point in the RECORD and commend them to my colleagues:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Dec. 6, 1963]

DICTATORSHIP LIVES ON

When the Vietnamese regime of Ngo Dinh Diem was overthrown, people danced in the streets of Saigon. The jails were emptied and political prisoners who had been held and tortured for months and even years rejoined their families and friends. To most it seemed like the dawn of a new era.

But the jails are fast filling up again. The new regime, backed strongly by a section of the military, has been making numerous and arbitrary arrests. People are being seized without warning and held without charge. Under Diem, most prisoners were allowed visitors twice a week. Under the new regime, visitors are not allowed.

Some arrests were to be expected. Some are usually necessary when a junta ousts a regime—for those who remain loyal to the old regime could be dangerous to the new. But what troubles the Vietnamese people and foreigners is that the new regime doesn't even pretend to follow any rule of law. It just jails people—without formal charge, without chance of obtaining a lawyer, without any opportunity for defense. And most arrests are purely political.

In the meantime little progress is being made by the Government in its attempt to rid the countryside of Communist guerrillas. The Communists have increased their activity and have won several recent engagements. The new Government seems chiefly interested in keeping itself in power. It has taken no steps to liberalize itself or to plan for elections as it had promised. The hopes that were so high after the fall of Diem are all but gone. Tragedy is still the fate of the Vietnamese.

---

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 8, 1963]

IRONY IN VIETNAM

Last month, when President Diem and Mr. Nhu were brutally slain in South Vietnam's military coup, there was much talk among the starry-eyed about a new birth of freedom and a new birth of democratic order. Well, let us take note of the realities: (1) There is continuing tension in Saigon and surrounding areas. (2) There is continuing political repression. And (3) there is continuing danger of a great internal blowup. Supporting evidence includes the fact that hundreds of individuals are being held as political prisoners under grim conditions. And the grisly rite of self-immolation still goes on.

The so-called Buddhists, of course, are happy. Mr. Diem is dead. Mr. Nhu is dead. And Madam Nhu, whose sharp tongue has sometimes spoken truths that should have been listened to more attentively, is in exile. But the affair is not ended. Trouble and intrigue still plague South Vietnam, and few things could be more foolish than to shrug off that fact. Ironically enough, the day may come when the Diem regime will be remembered as a relatively enlightened one.

---

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 7, 1963]

NEW VIETNAM MESS RISING

(By Marguerite Higgins)

President Johnson is faced with a new and ugly mess in Vietnam. And it is going to become increasingly to light despite the apparent determination of some American officials in Saigon to brush it under the rug.

The newest situation causing concern is the police terror that the military junta has launched, and that has already reached hundreds of hapless Vietnamese. They have

been thrown into jail without notification to their families, without benefit of lawyers, without even being told the charges against them.

With few exceptions, the only apparent reason is the suspicion that the imprisoned Vietnamese did their duty in carrying out, prior to the coup, the orders of the then duly constituted authority, the late President Diem. In a word, they had been loyal.

On a tour of Vietnam in November, this reporter talked to a half dozen persons who had lost relatives to the military junta's jails. And such was the atmosphere of fear, that in every single case, this reporter was asked not to write about it, until she was out of Vietnam.

ISN'T HELPING MAN

Quite apart from the principles involved, the junta's wave of political repression isn't helping the war against the Vietcong. For the persons loyal to Diem were—like their chief—deeply committed to fighting the war against the Communists.

A case in point is the chief of Quangnai Province in north central Vietnam, Nguyon Van Tat, who has been fired and jailed. But look at Mr. Tat's record. In 18 months as province chief, he turned Quangnai, which for 20 years had been overwhelmingly pro-Communist, into a model and prosperous area in which the peasant population joined the military in beating off Communst attacks.

At the height of the Buddhist crisis last summer, the leaders of the Quangnai pagoda approached Mr. Tat and informed him that the Buddhist leaders at the Xaloi pagoda in Saigon had ordered them to go on a 72-hour hunger strike. The local Buddhists added, that while they had nothing against Mr. Tat, they could not very well disobey an order from their religious higher-ups in Saigon.

AIDED HUNGER STRIKERS

After a hurried conference with Maj. John Kelly, American sector adviser in Quangnai, Mr. Tat told the Buddhists that while he regretted their determination to go on a hunger strike, he would do everything possible to make their experience as painless as possible. With Major Kelly's help, he brought in blankets, fruit juices, and medical attendants. And the hunger strike went off without incident in Quangnai city hall, where Mr. Tat had made arrangements for the comfort of the Buddhists.

In a country starved for good administrators, Mr. Tat's purge scarcely seems in the national interest of Vietnam.

Many of the firings and purges has been based on hysterical denunciations in the newly "friend" Vietnamese press, or even on plain rumor. This seems to have been largely true in the case of Ngo Dinh Can, the elder brother of President Diem.

Mr. Can was handed over to Vietnamese authorities even though he sought refuge at the American consulate at Hue, and even though English-speaking persons heard the American consul promise Mr. Can that the American Embassy would "assure him his safety."

When a Catholic priest got William Truehart, deputy chief of mission, out of a dinner party to ask why the promise had not been kept, he was told there had "been a misunderstanding." But there has been a curious silence on the part of the Embassy concerning the military junta's promise to assure Mr. Can of "due process of law." At the end of November, Mr. Can had not yet seen charges against him, and the American Embassy had shown no visible sign of trying to pressure the junta into living up to its word.

QUERY U.S. SILENCE

There are many Vietnamese who ask why the Embassy and the State Department, who were so vocal about Mr. Diem, have been so quiet about the newest wave of repressions.

This is a question that President Johnson is entitled to press—even if it is embarrassing to those Americans in Saigon and Washington who feel a certain sense of responsibility for the military junta because it is in power by their encouragement.

Indeed, in leaving Vietnam, this reporter gained the impression that the three persons most anxious for the coup d'etat—Ambassador Lodge, Under Secretary of State Harriman, and Far Eastern Assistant Secretary of State Roger Hilsman—had unleashed forces that are turning out far different than they foresaw.

One thing is clear. The American image in Asia is not going to profit from a kind of double standard that helps get rid of one government in the name of ending police repression and then stays silent as the new government invokes the same tactics.

---

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 8, 1963]

PERSECUTION OF CATHOLICS VEXES SAIGON

SAIGON, December 7.—Reports of anti-Catholic persecution and Communist agitation among students today were causing serious concern to the new South Vietnamese Government.

The Roman Catholic newspaper Living Religion said that 600 Catholics in northern Quang Nam province were terrorized and six arrested and tortured since the November 1 coup that ousted the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

At the same time, reports from all over the country said authorities were worried about Communist subversion among students.

The Catholic newspaper said Catholics were afraid to go to mass and were taking down altars in their own homes. Catholics are outnumbered five to one by the majority Buddhist population.

It also said that a Catholic leader has been arrested and others have been forced to attend indoctrination courses. At the same time, rumors were spread that Catholic priests kept guns and that Catholics had planned to murder Buddhists before the coup.

---

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 8, 1963]

DINH ENDS VIET TOUR IN TRIUMPH

HOI AN, SOUTH VIETNAM, December 7.—In this remote coastal town, the man who is fast becoming South Vietnam's most popular figure made a spectacular finish today to his stumping tour of villages and hamlets near the Communist border.

His swashbuckling manner captivated villagers. His words came through forcefully. He answered catcalls with a joke. Students paraded him on their shoulders.

Some saw potential danger in him; others said he is just what South Vietnam needs.

He is Maj. Gen. Ton That Dinh, 37, a leader of the coup that toppled the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem in November.

Dinh gave his final speech of the tour from a balcony at provincial headquarters in Hoi An, 150 miles southeast of the Communist North Vietnamese border.

PARADING ENDS TALK

Finishing with his characteristic flurry of gestures, Dinh stood back as 5,000 students burst into cheers. Then the students charged up the steps, hoisted him to their shoulders and carried him off.

As he passed through the crowd, he called out:

"I am not a politician as some of you newsmen seem to think."

But the fact is that this boyish-looking military officer is emerging as the strongest national figure in Vietnam.

Since the deaths of President Diem and his brother Nhu, the country has been under the control of a revolutionary junta headed by Maj. Gen. Duong Van Minh and Maj. Gen. Tran Van Dong.

In the junta, Dinh is a second vice chairman, Minister of Security, and commander of the Vietnamese 3d Army Corps.

He led the army units that stormed Diem's palace during the coup and is credited with engineering the revolt, despite the fact he had served as the military governor of Saigon under Diem and Nhu during the Buddhist religious crisis.

QUESTIONED ABOUT NHU

During his speech at Hoi An, a handful of students heckled him on his relationship with Nhu. One shouted:

"You supported Nhu before the revolution, but then you overthrew him. Why?"

Dinh beamed and replied: "Changing circumstances require changing actions."

At Quang Tri near the Communist border, Dinh strode through a wildly cheering crowd without guards or security and mounted a platform. Students grabbed him and put a garland of flowers around his neck.

"One of the most fatal mistakes the Diem regime made was that it did not have any contact with the people. We mean to change that," he said

American military advisers, who watched some of Dinh's speechmaking, were startled, and reactions were mixed.

"What the hell is this?" one said. "This man can whip up a crowd to anything. I think it's dangerous."

But another American adviser said, "It's like the shrewd politicians who used to stump the American countryside. This is exactly what's needed here, and I'm all for General Dinh."

Rumors have circulated recently that a split had developed between Dinh and Minh and Dong. There is no open evidence of a split, and Dong and Dinh often are seen together at Saigon night spots.

Nevertheless, Dinh's power and prestige have surged upward since the coup, and it is doubtful the junta would do anything at this point to oppose him.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 8, 1963]

SAIGON FACES CRITICAL BATTLES—THERE IS NO CERTAINTY NEW REGIME CAN ROUT COMMUNIST GUERRILLAS

(By Hedrick Smith)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, December 7.—This is time of flux and uncertainty in Vietnam when the only sure thing is the critical state of the war against the Communists in the rich and fertile farmlands of the Mekong River Delta rolling south from Saigon.

There is little disagreement here that the war in the delta is in serious shape—more serious than officials in Washington have let on—and that during the next gruelling 6 months the new Government faces an uphill struggle simply to regain initiative.

Nor is there any doubting that the generals who deposed President Ngo Dinh Diem have inherited an incredibly difficult task. Several Americans who work and travel regularly in the delta claim that if there had been no coup, virtually the entire area outside of the provincial centers would have slipped into Vietcong hands by spring.

In the months before the coup and in the 5 weeks since, Communist forces have grown more brazen and powerful. They attack more often in broad daylight. Their marauding units are larger, often company or battalion size.

CAPTURED WEAPONS

With the capture of U.S. weapons the Communists have proven more dangerous for American helicopters—the weapons once expected to give anti-Communist forces uncontestable advantage over the guerrillas. Now rare is the day when helicopters flying combat missions in the delta do not report their

planes have been hit by Communist groundfire.

The situation in the delta stems largely from the cumulative effect of a year of neglect and bad military tactics and Diem's political interference with the military. At the same time the Vietcong have built up a steady progression of strength and have extended their popular influence with a propaganda compaign which was more than a match for the Government.

This has created a vicious circle of problems for the Government now. "We have the problem of convincing the people that the Government will win this contest," one U.S. Army adviser said. "Until we do we won't have good military intelligence. Until we have good intelligence we won't have good military operations. And if we don't have them we con't convince people that we will win."

Many Americans hoped the impact of the November coup and the prospect of more responsive government would help break this cycle. Some feel the generals now ruling South Vietnam have so far failed to capitalize adequately on the popular good will generated by their coup.

But even now in Saigon and in provincial cities the new Government is well received. The high crest of enthusiasm has abated but the honeymoon period is not yet over. There is still a widespread sense of relief that the oppressive Diem regime is gone.

The change in the National Government has meant most to the people in areas where austere and often corrupt local officials of the Diem regime have been removed. This has given the coup immediate impact to the peasants. For this reason the new regime has steadily been replacing all province and district chiefs despite the inevitable disruptive impact on the Government machinery of such a move.

MOVES TO FREEDOM

More important, however, is that the widespread sense of oppression under Diem has eased. The new Government has gradually moved toward political and religious freedoms.

The press and former opposition politicians have emerged from hibernation or rigid control to test the freedoms guaranteed by the new junta. Admittedly these have only been the first baby steps toward democracy but, as one Westerner put it, "the people don't want politics they just want to breathe."

About 400 officials and businessmen closely connected with the Ngo family have been arrested since the coup. But most Westerners have been surprised at the new Government's restraint and the absence of a vindictive bloodbath. Of those arrested about half have been released, a few charged and roughly 200 are still under detention.

Although some arrests have undoubtedly been made to settle political accounts and most are illegal in the Anglo-Saxon sense, Saigon is not cringing from a reign of terror nor do the people complain of police state tactics. Arrests have been publicized and the treatment of political prisoners is far more humane than under the Diem regime which had 18 different security apparatuses seizing people at any time of the day or night.

If anything, Saigon's current malaise is uncertainty about the Government's future course. The power of President Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, was so pervasive that the new power structure is filling the political vacuum slowly.

AT THE TOP

The generals have added to the uncertainty by their own bickering and indecisiveness. Only last week the junta decided to shift three top field commanders and reversed itself within 24 hours. Some administrative agencies seem almost paralyzed awaiting orders "from the top."

But there have been encouraging signs. Americans are convinced that there is a far greater awareness of the difficulties of war than under Diem, greater candor in discussing problems and more willingness to heed American advice.

"The price in blood is now much greater than it would have been a year ago," one American military adviser remarked grimly. "The great unanswerable question is whether the new Government leaders are aware and are willing to accept the price it takes to win the war."

---

## THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks 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, on November 25, the day our beloved President John F. Kennedy was buried in Arlington Cemetery, memorial services were held in the synagogues and churches throughout the land. The overwhelming grief of our people was reflected in the words spoken that day.

On November 25, 1963, at Congregation B'nai Jeshurun in New York City, the Honorable Charles H. Silver, president of the congregation, delivered a moving address at memorial services for John F. Kennedy. I include that address at this point in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER

Our land has endured an agonizing nightmare that even the most insane narrator of fiction could not conceive.

Unfortunately, it is no wild dream from which we can awake to comforting reality, nor a disturbing novel whose cover we can close with a sigh of relief.

Dark, indeed, is the glass through which we look back on the events of the past few days.

The President is dead. Even as we mourn the loss of America's first citizen, we lament, as well, the loss of a part of our national self-respect.

All we have left are the bitter dregs of our bereavement—a chance to examine the heartbreak and error of yesterday—the fault and sorrow today. Out of these, perhaps, we can somehow build a path to a brighter tomorrow.

But we must not forget. We must remember these things. We must remember these momentous days of dread and resolve—in the sight of our Creator—to make amends, to seek the truth, and, with sanity, justice, and mercy, to wipe this abomination from the blighted pages of history.

The first news came like a bolt from the sky. This, it truly was—shocking and numbing in its impact on people in their homes and offices—workers in factories and shops—children in their classrooms.

With moist eyes, unable to move from our television sets, we have watched, stunned and confounded by a series of unbelievable scenes, consumed by a sense of horror and disbelief.

As the original fact of the cowardly attack on our President struck home—and then struck again with the dreadful tidings of his death—the whole world came to a sudden shuddering halt. The crowded streets froze into screaming silence.

In every fearful heart there came a piercing grief, a pang of sorrow for Mrs. Kennedy and the children. In every city, freedom held its breath.

The day of infamy that was born in Dallas began to spread its darkness at noon across the tortured face of the earth.

From every farflung land, even from behind the Iron Curtain, where compassion seemed to have fled, there came a sound of sobbing. Humanity could not stem its tears.

The bleeding flesh of our heroic dead became a symbol of mankind's shame that civilization could breed the evil hand and eye that aimed that fatal shot.

Was this the terrible price of too much freedom?

Are the borders of constitutional protection too broad for those who despise our laws and desecrate our liberty?

Has our own lazy loyalty and indifferent Americanism played a part in this incredible pattern of events?

It is not easy to answer.

Our hearts are too heavy with the knowledge that our noble young warrior has been cut down in the prime of his days, in the very procession of his triumph, at the very beginning of his most notable achievements.

He can no longer lead us in the struggle for justice and decency. And yet, somehow, he leads us still.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy had a way of telling us his plans for the New Frontier that made the soul of America stand taller. There was deep conviction in his voice and intellectual authority in every glowing phrase.

His was a bold, uncompromising call to truth—a call to arms against injustice and oppression that keeps on ringing in our aching hearts.

We hear him yet. We see him as he stood before us, smiling, self-assured, and, oh, so tragically young. He is there—head high, waving to the cheering crowds, rushing forward to shake a friendly hand.

Such a man cannot be eliminated by a madman with a gun—no, nor by the madness that walks abroad in the world. Such a man lives in the hope of every citizen, growing with the growth of the great country he served, alive and indestructible in our memories of those few short years when his own stature grew to match those other great Americans to whose ideals John Kennedy devoted his life.

Time erects his monument and history will build it high. We weep that Israel has lost this cherished friend. We are outraged at the disgrace that befell our land and took away our leader.

But we are proud that our beloved President, in death as in life, stamped the profile of his magnificent courage across the conscience of mankind.

He asked not what his country could do for him. He asked only what he could do for his country—and no man could have done more.

On this untimely day of atonement, as we sit in the synagogue along with all the generations of Israel, we pay homage to our sacred dead.

We honor the image of his remembered glory, his wisdom, wit, and eloquence. Our spirit is warmed again by the fire that lighted his love of America.

In his name, let us resolve to strengthen the sinews of our national integrity, to protect the principles of liberty, justice, and equality for which he gave his life.

That is the greatest tribute we can pay our fallen hero in eternal gratitude for his ultimate sacrifice, while our hearts follow him, along with our fervent prayers, to that further New Frontier he is entering tonight.

Let us rise, beseeching eternal peace and the blessing of Almighty God, as we join in a minute of silent prayer, for the immortal soul of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States.

In the last paragraph of the last speech he ever wrote, he expressed some of this philosophy for himself, for his country, and for the world:

"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 for 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."

## THE AMERICAN BANKING SYSTEM: SUBJECT OF INTENSIVE STUDY AND DEBATE

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the American banking system has recently been the subject of intensive study and debate. Such groups as the Commission on Money and Credit, the Advisory Committee on Banking to the Comptroller of the Currency, the President's Committee on Financial Institutions, as well as several committees of Congress, have given serious attention to our financial structure both in its broader aspects and in detail. They have considered whether the dual banking system, with its complex of State and Federal laws and overlapping jurisdictions of State and Federal supervisory agencies, remains an effective mechanism for the allocation of capital and credit. They have addressed themselves to the question whether existing statutory and administrative restrictions upon banking—many of which have their origin in the economic collapse of the thirties—are suitable in the light of present-day conditions. They have examined the organization of the Federal agencies responsible for monetary regulation and the supervision of our banking institutions.

Out of these manifold inquiries have come many proposals for change. Some of the proposals are embodied in bills pending before committees of the Congress, others are not.

I do not intend to speak of the merits of these proposals. I will address myself instead to the circumstances which, in the opinion of many informed observers, have made legislative action upon the more far-reaching proposals—and even upon the more modest suggestions—unlikely, if not impossible at this time. These circumstances arise in the main out of sharp conflicts in policy among the various Federal banking supervisory agencies—conflicts further aggravated by the absence of procedures for consultation and coordination among these agencies. The absence of broad agreement within the banking industry upon the need for many of the proposals, or the form in which particular proposals should be cast, is a further factor inhibiting legislative action.

The proceedings of the American Bankers Association annual convention held in Washington during the week of October 7 revealed in harsh outline the conflicts in policy and approach on the part of the several Federal banking agencies exercising jurisdiction over major portions of the banking industry.

The Congress is not unfamiliar with inconsistent policies on the part of agencies of the same Federal Government, and conflicting aspirations on the part of segments of the same industry. Indeed, informed legislative action is built in large part upon judgments shaped by the clash of competing interests and contradictory views both within and outside the Government. However, Congress has a right to expect that agencies of the executive branch will ultimately compromise their differences so that the legislative branch may proceed with some assurance that its action is acceptable to those upon whom it relies for expert advice. There is no evidence at this time that such a consensus is even a remote possibility. On the contrary, the relationships among Federal agencies exercising coordinate or related jurisdiction over banking have deteriorated steadily. Inevitably, such deterioration has been accompanied by an unfortunate polarization of their policies on matters of vital importance to the banking community.

Intervention by the President, in my judgment, is long overdue. While, concededly, the President lacks direct control over some aspects of Federal monetary and banking regulation, the very substantial measure of control which he does have, together with the prestige of his office, afford a proper basis for his immediate action. The President, in my opinion, should designate a high ranking Federal official—perhaps an Undersecretary or Assistant Secretary of the Treasury—as the coordinator of relationships among all the Federal agencies concerned with bank regulation. These Federal agencies include the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, with jurisdiction over national banks; the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with jurisdiction over State-chartered member banks; the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, with jurisdiction over State-chartered insured nonmember banks; and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, with jurisdiction over federally chartered savings and loan associations and member State-chartered savings and loan associations. Also involved in banking regulation to a growing degree is the Department of Justice, which has advisory responsibilities to some of the agencies mentioned heretofore, as well as direct responsibility for the enforcement of the antitrust laws as they relate to banks. Finally, there is the Securities and Exchange Commission, which has recently asserted jurisdiction over certain of the fiduciary functions of banking institutions.

It should be the responsibility of the President's designee, in concert with the agencies concerned, to work out a detailed procedure for their continuing consultation, and for coordination of their major policies. That official should be responsible for seeing to it that the procedure so formulated is adhered to. It may well be that such action, if taken promptly and vigorously, will obviate in the long run any need for a drastic legislative overhaul of the structure of Federal banking supervision. In any event, intervention by the President would serve as a useful, indeed a necessary, interim measure to ameliorate existing discord, and to prevent further impairment in significant intragovernmental relationships. Most importantly, it would serve to end the present uncertainty in the banking industry and elsewhere as to whether the administration has a banking policy, and if so, what that policy really is.

## OUTLAW THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today resubmitted a bill which, if passed, will in effect outlaw the Communist Party of the United States. I have done so after over 2 years' careful study of the issues involved and because I believe that no other action, however well intended, will rid this country of the menace of an organization whose objective is the ultimate overthrow of our representative form of government.

Only a few days ago, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, in a speech before the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation had this to say about the Communist Party, U.S.A.:

We are at war with communism and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be. Here, in the United States, the cause of international communism is represented by the Communist Party, U.S.A.—a cunning and defiant subversive conspiracy which is financed, directed and controlled by the Kremlin. Its membership consists today of a hard core of revolutionary fanatics who are knowingly and eagerly subservient to the dictates of Moscow. The dupes, the dissidents and the faint of heart have long since been purged from the party's ranks. Today, the Communists are engaged in a vigorous campaign to divide and weaken America from within.

So spoke FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover about the Communist Party, U.S.A. He spoke only 2 weeks after the life of the President of the United States was taken by an avowed Communist.

It has now been over 2½ years since the Supreme Court upheld on June 5, 1961, the law creating the Subversive Activities Control Board which authorizes the Attorney General to require Communists to register.

Although some 20 cases have been initiated under the law, none of these cases has been culminated, and indeed

the probability that they will be effectively prosecuted becomes more remote with each passing day. Furthermore, a reading of the Supreme Court decision raises the distinct possibility that when the present proceedings reach the Supreme Court on appeal—another delay of 12 years—the Court may very well rule that the registration requirement is a violation of the fifth amendment and that Communists may not be forced to register. Indeed the Chief Justice, Mr. Earl Warren, in his dissenting opinion stated that "the act does constitute a violation of the fifth amendment."

It seems highly possible that all the efforts and cost now being directed toward the registration of members of the Communist Party may ultimately be of no avail; assuming the majority of the Court concurs with Chief Justice Warren, and this does not seem an unreasonable assumption today.

I am aware that some will say that a law to outlaw the Commuist Party, U.S.A., will merely result in the members of that party going "underground" or will merely result in the Communist Party adopting a different name to avoid the letter of the law.

I do not believe either of these arguments valid. So long as members fail to register they are already underground for all intents and purposes. And I do not mind in the least if we cause the members of the Communist Party some discomfort in having to select a new banner under which to parade.

I believe the time has come when we must call a spade a spade, and when we must recognize the Communist Party, U.S.A., for what it is in the words of the FBI Director "a cunning and defiant subversive conspiracy which is financed, directed, and controlled by the Kremlin." It does not deserve the cloak of legality. I urge its support of all Members for this bill and hope the Un-American Activities Committee of the House will hold hearings at the earliest feasible date.

## PROJECT HOPE

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, amid the jolting happenings of the past 2 weeks, few if any Americans have considered any events, other than those that have dealt with the untimely loss of the late President.

Though for most of us, the world stood still on that terrible Friday afternoon, the 22d day of November, and for many the day-to-day routine that encompasses us all is just now returning to normal, nevertheless events continued to happen in many places around the world.

On November 22, Dr. William B. Walsh, president of Project HOPE, announced that the teaching-training hospital ship SS *Hope* which began a medical mission to Guayaquil, Ecuador, on the 20th of this month, will visit the Republic of Guinea at the conclusion of its mission to Ecuador. The former U.S. hospital ship, staffed by more than 80 members of the medical profession who will remain with the vessel for the duration of her voyage, will be away from the United States for approximately 2 years. Most of the permanent staff is expected to serve aboard the *Hope* for the duration of its journey to Ecuador and Guinea, a tribute indeed to the selflessness and humanitarianism of this group of dedicated Americans who will be away from their families and friends until late in 1965.

With its forthcoming voyage to Guinea, the SS *Hope* will have visited three continents—Asia, South America, and Africa. In 1960 and 1961 the ship spent 12 months in Indonesia and South Vietnam, and last March she concluded a 10-month visit to Salaverry in northwestern Peru. As my colleagues well know, the *Hope* visits only those nations to which it has been invited, and Dr. Walsh has received invitations from more than 30 nations urging him to dispatch the hospital ship to other lands.

Of particular interest to us is the fact that the *Hope* arrived in Guayaquil, Ecuador, December 2 to begin a medical mission which is expected to last 10 months. Staffed by 83 physicians, dentists, nurses, nurse anesthetists, pharmacists, dental hygienists, dietitians, X-ray technicians, medical technicians, physical therapists, a Protestant minister, and a Catholic priest, the *Hope* will anchor off Guayaquil where she will be joined by an additional group of 30 American physicians and dentists who will work alongside the vessel's permanent staff for approximately 2 months until replaced by another complement of some 30 to 35 doctors. This group is the rotating staff and is comprised of top-flight members of the medical profession who serve without pay. The permanent staff members receive salaries far below what they could earn were they to practice their profession in the United States.

I recall the arrival of the SS *Hope* in Salaverry, Peru, last March. The "Hopies," as the staff have come to be called, quickly established outpatient clinics ashore, set up an examination and immunization program, and distributed milk to the children, many of whom had never tasted it before.

On the afternoon of February 28 of this year, 10 months after the ship's arrival in Salaverry, over 45,000 people stood where once there were but a dozen, waving farewell to the ship and the "Hopies." The ship had been decorated from stem to stern with garlands of flowers by the townspeople; bouquets of flowers and small gifts were placed in the hands of the departing "Hopies"; weeping mothers stood on the shore and thrust healthy infants, once sick, or undernourished, into the arms of the doctors and nurses who had made them well. As the ship began its journey northward, people wept unashamedly on the shore and a complete and deathly silence enveloped the crowd until the ship disappeared from view.

Such is the impact of the SS *Hope*.

This fine symbol of America's compassion for others began another medical mission this week and Americans everywhere may be proud of the selfless devotion of these "Hopies" who work tirelessly to bring medical teaching as well as care to those in need in the far-distant corners of the world.

## ACTION IN KENTUCKY

Mr. SNYDER. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the tragic murder of our former President and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the telegram sent by Associated Industries of Kentucky to the Kennedy family:

IN MEMORIAM—JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, 1917–1963; 35TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(The following telegram was sent to the Kennedy family at the White House.)

The members, officers, directors, and staff of Associated Industries of Kentucky join me in extending to the Kennedy family this expression of condolence in a trying hour.

Mr. Kennedy's untimely death, apparently at the hands of a Marxist, should bring home to all of us the dangers that lie in coddling the many appendages of this vile conspiracy, and it demonstrates convincingly where our Nation's real enemies are spawned.

That the Nation should thusly lose its President and you a beloved member of your family, is a matter of grief to us all.

WILLIAM M. HORN,
*President, Associated Industries of Kentucky.*

I further feel that the following front page editorial from the newspaper Action In Kentucky is worthy of the attention of all Members:

THE BITTER FRUIT OF APATHY

They have told us there is no danger from the radical left—that it is small and inconsequential. Only idiots, neurotics, and right-wing extremists worry about it.

They have aimed literary and personal venom in the direction of concerned conservatives. They have smeared their organizations and labeled the legitimate protest of insane policies as the Nation's biggest threat.

Today, John Fitzgerald Kennedy lies buried in Arlington Cemetery while a shocked Nation is joined by the rest of the civilized world in mourning, nostalgia, and chagrin.

The 35th President of the United States was brutally shot to death by a sniper on Friday, November 22, 1963—a new day of infamy.

The prime suspect was a leading propagandist for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. This is one of the many Marxist-oriented groups calmly ignored by those who withhold their pastoral and journalistic acid for use against organizations seeking less government, more responsibility, and a better world.

In the pattern of other organizations spawned by the left and protected by the "liberal" establishment, a tint of respectability has been provided from the cloistered stained glass windows of religious institutions—down to and including Louisville. And all the while, the "liberal press" looks the other way and damns their critics.

The bigotry of the big press has never been more evident. Had this evil deed been perpetrated by someone with conservative leanings, or even an infiltrator into some conserative group, is there any doubt what would have happened? The names of all conservative leaders and organizations would have been raked through the mud in the biggest guilt-by-association campaign in history. There would have been cries to "hang them all." The flood of anonymous phone calls had already started before Lee Harvey Oswald's apprehension.

Now that a Marxist leader of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and a member of the American Civil Liberties Union is implicated, a truly fair and impartial attitude would now dictate a similar probing analysis of the leftist network. Nothing like this is happening. It has been played down, willfully suppressed to the extent possible.

An investigation and listing of the names of Kentucky leaders who have lent their endorsement to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and similar fronts might be expected. But the voice of the monopoly press, so eager to use the names of conservatives in bad light, is woefully silent. Yet they are here and they are known.

The devious (or inept) minds of self-styled liberal writers and commentators and preachers have even managed to twist this thing into an equal preachment against groups trying to counter the force of the murderous left. Rather than calling for a recognition of right from wrong, they urge against such decision.

The Fair Play for Cuba Committee is but one left front to achieve a sort of misguided acceptance through such serpentine logic. Members of this group were behind the recent youth tour to Communist Cuba in defiance of the United States.

The same sorry crowd of beatnik types spent 2 spectacular days harassing the House Committee on Un-American Activities when it sought information about the odorous affair.

The incident smacked of earlier Communist-incited riots against the committee at San Francisco, which local seminary professors and liberal newspapers said were merely the vigorous expressions of healthful American youth. Meanwhile, the liberal rank and file, armed with cocktail glasses raised on high, were busy defending them at parties all over the better side of town.

The purpose of abusing this honorable arm of the Congress was identical in each instance—to discredit and destroy it if possible. This is in harmony with a standing policy of the Marxist conspiracy, which immediately got busy trying to disassociate itself from any connection with Lee Harvey Oswald.

Oswald's death at the hands of another killer on Sunday, November 24, like the death of the President, was tragic but not surprising except to those who have been closing their eyes and minds to the clear reality around them. Tragic in a different way—and for a different reason.

Conservatives in Louisville were predicting it would happen, for the purpose of silencing him and preventing a trial that would focus page 1 attention on a long string of Communist-supporting organizations that have been given silent and tolerant condonement by the establishment press.

For his defense, Oswald significantly had sought the help of a Communist-protecting New York attorney by the name of John Abt, whose own record in the evolution of the conspiracy in the United States is detailed in 13 different parts of James Burnham's revealing and almost suppressed book, "Web of Subversion." Especially pertinent information about his involvement in cell activity in his own apartment is delineated on pages 95 and 96. The ACLU was his second choice.

The Marxists and their fellow travelers had everything to gain from Oswald's death. The conservatives, along with the ordinary uninformed or misinformed American incensed at the Kennedy tragedy, at this point had everything to lose.

Oswald's death was therefore the logical expectation to anyone who has observed even casually the pattern of the Marxist mind in operation—all the way from semantics to murder. And it wouldn't do to have Oswald dispensed with by another identified Marxist or leftist. That would put things right back where they stood. It would have to be done by an untagged, unexpected, unaffiliated person.

His death came at the hands of a girlie-show operator, Jack Rubenstein, who was so well known to Dallas police and had offered free drinks to so many reporters that nobody bothered to check when he violated security and went to the basement of the Dallas jail. The buildup of Rubenstein as a good citizen is already well underway.

The shot that killed Oswald also killed the impact a national demonstration of the Marxists mind would have had on the American public during a spectacular trial in which every word would be weighed and evaluated. It undoubtedly shut off the flow of additional information about the leftist network that could have been brought to light in such a trial.

Fortunately, there is every indication that Federal, State, and local authorities are cooperating in a deeper probe to uncover as much related information as possible.

All this is not to imply that the murder of President Kennedy was part of a plot beyond the brain of one misguided individual. But it perfectly illustrates the eagerness with which establishment networks leap at every opportunity to castigate conservatives and protect, when they can get away with it, the agencies of the left.

Before Oswald was picked up, the insinuations were running fast, firm, and clear. In keeping with the best tenets of propaganda, they were repeated often.

Those who have been leaping at rash conclusions in the past, without any basis of fact, independent study or analysis, now have cause for self-examination. When people blindly respond to herd instinct and group opinion, as most middle-roaders do almost instinctively, they lend credence to the cause of the enemy.

This occurs when a vengeful public press gives only one side of a story and its gullible readers leap for the bait. I have seen it happen in Louisville frequently during the last 3 years, with "good people" using their tongues to mouth blind, unreasoned "planted opinion" while letting their brains take a protracted vacation.

It is a case of bitter irony indeed, that the late President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, declared there was practically no danger from the left. To the dismay of thoughtful and knowing conservatives, he ordered a major curtailment of FBI activities in the very area of our national shame that ultimately produced his brother's death.

Such mistaken judgment can occur on both ordinary and sophisticated levels—for leader and layman alike are subject to whim and to human error. Whatever motive may be ascribed, the cold figures reflect a 500-percent advance of Communist enslavement of people since World War II—without the use of a single Russian platoon. With American endorsement, in most cases, of policies that encouraged the development. Bad actions, based on bad advice, fostered this ignoble retreat from freedom.

Our late President went to his grave with an undelivered speech criticizing the very conservatives who have been warning about groups that foster Oswald-type thinking. It is now too late for John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Ignoring the real enemy while worrying about the real (although critical) friend, cost him his life. But it is not too late for our Nation to mend its erring ways of abandoning God, helping the enemy, and punishing those who evidence genuine concern about the collectivist spiral which threatens to engulf us all.

The memory of this handsome, energetic young man, struck down at the peak of his career, should remind us again of the price of national apathy. The only thing extreme about those who have been sounding the clarion call about the Marxist apparatus is that they have been, and remain today, extremely right.

While the Nation prays for its departed leader, let it also pray that our pulpit, press and national policy will reap some germ of truth and understanding from this disaster. This is expecting a great deal—this opening of closed minds. Especially powerful prayers seem to be in order from those men of the pen and the cloth who preach doctrines of peace and understanding, while simultaneously advancing such evil conglomerations as the leftwing apparatus that produced an Oswald.

Out of the Nation's mourning may come a new dedication. And from it may flow a victory for freedom, for God, and for the awakening Republic. Let us work to that noble end.

---

## HERBERT H. LEHMAN

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, the Nation has lost a great political leader and statesman. Herbert H. Lehman will be sorely missed. Devoting his life to good causes, he fought consistently for principle and for practicing the ideals of our democracy. Governor Lehman's distinguished career has been noted in editorials and articles throughout the country.

I include in the RECORD editorials from the New York Post and the New York World-Telegram and Sun:

[From the New York Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

HERBERT LEHMAN: A PROFILE IN COURAGE

John F. Kennedy, in July of this year, designated 31 recipients of the Presidential Medal of Freedom—the highest honor a President can bestow for peactime service to the country. One of those selected for such distinguished recognition was Herbert H. Lehman; the awards were to be presented this weekend.

It is a cruel accident of history that neither Mr. Kennedy nor Mr. Lehman will be present when the ceremony is held.

Herbert Lehman will be remembered with affection and esteem for many things. What is perhaps most memorable is the extent to which his fighting spirit grew and his convictions deepened with the passage of time.

He was an able, enlightened Governor who carried forward the spirit of humane government—he called it government with a heart—that had pervaded the Smith and Roosevelt eras in Albany. A reserved man with no special gift of oratory and a congenital dislike for demagogy, he was nevertheless elected Governor four times—more often than any other man in the annals of the State. His quiet, sometimes hesitant voice communicated both a sense of compassion and integrity that confounded the

political rabblerousers. The son of a wealthy man, his concern for the dispossessed was never patronizing.

After Albany came his leadership of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—a post in which all the human debris of a war-ravaged world became his burden.

He was 71 when he was elected to the Senate in 1949; a record of large achievement was already written, and this seemed destined to be the serene twilight of a life of distinction. Instead it produced his finest hours and when, it might be said, he crossed the bridge from virtue to greatness. It was in those hours that he met the critical test tha places him in the company of Norris, La Follette, and others in that small band of Senate figures who have dared to stand almost alone against the furies of the day.

The portent was there during his Senate campaign. In that interval Cardinal Spellman issued his lamentable assault on Mrs. Roosevelt over the aid-to-education bill. Most of the local politicos suffered acute political lockjaw; Herbert Lehman rose to Mrs. Roosevelt's defense in dignity and solitude. There were those who said he had committed political suicide, but the electorate had a larger wisdom.

In Washington, almost at the moment of Lehman's arrival, the age of McCarthy began. Cowardice and evasion dominated the Senate; Lehman refused to be intimidated. In the summer of 1953, many Senate liberals, in a dubious effort to affirm their own patriotism, sponsored a so-called anti-Communist bill more damaging to the Bill of Rights than any legislation McCarthy had proposed. Herbert Lehman, with Estes Kefauver, stood up defiantly, declaring:

"I will not betray the people of my State in order to cater to the mistaken impression some of them hold. * * * My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult. I shall cast my vote for the liberties of our people.

Lehman's passion for freedom had been abundantly revealed in these trials; his dedication to equal rights was the other major preoccupation of his Senate career, and again he was ahead of his time. Long before the civil rights movement had won political allies in many high places, Lehman was fighting the battle for effective legislation to end the degradation of second-class citizenship and give American Negroes the equity and equality so many of them had so long been denied.

Finally, when he decided in 1956 that he could no longer meet the physical ordeal of conscientious Senate service, he returned to New York. Again it was assumed that his political lifetime was nearly over; instead he plunged with implausible fervor into the Democratic reform movement and became, with Mrs. Roosevelt, not merely its spiritual leader but a street-corner activist. Who will ever forget the pictures of him pounding the hot pavements of a sweltering summer for the Wagner reform ticket that eventually staged one of the unforgettable upsets in our political annals? Perhaps the reform crusade was the hardest effort of all; it required open conflict with machine men Lehman had long known, and he was a sentimental man. But he did not shrink from it, and his example stirred the conscience of a city.

And so, until the day he died, Herbert Lehman was fighting the good fight for the basic American decencies.

His voice and his name were identified with a thousand efforts to help those born less fortunate than himself, to safeguard our tradition of freedom, to fulfill the dream of the Emancipation Proclamation.

He was never a thunderer, but his voice was heard; he was a gracious man, even in dealing with his adversaries, but he could fight hard and resolutely for the things in which he deeply believed; he was blessed with humility, but he scorned obsequiousness; he knew there were times when compromises were inevitable, but his incorruptibility was always clear. He endured personal tragedy with gallantry and stoicism.

Above all, he imparted a quiet nobility to all the causes he espoused, and to the lives of all who knew him. For his wife and others close to him there can only be the consolation that he lived long enough to become not merely a beloved resident of New York, but a revered citizen of the world.

---

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, Dec. 6, 1963]

LEGACY OF DECENCY

Herbert H. Lehman leaves a rich political legacy.

He was warm and human in a field where it is sometimes easy to become aloof and imperious.

Veteran reporters remember him for his availability, his constant willingess to talk, even when under attack. Voters remember his folksy approaches on streetcorners and sidewalks.

He was decent, a fine person, with honest instincts—and politics can so easily compromise such instincts. There was never a breath of scandal attached to him.

He was a humanitarian. This spirit was stamped on every piece of legislative progress he touched, particularly in his later years as a Senator in Washington.

He was very serious, especially about the various offices he held. Some said he was so serious he was stuffy and humorless. But that's overstating it.

He was unique. He succeeded Governor Roosevelt when the latter went to the White House. From then until December 1942, he was Governor. He resigned after such an unprecedented time in office to take a Federal position as director of relief for wartorn Europe.

He later continued such humanitarian work with the U.N. He returned to political office in 1949, when he was elected Senator.

He was a fighter. He fought Tammany Hall on the streets of New York and he won. He fought to keep Mayor Wagner in office and he won.

He fought in the U.S. Senate for the causes he believed in. These causes always had humanitarian overtones.

Yet he was not born to politics. He came from a wealthy background and enjoyed working for a Wall Street banking house. He shunned the kind of politicking he eventually grew accustomed to.

For a man who was such a reluctant politician, he succeeded marvelously.

Mr. Speaker, Joseph Wershba of the New York Post has written with deep feeling of the lasting mark which Herbert H. Lehman has left. I include his excellent article at this point in the RECORD.

[From the New York Post, Dec. 8, 1963]

HERBERT LEHMAN: THE MARK HE LEFT

(By Joseph Wershba)

And now he joins Eleanor Roosevelt.

Like Mrs. Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman had his roots in well-to-do, upper middle class society. He could easily have led the quiet, contented, gracious life.

But even after he was 80 years old, he was walking the boardwalk of Coney Island under broiling summer sun or touring street corner rallies on cold, rainy, windswept autumn nights, exhorting his fellow citizens to drive out bossism and vote for reform.

The exertions did not wear him down. They kept him young in heart till the last moment.

If he had been a conservative standpatter all his life, it would not have occasioned much surprise. If he had spent the days of his years pursuing his business and augmenting his wealth, people would have marked him a success and given him the respect due his station.

But like Eleanor Roosevelt and her husband before her, Herbert Lehman was living witness that economic determinism often falls apart when applied to human personality: Poor people are not always radical and rich people are not always conservative. Sometimes, the greatest ideologues for the advancement of the underprivileged may have risen from the class of the favored few.

Herbert Lehman was not an ideologue, a theorist or a creative thinker. He was an activist, a doer.

In one of the greatest moments of his country's peril—the period of McCarthyism almost triumphant—Herbert Lehman stood virtually alone among public officials in fighting McCarthy head on. That is his greatest glory.

Herbert Lehman sought to save his country from going down the dark road, and his example served as a rallying point for millions of his fellow countrymen who finally found their tongues. And that is the greatest mark he leaves in history.

The journalists and historians say Herbert Lehman was a colorless man and they are probably right—in terms of "public image." Search the thousands of clippings on his 50 years of public life; search the hundreds of pages of his biography by Allan Nevins. There are hardly any anecdotes. There is hardly any "color."

He had dignity. He had self-respect. He had respect for others. That was his color.

He had all the material prospects of life for himself and his family and he did what he could to improve the living conditions of millions of human beings at home and abroad. That, too, was his color.

The older people would lean out to touch him as he came amongst them on his Manhattan campaigning for the reform movement; they'd lift their hats or comment solicitously that he looked well that day—or maybe that he wasn't looking as well as the last time. This was a patriarch who moved among them. And on them he had left his mark of 50 years of service.

He left his mark, too, on various sections of the middle class, including the upper portion which was persuaded by his example to accept liberalism as a fundamental way of American life. As a banker, he was a bulwark of American capitalism. He believed without question in the merits of free enterprise. He was a millionaire, many times over. Yet withal he was the essence of modern-day liberalism.

In his years as Governor of New York, his liberalism was embodied in a broad program of social reform. Every worker who loses his job today and is tided over a while with unemployment insurance has Herbert Lehman to thank in part. Every elderly person who draws public benefits and assistance today, has Herbert Lehman to thank in part. Every worker and employer who have been able to settle their differences before the State labor relations board—instead of by lockout or strike—also owe Herbert Lehman a debt—and many other advances, like public housing—are some of the marks he left.

In his World War II years as director of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), Lehman fed and clothed as many European civilians as he could—despite the enormous problem of international suspicions. There was always a huge monkey wrench in the machinery—but many Europeans alive today have Herbert Lehman to thank. And that too is a mark he left.

All these are important legacies of a man. And yet, one keeps coming back to his later years for the marks that will last the longest. It was after he became a Senator, a man in his seventies, that he threw himself into the great struggles of the day—and became the conscience of liberalism in public office.

He fought for civil rights for the Negro. He fought for liberalized immigration laws. He fought against the tidelands oil giveaway. He fought those who wanted to expand the Korean war into a certain thermonuclear World War III. He had to defend himself against the know-nothing charges that he was a Communist in disguise.

And always the fight against McCarthyism. He was not the only voice against the McCarthyites in those terror-reigning days of 1953–54 when the junior Senator from Wisconsin had browbeaten most of Washington into silence. But always, on the floor of the Senate, there was Herbert Lehman.

And then the period in which he is most vividly remembered—as the active partner of Eleanor Roosevelt in spearheading the reform movement within the Democratic Party of New York City. There were many victories in that fight: Robert Wagner taking on Tammany and Carmine DeSapio—and winning; DeSapio defeated by a reformer for district leadership; DeSapio losing a second time in his comeback attempt; reform Democrats victorious in a number of local elections.

The reformation of the Democratic Party in New York City is another mark of Herbert Lehman. Whether it will be a lasting one never really depended on him anyway. He and Mrs. Roosevelt gave it their blessings and their fullest effort—but the staying quality of a reform depends on the newcomers who take over. And they will always have the Lehman-Roosevelt example to remind them that what is hard earned must be hard kept.

Herbert Lehman could just as easily have been a Republican instead of a Democrat. It was an accident of history that his father and uncle had settled in the South, where they became Democrats, instead of in the North, where they most likely would have allied themselves with the Republican Party.

The Lehman brothers came from Germany in the 1860's and settled in Montgomery, Ala. They supported the Confederacy during the Civil War, then moved to New York after the war was over. The joys of history are never more rewarding than when it produces such ironies as a father in Montgomery supporting the Confederacy, followed by a son in New York who would be one of the leaders in the movement for Negro rights a century later.

The German Jews who migrated to America in the 1840's allied themselves, in the main, with the Republican liberal tradition that stretched from Lincoln to Theodore Roosevelt. In the case of Herbert Lehman, his political background was Democratic. But over and above the party consideration, his outlook was in the liberal tradition.

Lehman did not merely inherit a tradition of liberalism and good works. He developed it. He opened his eyes to the less affluent world outside his door and he saw there were children and parents in the Lower East Side who would not share in the bounty of America unless people like himself helped them. He always said that the person who did the most to show him the social problem was Lillian D. Wald, of Henry Street Settlement fame. They had been brought together by a member of the Jacob H. Schiff family in the 1890's. Lehman became an ardent volunteer worker with the Henry Street Settlement—and that, too, is one of the marks he leaves.

He and his wife Edith had three adopted children—and their feeling for children never left them. It was Lehman who gave the Children's Zoo at Central Park. That, too, is a lasting Lehman mark.

In his last year, Lehman was deeply disturbed by the rise of rightwing movement in America. He sensed their essentially anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, anti-Negro, anti-liberal nature. He saw them as a revival of American style fascism and he warned that they were a new peril to the freedom of this Nation. That warning, too, is a mark Herbert Lehman left.

How sum up this kindly, courteous, persistent, gallant—and "colorless" man?

"He was a great American and noble Jew who combined in his life and works the thunder for justice and the love of his people reminiscent of the prophets of Jewish history," says Rabbi Joachim Prinz.

And perhaps that is the lasting mark left by Herbert Henry Lehman, 1878–1963.

Mr. Speaker, during his years in the U.S. Senate, Senator Herbert H. Lehman became popularly known as the conscience of the Senate. The columnist, William V. Shannon, writing in the New York Post of December 6, describes the Senate years of Herbert H. Lehman. His discerning article follows:

[From the New York Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

SENATE YEARS

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—Herbert Lehman was a pilgrim who never stopped seeking the good society.

He early learned that cleverness and political guile were not his forte. A native wisdom told him that, when in doubt, he should trust to his own instinctive reactions. He made of his integrity a shining shield that enabled him to go unafraid and uncompromised into scores of angry controversies. He had the enormous strength and durability that come from a serene conscience and an open, uncomplicated response to life.

Those of us who cover Washington met him late in his pilgrimage. We did not at first expect that we would be witnesses to some of its most exciting and meaningful episodes. It was just this season of the year in 1949 when Herbert Lehman arrived as a freshman Senator having just defeated John Foster Dulles in an unexpectedly bitter campaign. Lehman thought his victory had put all harsh emotions behind him, and he looked forward to constructive work in the company of the sober, thoughtful men he expected his fellow Senators would be. But the rancor and innuendo of that campaign were the true harbingers of his 7 stormy years in Washington.

Lehman had few opportunities to achieve positive accomplishments. Almost all of his energies had to be expended in combating folly, rebutting bigotry and reaffirming basic principles.

No one in the press gallery anticipated this Horatio-like role for the new Senator. He was 71, dignified, seemingly rather solemn, an ex-banker, and best-known as a competent, thrifty Governor. But in less than 3 months, Joe McCarthy began his rampage against the State Department.

Like many others in those early days, Lehman innocently believed McCarthy could be argued with and refuted with facts and logic.

At one point in an early debate, McCarthy flourished a document which he said would prove his charges. Lehman challenged him to read it aloud. McCarthy said he could not do so, but added: "I will show it to the Senator and allow him to read it for himself."

Lehman promptly walked across the floor and stretched out his hand. McCarthy refused to give up the paper.

That was Lehman's first instruction in the real nature of the "world's most exclusive club." The Senate, during most of his years in it, was at a historically low ebb, both in its moral atmosphere and in the quality of its leaders and prominent Members.

Equally revealing for Lehman was a radio debate in which he took part in the spring of 1951 after Truman fired General MacArthur. The other participants were Homer Capehart, Robert Taft and Hubert Humphrey. The discussion grew unusually heated. Just as the program was going off the air, Capehart denounced Humphrey and Lehman as pro-Communist China. They denied it. Capehart began to push Humphrey. When Lehman tried to intervene, Capehart shoved him. Lehman held his own during 30 seconds or so of clumsy sparring before the fight was broken up. He suffered no damage except a broken pair of glasses.

Reflecting on it the next day, he shook his head in bemusement. "Nothing like that ever happened to me before. You know, before I came down here, I honestly used to think the Senate was the greatest deliberative body in the world."

He lightly emphasized the word "deliberative."

Lehman, shortly afterward, tried during a long night session to save the price control bill—this was during the Korean war—against crippling amendments. The official Democratic leaders had, for all practical purposes, abandoned the bill to its fate. But Lehman kept plugging away, speaking against almost every amendment and demanding rollcall votes. When the badly mauled measure finally came to a vote on final passage, he voted "present." Under the Senate rules, a Member can vote "present" only with the consent of the Senate. But it is a rule that is honored only in the breach. No Senator had been forced to explain a vote of "present" in over 50 years.

That night, however, during an angry half-hour of gavel pounding and shouting, the Republicans insisted that Lehman vote "yea" or "nay" on final passage. They won their point on a roll call, 39 to 35.

Lehman asked what the penalty was for not voting. Told there was none, he said, "The Senator from New York does not wish to disregard the rules of the Senate, and therefore reluctantly votes 'yea.'"

Was it merely personal vindictiveness that impelled Taft, Wherry, Hickenlooper and the other Republicans to extract a vote from Lehman that night? Or did they feel his vote would serve as a kind of moral seal attesting that the bill they had concocted was not as bad as he had said it was?

Whatever the reason, Lehman was increasingly forced into the lonely role of critic and crusader during his Senate years. This was a paradox because he was not by temperament a rebel or a dissenter.

A man such as WAYNE MORSE positively enjoys being a nay-sayer and a minority of one. But Lehman, although shy, was potentially a good club man. He was easygoing and friendly by nature, and years of experience as a Democratic Governor with a Republican legislature in Albany had taught him the necessity for tact and compromise. But the Senate during his years there repeatedly outraged his fundamental moral instincts. He just could not find any common ground with the McCarthyites, the reactionary Republicans such as Capehart, and the hardshell southerners.

The public rarely caught a glimpse of this conflict between congeniality and conscience since conscience so regularly won.

The Washington record was not wholly one of battles gallantly fought and lost. In his first year, he almost singlehandedly forced the substitution of a more liberal displaced persons bill for the measure originally reported out by Pat McCarran. This victory which opened America's door to thousands of additional refugees was one very close to Lehman's heart.

This report would not be complete without a word about Mrs. Lehman. They had a beautiful marriage. One reason Herbert Lehman could be so strong in the public's service was that he was so secure and happy in his private life.

They shared a deep love of children and of animals. The delightful Children's Zoo which they recently gave the city in Central

Park unites these two interests. It is a happy memorial to a warmhearted and highminded man.

Mr. Speaker, the children of New York—the future generations—owe deep debts of gratitude to Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, not only for his legacy of a sterling example of public service, but for his keen appreciation of their childhood pleasures.

In 1960, at the time of their golden wedding anniversary, Governor and Mrs. Lehman generously donated funds for the establishment of a children's zoo in Central Park. The Children's Zoo has been a source of great delight to countless children.

Nora Ephron, writing in the New York Post for December 6, captured the wonderful spirit of Governor and Mrs. Lehman as they took pleasure in the enjoyment of the children who visit the zoo. Her moving article follows:

[From the New York Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

FOR LEHMAN: THE LAUGHTER OF CHILDREN

(By Nora Ephron)

He was an old man with that special kind of wisdom—he knew there was nothing like children to keep people young. He stood, resting against his cane, near the enchanted castle of the Children's Zoo, and he watched the youngsters laughing and playing with the animals.

After a while his wife turned to him, "I think you'd better go now," she said.

"Not just yet," he replied.

That was 2 months ago, the last time Gov. Herbert Lehman was able to visit the Central Park Zoo he and his wife gave to the children of New York. Yesterday, he died just a few blocks from the fairy village over 1,600,000 persons have seen since its dedication 2 years ago.

THE ENCHANTED ACRE

There were a few children, bundled up in windbreakers, at the zoo, yesterday. They ran through the Enchanted Acre, Lehman and his wife designed, through Noah's Ark, the witch's house in Hansel and Gretel, the castle; they fed the ducks in the Dee. They were shouting and laughing and playing, unconsciously, what was probably the only tribute the grand old man would have wished.

In Old MacDonald's Farm, Stockyard Keeper John Adornette was consoling a goat, who was watching a 4-year-old named Thomas eat the cracker he was supposed to feed the livestock. "The children and the animals have a better time here," said Adornette, who transferred from the main zoo 2 weeks ago. Thomas looked at the cow and said "moo" several times, which is the only thing children seem to be able to say to cows.

LOVED TO WATCH THEM

In the stainless-steel kitchen inside, a man was slicing up hundreds of carrots. In the office, a keeper named Fitzgerald was ordering bales of hay. Mrs. Autumn Smith, a clerk who knew Lehman for 14 years, tried to express what most the employees felt yesterday:

"Lately he hadn't been here too much," said Mrs. Smith, "but they used to be here almost every day on the weekends. He loved children. He wanted the children to have fun and he really loved to watch them." Mrs. Smith is married to Lehman's chauffeur and first met him in Washington in 1949.

"I remember the first time I was introduced to him, in the Senate Office Building," she said. "He couldn't have been nicer if we had been the President and First Lady. He was a man with so much heart."

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY GIFT

The Lehmans presented the zoo to the city on their golden wedding anniversary. "But the best reason," the Governor said at the time, "is that it will give pleasure to all those little ones."

When the zoo was opened, adults could enter only if accompanied by a child; last year, with the approval of the Lehmans, the rule was changed to allow anyone to come in. Yesterday, a young couple looked through the swiss cheese holes in a large box that holds a number of fast-multiplying mice. "It's just wonderful," said the woman. "I wonder whose idea it was."

## CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. GUBSER. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, December 7, I was one of the few Members of the House present when a legislative day was established in about 1 minute for the purpose of qualifying a discharge petition to be filed today on the civil rights bill now pending before the House Rules Committee. On Saturday I heard the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] attempt to make a point of order that a quorum was not present. It is my personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, that had the gentleman from Florida been recognized, his point of order would have prevailed and the House would not have been duly constituted and a legislative day would not have passed. It is my further belief that had a quorum call been placed in effect, the list of absentees would have included ardent supporters of the discharge petition who contend that the duty of Congressmen is to stay in attendance until the civil rights bill is passed.

Despite the events of last Saturday, the reality of today's situation is that the required number of legislative days have elapsed and a discharge petition on H.R. 7152 has been filed.

It is ironic that the committee to be discharged is the Committee on Rules which was "liberalized" earlier this year after a heated controversy. Proponents of this "liberalization" claimed that adding three Members to the Rules Committee would assure the fact that all legislation would be brought to the House floor for a vote. Now, even with a Rules Committee which is to their liking they are urging us to bypass it just 10 legislative days after a bill was officially reported to it.

The dual standards for what constitutes delay for the Rules and the Judiciary Committees is difficult for me to understand. The Judiciary Committee considered and debated and compromised this bill from May 8 to November 20 of this year, a period of more than 6 months. Even the honorable chairman of the Judiciary Committee required from October 29 to November 20, a period of almost 3 weeks, to officially report the bill after his committee had ordered it reported.

Mr. Speaker, can we say with any degree of honesty that the 10 days which have elapsed since the Rules Committee assumed jurisdiction of the civil rights bill is any more of a delay than the almost 7 months which the Judiciary Committee consumed in considering this bill? Is the 10 days which have elapsed since the liberalized committee assumed jurisdiction of the bill any more of a delay than the 2½ years which were needed before an administration civil rights bill was even proposed to this Congress?

Mr. Speaker, it has been conceded that this discharge petition cannot possibly bring the civil rights bill up for House consideration during the current year.

The leadership plans to adjourn by December 20 and under House rules the bill could not be considered under the discharge petition until December 23. There is little question, therefore, that the bill cannot be debated until next year.

The discharge petition will not bring about earlier consideration by the Rules Committee.

The gentleman from Virginia, Chairman HOWARD SMITH, has announced that he will hold hearings early in January. Despite what some may say of the gentleman from Virginia, there is no one who would even imply that his word is not good.

Mr. Speaker, since the civil rights bill will be considered in January if the Democratic leadership truly wants it considered, today's discharge petition is a meaningless gesture. It will accomplish nothing for the cause of civil rights.

What, then, is the purpose of the discharge petition?

This is a question, Mr. Speaker, which I cannot answer nor would I attempt to answer. Some have suggested that it is politically motivated but I would not presume to sit in judgment of another Member's motivation.

Those who suggest political motivation say that the discharge petitioners expect public confusion to serve the partisan purpose of harming Republicans who believe that in a government of law we must preserve legal and orderly procedure. They say the American public is unfamiliar with the complexities of legislative parliamentary procedure and will immediately interpret failure to sign a discharge petition as opposition to civil rights. They contend that the public will forget the fact that 49 Republican House Members have introduced comprehensive civil rights bills as against 37 Democrats, an impressive comparative figure when Democrats outnumber Republicans in the House approximately 3 to 2. They feel the public will not remember that Republicans furnished the bipartisan support at President Kennedy's request which was responsible for favorable Judiciary Committee action on civil rights and that the long-established voting record of Republicans in Congress is overwhelmingly in favor of justice and equality under the law. They feel the public will forget these things and jump to the conclusion that Republicans are opposing civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what may have motivated it, many Members of the House find themselves on the horns of a

difficult dilemma. On one side they must defy orderly procedure or on the other stand falsely accused of being against a civil rights bill.

Having confidence in the intelligence of the American people, it is not difficult for me to decide what to do in this dilemma.

Mr. Speaker, I am for equal rights under the law and I expect to vote in favor of a civil rights bill during the month of January 1964. And I expect to vote for it after orderly legislative procedure has been followed.

The test of my sincerity will come with my vote on the civil rights bill. I will not demagog by signing this petition today.

If I were to sign, I would not be helping the cause of civil rights. Though the petition has been misrepresented, causing many well meaning individuals and organizations to temporarily misunderstand, this petition will not hasten House consideration of the bill.

To sign it would, in my opinion, violate and prostitute the legislative process because of pressure.

Mr. Speaker, a Congressman who is worthy of the name is expected to be able to withstand pressure and to do what he knows is right as his mind and heart see the right.

Though it is not the easiest way, I believe the right way is to follow orderly procedure.

## PROCUREMENT METHODS OF THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the necessity of taking your time and that of the Members of the House to call attention again to the haphazard, inefficient procurement methods of our Defense Department.

Sometimes I wonder "Why should it be necessary for me to carefully scan hundreds of procurement documents each week in order to show those in authority how millions of dollars can be saved?"

My staff is limited and so is the time of a few expert volunteers. It is necessary for us to work long and hard in order to ferret out the deplorable and inexcusable procurement methods by which tax dollars are being wasted.

Thank goodness, some of the military authorities appreciate what I have done in pointing out these gross mistakes and have pledged their full support and cooperation. Maj. Gen. Frank W. Moorman, Head of the Army Electronics Materiel Command, and Brig. Gen. Wesley Franklin, Head of the Army Electronics Material Agency, have done just that in the recent past. I believe they are sincere.

With their help, I know millions can be saved.

One case where a tremendous saving can be effected is in the purchase of an autopilot known as the AN/ASW 12. Back on June 7, 1963, the Los Angeles Procurement District of the Electronics Command issued a sole source bid document for 1,100 of these equipments. In the past, I have discovered, this item cost about $20,000 each.

When this document came to my attention on June 13, I noted that there was a stipulation of "no drawings available." I immediately asked the Army to supply me with copies of past contracts for the equipment, feeling I would discover drawings had indeed been bought and paid for. On June 19, 1963, copies of five past contracts for the equipment were mailed to me, and I was advised that five more contracts were currently active.

One glance at those five old contracts almost made me lose my Hoosier temper. The Army had bought drawings and specifications as a part of all five contracts, dating back to 1958. As a matter of fact, it had spent $450,000 for this material on the five old contracts alone.

In separate letters to Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, commander of the Electronics Materiel Agency, Philadelphia; and Col. Burleigh B. Drummond, commander of the Los Angeles Procurement District of the Army, I said in part that:

> It appears to me that drawings should, indeed, exist in a quantity sufficient to provide enough information so that practically anyone with a reasonable degree of competence could manufacture this set. I think this equipment should now be removed from the expensive shelter of sole source and put out on the street for competitive bidding.

On June 26, 1963, General Stanwix-Hay informed me by phone and by wire that the procurement had been canceled and said, "Many thanks for your help."

On July 2, 1963, General Stanwix-Hay told me a complete investigation was going forward.

When I had no report by September, I wrote General Moorman, the new commander, and asked for results of the probe. Two days later, the general called to assure me he was in sympathy with the accomplishments being made in my procurement study and was pleased with the victories being scored in behalf of responsible competitive procurement.

On September 24, 1963, a letter from the Electronics Command reporting on the ASW 12 case said, in part:

> As indicated in your letter, manufacturing drawings and changes thereto for the AN/ASW 12 have been procured on previous contracts. In order to expand competitive procurement, the U.S. Army Electronics Command plans to buy a procurement data package suitable for this purpose.

The letter claimed manufacturing drawings on hand were but 60 percent complete and mentioned that proprietary items were invoked in the other 40 percent.

This surprised me, Mr. Speaker. Certainly the Army paid 100 cents on the dollar and the people had every right to expect delivery of 100 percent drawings. I conveyed my feelings to the Army, and on October 4, 1963, received a telegram from General Moorman assuring me the Army had approached the contractor about a procurement data package and stating the next purchase of the equipment would be by competitive bidding.

The fact that procurement of this set will be competitive in the future is good news, Mr. Speaker. It is my prediction this procurement will drive the cost down by 50 percent under the past average price of $20,000 per unit.

The bad news here is that again Army civil and military servants have done their work in the past in such an inefficient and slipshod manner. The Army paid out tax money on at least 5 of 10 past contracts—and I imagine on all 10. Yet, and this would have been unbelievable to me years ago until I learned of all the waste in military purchasing, it got only 60 percent of what it paid for and no one seems surprised.

Mr. Speaker, here is more evidence that the Army is altogether too free and easy with our tax dollars. Here is concrete evidence of the superficial way in which much procurement work is done. Here is proof that the time is here and now to completely fumigate the procurement areas of the military and let in the fresh air of efficiency and hard work.

## ECONOMY DRIVE PROGRESSING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past few days in the press and on the air of a new wave of economy in the executive branch of the Federal Government. This is welcome news to many of us.

The new budget will be before us in January. This will give us the answer to whether or not the President has been able to translate his welcome words into facts and figures.

Having served with President Johnson when he was a Member of the Senate on conference committees on appropriation bills, I know he is knowledgeable as to the budget and can recognize waste as well as areas where economy can be practiced. It is hoped that this knowledge will be useful to him in his present efforts.

I am sure the American taxpayer hopes that the 1965 budget will be sharply reduced as the result of the new President's review.

But, Mr. Speaker, these efforts to effect economy in Federal spending are not new, nor have they been the concern of only one political party.

May I remind my colleagues that on March 4 of this year, announcement was made of the formation of a task force from among the Republican members of the Appropriations Committee. The task force was organized to study the President's budget and to make recommendations as to where reductions could be made without curtailing or eliminating any essential service. I have the privilege of serving as chairman of this task force. The task force was conceived and appointed by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the

ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee. The gentleman from Iowa has long been an advocate of economy in the Government and has been successful in years gone by in saving millions of dollars for the American taxpayers. The other Members of the task force, in addition to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and myself, are the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

The minority leader [Mr. HALLECK] has been most helpful to the task force in counseling with us and in joining with us in the study of the budget.

The task force has had the advantage of meetings with and advice from former President Eisenhower.

Maurice Stans, director of the Bureau of the Budget during the Eisenhower administration, gave great assistance to our task force.

TASK FORCE GOAL

We concluded that budget reductions were not only feasible but essential to the national interest. Our conclusion was that new spending authority could be cut by a magnitude of from $10 to $15 million.

We were chided and ridiculed.

The President, in his March 6 press conference, doubted our ability to make substantial reductions and stated that he had submitted a hard budget.

The distinguished majority leader took the floor to chastise us verbally, suggesting that the economy move was impossible unless we deprived our children of education, took food from their mouths. He complained that we threatened the security of the aged and ignored the ill. He gave a long list of projects throughout the United States which he said would be lost forever if we had our way. In fact, after hearing all of the things the gentleman charged us with, I did not want to look in the mirror for several days.

I call your attention to the majority leader's speech. You will find it in the RECORD of April 2, 1963, from page 5492 to page 5525, 33 pages, and I may say that even the printing bill for the speech was no small item. I call your attention to the fact that we have cut the budget, without inflicting the hardships or bringing about the catastrophes the gentleman envisioned.

We welcome the suggestions that President Johnson will urge reduced spending, and we hope that his suggestions will not receive the vitriolic reception accorded those of our task force.

ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

What have we done? Here is the record of achievement thus far.

Of the 11 appropriation bills for fiscal year 1964 already passed by the House, the budget request was $91,817,407,145. When these bills were acted upon by the House, the amount passed was $86,397,074,119, or a total reduction at this time of $5,420,333,026.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I can confidently estimate an additional reduction of the original budget requests of $2 billion, and that when this session of the Congress adjourns, I estimate that the House will have made savings of $7½ billion.

The President has been talking of budget cuts in the new 1965 budget. Let us recall that we are still working on the 1964 budget, and his influence would be welcome here, as well. I would hope that President Johnson would use his great influence in the other body to help us hold down appropriations in several forthcoming conferences where the House figures are below those of the Senate. And in those cases where the other body has found means of reducing the House figures, I hope that we will recede and accept their judgment in the interest of economy.

By reason of the continuing resolution, this is possible.

MORE CAN BE DONE

Mr. Speaker, we have not reached the goal set by our task force, but there has been a real accomplishment. Who will deny $7½ billion is not a real accomplishment? Much of it has been bipartisan. The distinguished chairman of our Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has made a number of hard-hitting speeches in which he pointed out exactly where we are heading with our extravagance and our planned deficits.

More should have been done and more can be done.

The task force will continue in the next session, and we will continue to count on bipartisan support.

We plan to make a minute study of the new budget, as we did of the old. And I can say now that we will again refuse requests for our detailed worksheets—the "bill of particulars" as they were called. We shall not furnish the spenders with our figures nor give them the opportunity to use our figures in their propaganda to build a case against us.

We shall continue to work for economy and we shall welcome help from any source. We shall strive for a balanced budget. We shall rely heavily on the economy pledges of those who urged the tax cut bill last summer. We will do everything in our power to avoid planned deficits, or deficits of any kind. We believe that planned deficits are not in the bests interests of the Nation.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman first of all for the statement he has made. We are apparently coming to the end of a long, drawn-out first session of the Congress. We have not finished the work on the appropriation bills, as we should have finished, but we have gotten some of them passed.

I agree with the gentleman completely that when the task force which he headed began its work, when it was announced that on the Republican side of the aisle here in the House of Representatives we were going to make a determined effort to try to reduce Federal spending, to do away with waste and extravagance, many scoffed. We were subjected to ridicule. Scare stories of all sorts were being published in the press and spoken here in the House of Representatives. Predictions were made as to the dire things that would happen if we were able to cut some of these appropriation bills. We have been able to cut them, and I have not discovered where any real damage has been done to any essential function of the Government. On the contrary, I think the Government is still spending too much money. But may I say parenthetically, that is not the fault of the gentleman from Ohio and those who served with him on the task force, our members on the Appropriations Committee, and those of us on our side who have been struggling for some sense in Government spending.

There have been times when we just have not had enough help. We are in the minority. Without help from the other side of the aisle we cannot prevail. I think the gentleman spoke very well when he said that of course in some instances we have had help from the other side of the aisle, and certainly I would be the first to commend this business of putting fiscal responsibility ahead of what otherwise might in some degree be a matter of party responsibility.

I would agree with the gentleman that the fight has just begun. As we go into the next session to wind up the affairs that should have been disposed of before now, we should continue our efforts for some sort of fiscal responsibility, for restriction of our spending and for taking care of the financial affairs of our Government.

I would express the hope that we will have support not only here in the House of Representatives but throughout the country from people who say to us, "Why do you not do something about excessive Federal spending?"—but who do very little to try to stimulate public interest in that direction. If we could get that sort of help, then in my opinion we will be much more successful than we have been. But, certainly, so far the operation headed by the gentleman from Ohio has been a great success, and again I commend him and his colleagues for it.

Mr. BOW. I thank the distinguished minority leader. May I again say on behalf of the task force that the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana, has been most helpful not only in his counsel but in other activities in helping the task force and we appreciate his counsel and his help very much.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa who is the minority leader on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I too want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] for a job well done as chairman of the Republican budget cutting task force. It was my privilege, and I might say my great honor, to appoint the members of that task force. In naming the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] as chairman, I was quite sure that I was naming as the man to chair this important committee, a man

who had great knowledge of the functions of Government and of almost every agency of the Government as a result of his long experience both as an investigator and as a Member of the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has measured up and more than measured up to the task which I delegated him to do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that never in all the 25 years that I have been a Member of the House of Representatives have I seen a more dedicated group of people, members of the Committee on Appropriations and especially the minority members on that committee as well as a number of the majority members of the committee, do a job more effectively and more diligently than has been done on the President's budget by reducing that budget to the tune of about $7½ billion which is no small task. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will agree with me that the Members of the House whom I have just named will be satisfied with nothing less than a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1965 and for every year thereafter at least in peacetime. I hope even though it be a shaky peace that it will be a long lasting peace.

So again I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio and I also want to compliment our great and distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] for the fine cooperation he has given us, and also I feel it my duty to mention the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] as well as Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Stans and his assistants. You know $7,500 million as we say out on the farm just is not hay. It amounts to a lot of dollars for every American family. We propose to keep on fighting and working diligently for a balanced budget. I know the gentleman will agree with me that we intend not just to save money, but we intend to have a balanced budget and possibly in 1965 to have a little surplus if it is at all possible to do so. I am sure the gentleman will agree with that.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman and I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution to the discussion today.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] who has served so many years and so diligently on the committee and has been one of the members who has joined in effecting great savings over the years to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in complimenting the task force on at least setting a goal for us to shoot at in the matter of wise spending of the taxpayers' dollars. They are not easy to come by. We work at times in a confusion of budget systems and not always with the full cooperation of all the powers of the Government in the United States. Certainly we can be aided in our labors with the right attitudes emanating from the White House. I was heartened when I heard our new President taking action to try to effect some economies in the expenditure of dollars, and I want to accept that as a challenge to us to work with him. We can assume that he is sincere in his determination. With a determination on the part of the Congress, working through the Committee on Appropriations, and the cooperation of the White House, I know that wise spending can be effected and that wholesome and truly constructive savings can be had. I am sure that the toboggan that the dollar has been on for so many years can be slowed down and that the value of the dollar that the American people do business with and in which their savings are and which is really, in a sense, somewhat sacred to them as they move on into their old age will be protected by the work that we are here and now trying to do.

Again I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio and his coworkers, one of whom is here and served on this task force, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his contribution.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], a member of the task force committee.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives is being subjected to an extensive campaign of criticism and vilification. A principal complaint is the delay in the passage of the fiscal 1964 appropriation bills.

Up to now, the House has reduced the $98.8 billion Presidential budget by $5.6 billion. There is one more appropriation bill to be acted upon—foreign aid.

It is reasonable to assume the foreign aid item will be reduced by about $1.5 billion. We can reasonably anticipate a total reduction in the Presidential budget, made by the House of Representatives, of about $7 billion.

Taking into consideration Senate restorations and final conference agreements, I expect that the total congressional budget appropriations will result in a final net reduction of more $5 to $5.5 billion below the Presidential budget recommendations of $98.8 billion submitted last January.

Instead of condemnation, this House is deserving of the highest praise for its conscientious examination of, deliberation upon, and consideration of the appropriations bills. Based upon an estimate of 50 million families in this Nation, each family is saved from an eventual average tax imposition of $100 per year.

That saving alone justifies the delay in the passage of the 1964 appropriations bills.

Yes, it would have been easier and more pleasant to rubberstamp the 1964 Presidential budget after a cursory examination.

It is no easy task to examine and cross-examine thousands of witnesses—to review thousands of programs and activities in detail—to confer and negotiate at length with subcommittee members upon hundreds of items—to reduce appropriations without decreasing our military power—to reduce programs without curtailing essential public services.

I want to categorically state that this House has fully and most capably discharged its constitutional responsibilities in the fiscal management of this Government.

Some newspapers have stated that there is a dark, secret plot in this House of Representatives to obstruct our legislative process. Others have charged this House with incompetence and incapability.

If the elimination of $5 billion of unnecessary spending is a dark conspiracy, if the saving of $100 per year in taxes to every family in this Nation is a conspiracy or a crime, then we should proudly plead guilty.

The distinguished Speaker of this House, the majority leadership of this House, the chairman and the majority members of the Appropriations Committee, the membership of the majority party of this House are all deserving of this Nation's highest praise for their contributions to the legislative processing of this year's appropriations bills.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] deserves special mention. He lent his chairmanship, his prestige, his wisdom, his patience, his encouragement toward the maintenance of fiscal responsibility on the part of this House of Representatives, and toward the restoration of fiscal sanity and solvency in this Nation.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to mathematically apportion the credit due to the many, many Members of this House for their part in this long year of appropriations legislation. But, it is safe to say that these substantial spending reductions would not have materialized without the unified support of the Republican Party Members of this House.

For the first time in my memory, the Republican members of the Appropriations Subcommittees worked as a team with specific appropriation reduction targets.

The greatly admired ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], conceived and inspired the joint effort that finally realized, in a large measure, our party's goals of prudent fiscal management and a minimum tax liability for the Nation's taxpayers.

He appointed a Republican appropriations task force to carry out the task of examining the budget and setting out goals for budget reductions. He exercised his usual sound judgment and perception in appointing the highly respected gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] to direct and coordinate the work of the subcommittees. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] did an outstanding job.

The Republican members of the Appropriations Committee, after a careful scrutiny of this year's $98.8 billion budget, set a target for reducing it by $10 billion.

Specific reductions were agreed upon for each appropriation bill. These reductions were given unified and coordinated support by the Republican members of the subcommittees.

A reduction of $7 billion by this House is a magnificent achievement.

The establishment of specific targets, the unity of the Republican Party behind these targets, has resulted in a greatly improved and favorable relationship with the Senate Appropriations Committee. We no longer split the difference between the House and Senate appropriations as a matter of course. The House has been able to maintain a much greater percentage of its reductions in conferences with the Senate than in former years.

The Republican policy committee and the Republican conference of this House gave its wholehearted support to this program.

And, Mr. Speaker, this has been a gigantic effort. It has been a magnificent start toward restoring fiscal soundness.

The Republican Members of this House can justifiably point with pride to their substantial contributions toward producing for the people of this Nation a $5 billion reduction in unnecessary Federal spending.

The Republican Party Members of this House furnished the inspiration and the persistence needed to do the job.

The target for this year of the Republican Members of this House has been substantially realized.

Fiscal policies and fiscal management will be a most controversial issue that will arise immediately upon the convening of the next session of this Congress. I trust that the Republican Members can again unite among themselves, and then work in cooperation with the majority party toward a realistic, frugal, and economical fiscal program in the next year—toward a balanced budget, a sound economy, a stable currency.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and wish to say that it has been a great pleasure to work with the gentleman and a great edification.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from New York and wish to say how much the task force has appreciated the fine work which the gentleman did and how much it appreciated his counsel and hard work, often late into the night, on these budget figures.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who has been very much interested in the work which the task force has been doing and has been very helpful in his aid to us and advice to the committee in many instances.

Mr. CURTIS. I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take the time to add my commendation to the task force conducted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. Indeed it has done significant work, I too recall the catcalls and jeers that were received at the time this task force was set up to the effect that significant cuts in the budget could not be accomplished. The argument was that those who were concerned about getting our expenditure side of the budget down were just taking on an impossible task. I must say that it was a very difficult task that the gentleman undertook, and that there was not all the cooperation that possibly we might wish there had been. Had there been such cooperation I am satisfied that this budget would be much lower on the expenditure side than it now is.

Mr. Speaker, we on the Committee on Ways and Means deeply understand the necessity for this work to go forward. If we do not raise the money in current taxes that has been voted for expenditures, we on the Committee on Ways and Means have to provide it in what amounts to deferred taxation, which is issuing more Government bonds. The economic impact on our economy to issue and try to sell more bonds on top of the tremendous sums of money that we already owe evidenced by the Federal debt is reaching a point that is nigh unbearable.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been arguing for tax cuts for years long before the neo-Keynesian economists woke up and found out that our Federal tax structure was undermining our economy, have tried to point out that we must earn this tax cut before we can have it.

We can only cut taxes economically and beneficially if we do not shift over to Government bonds the deficit created by the cutback in the revenues.

The work that the gentleman's committee has been doing has more bearing on whether we can give a tax cut and really hope to achieve the economic gains from cutting our Federal taxes. The gentleman's committee has done more in that direction than any group I know of.

I would like to point out that among other things there are three accomplishments your committee can claim. They are the reestimations downward of the expenditure rate for fiscal year 1963 estimated in January of this year, as required under the Budget and Accounting Act to be $94.4 billion. The budget-cutting move started in January is the first time since I have been observing these figures closely in recent years that the estimate made in January was greater than what turned out to be the actual figure. The expenditure rate for 1963 turned out to be $92.6 billion, a cut of $1.8 billion, directly attributable, I may say, to the work that this committee engaged in.

The second point has already been made. The budget for the fiscal year 1964, estimate of expenditure levels was $98.8 billion. This level has been reduced by $1 billion, to $97.8 billion, by the administration. This figure was given to the Committee on Ways and Means a month or so ago the last time we increased the Federal debt, to $315 billion. But, as the gentleman from New York has been pointing out, we have been operating this Government for 6 months, we are going into the 6th month, of fiscal 1964 under continuing resolutions to a large degree. These resolutions relate to the expenditure levels of fiscal year 1963, which is $92.6 billion, not the $98.8 billion of fiscal year 1964.

I asked the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury what was the impact on expenditure levels for fiscal 1964 as a result of these continuing resolutions. To my shock and surprise they did not have the figures. Those figures have still not been made available to the Congress, but we will see in the budget to be presented to the Congress in the coming January the estimates. The estimates have to be made under the Budget and Accounting Act for the expenditure level of fiscal 1964. I am very hopeful they will be down around $94 billion. If the administration can reach that figure and we can hold fiscal 1965 to around $94 billion, then in the judgment of at least the Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee, as we expressed ourselves in the minority views in last January, on the President's economic report, we can have a tax cut of around $10 to $11 billion right away and we can look forward to real benefits of our economy.

Again, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that the gentleman and his committee have done more to make this a reality than any other group.

Third, and probably more important as we look into the future, is the work that you have done in the area where Congress can be most effective and where your committee can be, which is new obligational authority. I have been talking about expenditure levels. The real control over expenditures the Congress has retained is over new obligational authority. The budget for fiscal year 1964 suggested $108 billion of new obligational authority. Only about 40 percent of that will be spent in the fiscal year 1964, but it has a direct impact on fiscal 1965 and fiscal 1966, and a considerable impact on 1964 too.

It is in this area that the gentleman's committee has been most effective and the reason why it is so important that this good work you have started be continued. I hope those on the majority side of the aisle join with you in your efforts to further this end.

Now, if I might make a final comment, and I do not know why as a Republican I should make this comment, but it seems to be fair game around the country to refer to this Congress as a do-nothing Congress. As a Republican I might say, Why should I defend against the castigation of this Congress, inasmuch as it is under Democratic leadership?

Let me say that a Congress that has passed new obligational authority of $100 billion, the highest in our history and one that raised revenues of $89 billion, is hardly a do-nothing Congress. In my judgment, it is doing too much.

But this is what Congress goes about, the business of authorizing programs that will justify expenditures of $100 billion, and then passing appropriations bills that go with the programs, and the tax legislation necessary to raise the revenues to pay for them. There is no Congress in history that has reached this kind of level in budgets. Talk about a Congress that has done that as "do nothing" is ridiculous. It actually has been doing too much. Those who have been complaining about doing too little

are complaining because the Congress rejected an authorization bill of another billion dollars here or another billion dollars there. They are complaining because of the 1 percent, or whatever it is, they have been interested in, in the judgment of the Congress was not added to the vast sums already approved in these gigantic budgets.

In my judgment, this Congress has been doing entirely too much. A great deal more attention needs to be paid to those times on the floor of the House when, without proper study in our committees and without proper debate on the floor of the House we authorized programs and appropriated money. Those were the times Congress should have received criticism, not when they rejected bills.

So I do want to commend the gentleman again for his fine work and the work of his committee. In my opinion, you have done more for the good of this country than any group that has been working in the past two Congresses.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Missouri. He has made his usual fine contribution to the debate on the floor of the House. I thank him for the remarks he has made as far as spending in this Congress is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an address by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under President Eisenhower, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The address referred to is as follows:

A FEDERAL EXPENDITURE POLICY FOR 1964–65

(Remarks by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics at Barnard College, Columbia University, before the Conference on Federal Expenditure of the Tax Foundation, Tuesday, December 3, 1963, New York City)

I have argued on an earlier occasion, about 1 month ago, that the prospect of large-scale tax reduction in 1964 and again in 1965 called for a basic reshaping of Federal economic policy.[1] In particular, I have argued that it calls for a cessation, at least during the period of tax reduction, of increases in aggregate Federal expenditures. Accordingly, I shall try in this brief paper to describe the expenditure policy which in my judgment would serve us best at this time and to make certain suggestions for putting it into effect. Before I undertake to do so, however, let me describe the circumstances which, as I see it, call for a revision of Federal expenditure policy.

Briefly, Federal expenditures will have to be brought under very much closer control because it would be excessively expansive to allow them to continue to rise at the $5 to $7 billion rate that has obtained in the last 2 years at a time when the economy is operating at a high level and making further advances, when there is already a large deficit in the budget, and when the economy is about to receive the stimulus of large-scale, demand-increasing tax reduction.

[1] In a paper, "Policies to Accompany Tax Reduction," read before the dinner meeting of the 11th Annual Economic Outlook Conference sponsored by the Department of Economics of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, Thursday, Oct. 31, 1963.

There is only one condition under which we might accommodate a policy mix of large-scale tax reduction concurrent with large-scale increases in Federal expenditures. That would be if we were to pursue a monetary and credit policy, supported by appropriately noninflationary debt management policies, which would restrain activity in the private and State and local sectors of the economy by means of significantly higher interest rates. But economic and social priorities at this time argue against any further shift of resources to the public sector. We have already had 2½ years of exceptionally rapid increases in Federal spending. Federal cash payments were being made to the public in July through October of this year, for example, at a seasonally adjusted rate that was 30 percent higher than in 1960. Although Federal purchases of goods and services accounted for only slightly more than 10 percent of GNP in 1960, they have accounted for 15 percent of the GNP increase since that date. And in the fiscal year 1963 the rate of increase of civilian employment in the Federal Government was about one-third again as fast as the growth of civilian employment as a whole.

Moreover, would it not be inconsistent to strive with one hand to stimulate demand through tax reduction—and especially the demand for consumer goods typically purchased on credit terms—and with the other hand to raise the cost and limit the availability of credit by tightening monetary and credit policy? But the continuation of aggressively expansive Federal spending would force us into precisely this inconsistency. Under the circumstances, therefore, close expenditure control is obviously essential.

But it is not sufficient to say merely that there should be a close control over Federal expenditures. A definite policy target is needed. A reasonable target, I suggest, would be to hold aggregate Federal spending constant at its current level through the remainder of this present fiscal year and during the fiscal year 1965. Two aspects of this policy suggestion require comment: first, its economic merits; and, second, the question whether it is feasible, as a practical matter, to hold aggregate expenditures constant.

The economic repercussions of a change in the rate of Federal spending can be critically important, of course, if the change is sizable and especially if it is abrupt. But in the present instance the chance of any unsettlement being caused by a hold-the-line spending policy is minimized by the fact that although Federal outlays are currently very high they have tended to level out in the last few months. The Federal Government's purchases of goods and services, as reflected in the national income and product accounts, actually were lower (less Government sales) in the third quarter of 1963 than in the second quarter; and in July through October the monthly rate of total cash payments, seasonally adjusted and annualized, flattened out at about $123 billion. I do not know what the November figures will show, but I think we can safely assume that they will not differ sharply from those for July through October. If this is so, then the economy has already had 5 months to adjust itself to constant as contrasted with very steeply rising Federal expenditure rates. Obviously, this reassures one a good deal in making the suggestion that expenditures be held constant at current levels.

An additional observation is called for on the matter of holding Federal expenditure rates constant at present levels. I cannot be entirely sure of this, but as I read the figures on Federal cash payments to the public, it looks as if there is actually no alternative within present budgetary limits to holding expenditures at their current level. To put it differently, it may be that to hold the line on Federal spending is not so much a policy suggestion as a policy imperative.

The point is this: Last January's budget document projected cash payments to the public in fiscal 1964 of $122.5 billion. That rate was not only reached but actually exceeded a bit in the first 4 months of this fiscal year. What is more, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has recently stated that, as a result of a congressional scaling down of appropriations requests, and because of a miscellany of other factors affecting expenditures, administrative budget spending in fiscal 1964 will be about $1 billion less than what was projected last January. This estimate suggests the need for a roughly equivalent scaling down in the projection of cash payments to the public. If this is the case, then we have, indeed, already reached our budgetary ceiling for the fiscal year 1964. And any appreciable increase over the October spending rate would require a cutback during the second half of this fiscal year. There is flexibility in the backlog of earlier authorizations and in the possibility of supplemental appropriations to permit such an increase; but, all things considered, it seems unlikely that there can be any appreciable further increase in expenditure rates in this fiscal year. As I have said, a hold-the-line policy may prove to be inescapable.

A shift in policy from very rapid spending increases to strict expenditure control is also indicated as a necessity by the trend of Federal cash payments to the public in the first half of calendar 1963. The plain fact of the matter is that Federal cash payments increased in the first 6 months of 1963 at a rate which if projected through the rest of this calendar year and into 1964 would bring them by mid-1964 to something like $130 billion a year. This would be roughly $15 billion higher than the rate obtained in early 1963. Such an increase would mean that Federal spending had, I would think inadvertently, gone far beyond anything currently contemplated. The only way to prevent this from happening is to institute a rigorous expenditure control program at once, throughout the Federal Establishment. This is another reason why I say that a hold-the-line expenditure policy is not so much a policy suggestion as a policy imperative.

Let me turn, then, to the second question; namely, to the feasibility of holding outlays in fiscal 1965 at the fiscal 1964 level.

For anyone familiar with Government financial housekeeping it will be evident, of course, that because expenditures under some programs increase more or less automatically from one fiscal period to the next, aggregate expenditures cannot be held constant as between two adjoining fiscal periods without making counterbalancing reductions in other programs. This is the well-known problem of the "built-in" expenditure increase.

* * * * *

We can move from this to an estimate of built-in expenditure increases for the budget as a whole. This should be done, of course, on an item-by-item basis, but it would be impractical for me to undertake to do so. If we do it roughly, by assuming an equivalent amount of built-in increases in other major (nondefense) divisions of the budget, we reach an estimate of $1.8 billion. I would prefer, however, to use a round figure of $2 billion. It pays to resolve all questions regarding budget figures on the liberal side, in any case, and the $2 billion figure falls within the $1.75 to $2.25 billion range which is favored by many budget experts. Finally, a $2 billion figure is confirmed by estimates made by Maurice Stans during his period of service as Director of the Bureau of the Budget. In an address to the Tax Foundation on December 1, 1959, Mr. Stans estimated built-in budgetary increases between the fiscal years 1960 and

1961 as falling within the range of $2 and $2.5 billion. It would allow for mandatory expenditure increases, in addition to the $900 million in defense, of up to $500 million for additional public debt interest costs, $100 million for veterans' programs, and $500 million for specific items in the space, agriculture, public works, and other sectors of the budget.

So, we may formulate the expenditure control problem as follows: Is it possible to reduce discretionary expenditures in specific programs by $2 billion between the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 in order to offset built-in or mandatory expenditure increases of equal amount in other programs?

It is impossible for me to answer this question on the basis of an item-by-item commentary on the whole Federal budget, though I want to state with all the emphasis I can that this is precisely the way it should be answered. To do so would be more than any single individual could possibly accomplish, working alone, and in any case could not be described in the time available to me on this program. What I shall try to do is to show, by citing several areas within which large economies could be effected, that it is perfectly feasible to counterbalance built-in increases of roughly $2 billion and thus to hold aggregate expenditures constant. I want to show that it is wrong to be defeatist about the uptrend of Federal expenditures: in short, to defeat defeatism. In addition I will refer to several comprehensive budget analyses that have been made by others and which reveal possibilities, on an item-by-item basis, for expenditure reductions that go far beyond $2 billion.

Let me turn first to an area that I have had occasion to comment on several times in the past; namely, Federal credit programs.[2] They are prime candidates for expenditure reduction because they have expanded at an exceptionally rapid rate in the last few years. Also, they have reached such a size that even a small percentage cut in them would produce a very large saving. And, finally, cuts can be made in this budget area with no net deflationary effect because credits that would otherwise be handled in the public sector can, if the programs are conducted to this end, be extended privately. Retrenchment would be effected by a more realistic interest rate policy (it must be conceded, I think, that the demand for long-term Federal credit at 2 percent, as it is currently available through the Rural Electrification Administration, is well-nigh unlimited), by more rigorous application of the rule that potential borrowers show private credit is unavailable on reasonable terms, and by a greater effort to enlist private participation in loans and to substitute Federal loan insurance (or guarantees) for direct advances.

The January 1964 budget document estimated that at the end of the fiscal year 1964 the U.S. Government would have loan assets of $31.5 billion. It showed that disbursements under the various direct loan programs in fiscal 1964 would total $8.1 billion, and that their net budget cost would be $1.2 billion. There is, of course, a great variety of programs represented in these totals, including the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Agency for International Development, and the Export-Import Bank of Washington. Some of them would be far less reasonable subjects for retrenchment than others. It is instructive to observe, however, that if disbursements for all programs combined were held to 90 percent of those projected for fiscal 1964, the net budget saving would be $800 million. In other words, in Federal credit programs alone it would be possible to counterbalance nearly half of the built-in expenditure increase estimated for the Federal budget as a whole. And this would be no austerity program. Even after an average 10-percent cutback from the fiscal 1964 levels, disbursements for Federal credit programs would still be $300 million more than they were in fiscal 1962.

Alternatively, one might approach the problem of Federal credit program retrenchment by putting specific programs on a revolving fund basis. This could not be done for all programs, but it could be done for a significant number of them. Indeed, a reading of table E-2 in the January 1963 budget document shows that net budget expenditures would be reduced by over $900 million if only four programs—those of the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Community Facilities Administration, and the direct lending activity of the Veterans' Administration—were operated as revolving funds.

By either of these approaches or, what would be more sensible, by a combination of the two, expenditure reductions of $800 to $900 million would be accomplished.

Next, consider the variety of programs embraced under the heading, "Civil Public Works." Like Federal credit programs, they have grown very rapidly of late: from $1.7 billion in fiscal 1955 to an estimated $7.2 billion in fiscal 1964. And new authorizations of $8.2 billion were requested last January.

There are also two approaches to expenditure reduction in this budget area. First, projects already underway could be stretched out over a longer period of time than was originally planned for their completion, thus reducing annual outlays. Second, a moratorium could be declared for a period of time, say for a year or two, on the initiation of new projects. A stretchout of average completion periods from 3 years, which seems to be the present average, to 4 years would produce an annual reduction in disbursements of around $700 million. And it appears that a temporary no-new-starts policy would yield an expenditure reduction of nearly $250 million a year. A combination of the two would reduce budget expenditures for civil public works by close to $1 billion. Again, this would not be austerity: civil public works expenditures in the fiscal year 1965 would still be about $1 billion a year more than they were in fiscal 1962 and not much less than in fiscal 1963.

Third, we may consider Federal expenditures for research and development. Not only have these grown at a more rapid rate in recent years than outlays in any other major category of the Federal budget, but I think it is fair to say that nowhere is there more need for a reevaluation of priorities. As it stands, the program as a whole, which has increased from $3.1 billion in fiscal 1953 to $14.9 billion in fiscal 1964, is predominantly defense and space oriented. These two categories of expenditure—$9.2 billion on defense and $4.2 billion on space—dwarf everything else. For example, the fiscal 1964 budget of the National Science Foundation, where research assistance is predominantly nondefense, was $116 million; $44 million was allocated to the Office of Education and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation; and the Office of Saline Water, where research is directed to finding ways of transforming vast stretches of the earth's surface to arable and livable space, received $11 million. Whatever one may think of the overall size of the Federal Government's research and development budget, it is clear that its scale of priorities has gone seriously askew.

I leave it to you to estimate what expenditure reductions might be effected in this area of the budget. Projects of only marginal interest might be eliminated; a more rigorous test of the need for new undertakings might be insisted upon; and there might be some extension of completion dates. In a budget category involving expenditures of close to $15 billion, an overall 5-percent reduction would result in savings of $750 million annually. And even this would leave outlays $2 billion higher than they were in fiscal 1963.

Of course, to hold the total of all budget expenditures in fiscal 1965 at the fiscal 1964 level will require doing more than reducing specific discretionary programs by $2 billion. First, spending must be held for a time at an unchanged level in all discretionary programs not scheduled for a reduction. Second, it rules out the possibility of introducing, at least for a time, any new programs without making reductions in existing activities beyond those needed to offset mandatory spending increases. The examples I have given by no means exhaust the possibilities for expenditure reductions, but they suffice to show that reductions well in excess of those needed to counterbalance built-in increases can be found in three budget areas alone. And they show that this can be done without recourse to anything that could be regarded, even remotely, as an austerity program.

And the argument can be carried one step further. Not only can aggregate expenditures be held constant at present levels; it is possible to reduce them substantially below current levels. This conclusion has been reached in one independent budget study after another. The business committee on tax reduction in 1963, for example, stated on May 31, 1963 that "* * * a reduction in the 1964 budget is reasonable and practicable"; others have given detailed suggestions for reductions. Let me cite five such blueprints, all dealing with the fiscal 1964 budget.

First, an item-by-item budget analysis was made early in 1963 by the Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee with the assistance of Maurice Stans. It concluded that new obligational authority (NOA) requests in the fiscal 1964 budget could be reduced by $10 to $15 billion and that projected expenditures could be cut by $4 to $6 billion.

Second, in a report issued earlier this year entitled "The Federal Budget for 1964" the Government Economy Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers concluded, also after an item-by-item analysis, that the fiscal 1964 budget should and could be revised so as to reduce NOA by $12.4 billion and expenditures by $6.8 billion.

Third, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in a statement issued on May 13, 1963 entitled "117 Ways to Cut the Budget," itemized NOA reductions of $9.1 billion and expenditure reductions of $4.5 billion.

Fourth, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, in a bulletin issued February 25, 1963 entitled "Proposals for Cutting the 1964 Federal Budget," identified actions that would reduce NOA by $9.8 billion and expenditures by $5.8 billion.

Fifth, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, in a statement issued March 29, 1963 entitled "The Federal Budget Could and Should Be Cut," specified—by department or agency and by program—reductions in requested NOA of $12 billion and expenditure reductions of $7.1 billion.

Finally, on the feasibility of expenditure reductions, let me cite statements by three prominent citizens, each with extensive governmental experience: (1) Mr. Ellis Briggs, a retired U.S. Foreign Service officer of ambassadorial rank, stated recently (Esquire,

---

[2] See, e.g., "The Strategy of Economic Policy" (Fordham University Press, New York City, 1963), pp. 68–74.

September 1963) that a majority of the 100 U.S. Embassies around the world could operate twice as efficiently with half their current personnel; (2) in a recent speech (an address to the Eighth Annual Career Service Awards dinner in Washington, D.C., on March 13, 1962, and reproduced in Administration of National Security, a collection of papers prepared by the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations) Senator HENRY M. JACKSON made the following statements: "The size of many Government offices has swelled beyond any real requirement. Some offices would operate more efficiently with one-third or one-half as many people;" and (3) Senator HARRY BYRD has reported that in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee the incumbent Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Luther Hodges, stated that 10 percent of the Commerce Department employees were doing unneeded jobs.

Two things should be clear: First, that expenditure control is necessary; second, that expenditure control is feasible. What is needed is action. As steps are taken there will be a need, also, for guidelines to direct the effort along truly effective lines and to insure its effectiveness. In this connection it is pertinent to recall the broad headings under which President Eisenhower made recommendations in his January 1959 budget message on ways to reduce expenditures. Reductions could be made, he pointed out, through (1) greater non-Federal participation in a wide variety of Federal assistance programs; (2) substitution of private credit for Federal loans through flexible interest rates; (3) revision of agricultural price support laws; (4) modification of the laws pertaining to veterans' benefits; (5) reappraisal of ship subsidies; and (6) wider use of user charges.

Referring specifically to the fiscal 1964 budget proposals, the study alluded to earlier by the Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee was based on the following principles:

"1. Limitation of personnel additions in 1964 to [the] requirements of nondeferrable workload increases such as may be caused by recent new legislation, or for law enforcement or protection of property, or high priority objectives;

"2. Absorption by all agencies of the half year payroll increases effective January 1, 1964, even though this necessitates personnel attrition or other expense economies (as contemplated in the pay legislation);

"3. Postponement of a considerable portion of new nonemergency construction, both civil and military, and some stretchout of previously authorized capital outlays;

"4. A moratorium on initiation of new programs not fully essential for the national welfare or security; [and]

"5. Conscious reappraisal of ongoing programs and services, with a view to reducing those of low priority and leveling out temporarily those (like research) which have enlarged substantially in recent years."

On October 18, last, the incumbent Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Dr. Kermit Gordon, in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, outlined the general principles on which the fiscal 1965 budget is being constructed as follows:

1. Provision will be made for "* * * only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of satisfying pressing national needs";

2. Efforts will continue "* * * to identify existing Federal programs which could, more appropriately and more effectively, be carried out by the private sector or in which non-Federal interests could bear a larger share of the costs" and, in the case of Federal credit program, "* * * a policy of substituting private for public credit wherever feasible" is being instituted;

3. "Where Federal expenditures convey special benefits or privileges to particular groups or individuals beyond those accruing to the public at large, the beneficiaries ought to bear a fair share of the costs involved;"

4. "In every department and agency [action is being taken] to insure that the objectives of Federal programs are achieved at the lowest possible cost;" and

5. "Hand in hand with control over expenditures goes control over [Federal] employment."

You will note similarities running through these three statements of principles. All knowledgeable students of the Federal budget come in the end to pretty much the same conclusions on how to contain and possibly to reverse an upward spending trend. The results of congressional action on the fiscal 1964 budget, which are so far encouraging, and the shape of the fiscal 1965 budget which President Johnson will soon be presenting to the Congress will tell how much progress on this critical fiscal problem is being made.

---

## METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during the recent national tragedy the city of Washington received unprecedented numbers of visitors who came to pay their respects to the late President Kennedy. These hundreds of thousands of visitors imposed heavy responsibilities upon the Metropolitan Police Department. It is gratifying to note that the way and manner in which these men under the leadership and guidance of Chief of Police Robert V. Murray brought the plaudits of many grateful people throughout the Nation.

This was the second time in recent weeks that Washington has been the host to great masses of visitors. In both instances the courteous and efficient performance of the men of the Metropolitan Police Department has been of the highest quality and has reflected great credit upon the Department and the Capital City.

It has been my pleasure to be closely associated with Chief Murray and a great number of his men because of my assignment as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia. This has been a rewarding experience for me in that I have had the privilege to become so intimately acquainted with this outstanding law enforcement officer and many of his colleagues and have thereby had an opportunity to closely evaluate the manner in which they perform their most important duties. They have at all times measured up to the highest traditions of the law enforcement profession.

It has also been my privilege to talk to high police officials throughout our Nation about some of the problems of law enforcement which confront Chief Murray and the law enforcement officers of the District of Columbia. Without exception these leaders in the field expressed commendation of Chief Murray and his Department. They also express great concern that this splendid law enforcement organization must labor under such handicaps as exist by reason of court decisions applicable only to the District of Columbia. They feel, as do I that this undue burden should be lightened by the enactment of corrective legislation such as was approved by the House of Representatives earlier this year in an omnibus crime bill.

There are those who resist the legislative changes which many of us feel are necessary if we are to unshackle the Metropolitan Police Department from these unrealistic court decisions which constitute chains about the Department's wrists. Chief Murray has expressed a desire to have the Congress cooperate with him in bringing about a statutory situation which will be consistent with good law enforcement and protection of the law-abiding public, as well as the rights of those who are accused of the commission of crimes. For his enlightened interest in these subjects I expressed to him my gratitude, which I am sure is the same as the sense of gratitude held by most law-abiding citizens.

I recognize that there are those who sincerely disagree with the position which the majority of the House has taken on this subject as well as with the position taken by Chief Murray as head of the local police department. In our system sincere disagreement in matters of philosophy and procedure are not unusual and should not be condemned. To those who disagree in a wholesome and intellectual manner we are indebted because of their advocacy of their views in a way which insures that both points of view will be laid before the Congress. This is as it should be.

There are others who would seem to go beyond the area of sincere disagreement and seek to castigate and harass those whose views differ from their own. Fortunately, they are not in a position to harass Members of Congress and others charged with legislative decision-making because of the nature of our system. Not being able to do so, they seem to seek to harass and harshly criticize Chief Murray and the members of his Department who are trying to bring order out of the judicial chaos now prevailing in the area of law enforcement in the District of Columbia. I express the hope that those who persist in this type of conduct will see the error of their ways.

In the Congress we are frequently reminded that the city of Washington holds a unique position among the cities of our Nation. This unique status comes about by reason of the wisdom of the authors of our Constitution and the Congresses which have preserved this unique system of municipal government through

succeeding generations. Because of its position as the Federal City and the Nation's Capital every citizen of America has a special interest in the administration of affairs of this municipality. I believe that this is particularly true in the matter of law enforcement since unseemly conduct in the District of Columbia is a cause of concern by every American.

In like manner, excellence of law enforcement and the prevention of crime by our outstanding Metropolitan Police Department should be a source of much satisfaction to all of the people of America. Under the leadership of Robert V. Murray the citizens of our Nation have had continuing reasons to have great pride in the performance of duties by the Police Department which serves the Nation's Capital so well.

I was pleased recently to observe that one of the distinguished news commentators of Washington, Joseph McCaffrey, of WMAL-TV took note of the splendid performance given to the people of Washington by Chief Murray and his men. In this broadcast Mr. McCaffrey said:

> It might be well at this time to take note that the Metropolitan Police Department here in Washington, D.C., is one of the best in the Nation.
>
> Under the leadership of Chief Robert Murray this Department has been charged over the years with protecting the lives of the great and the near great during their official and semiofficial visits to Washington. They have done an excellent job and, it should be pointed out, the men of the Department have worked 34 and 38 straight hours during emergencies without a whimper. They deserve much praise.
>
> Those of us who remember too well the morale of the Department when Robert Murray was named Chief, know how much he has done for the Department and for the people of this city and the Nation. It might be well, reviewing what has happened during the last several days, to call a halt to the pillorying of Chief Murray, and an end to the harassing of the Chief and let him continue to do the good job he has done, is doing, and will continue to do.

I agree heartily with Mr. McCaffrey that the Metropolitan Police Department is one of the best in the Nation and that under the leadership of Chief Murray they have done an excellent job at all times without whimpering or complaining. I would also join with this distinguished newsman in expressing the hope that the "pillorying of Chief Murray" will come to an end and that he will not be interfered with in the good job that he has done, is doing, and will continue to do so long as he serves in his important position.

I have taken this time today to express these sentiments because of the deep appreciation that I have for one of the Nation's outstanding law enforcement officers, Chief Robert V. Murray. In expressing this feeling of appreciation for this splendid man I would also include in my thoughts those loyal and devoted members of the Metropolitan Police Department who are so ably carrying on their important duties as guardians of the peace of this community under Chief Murray's leadership.

## A TRIBUTE TO METROPOLITAN POLICE CHIEF ROBERT V. MURRAY

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, before speaking to the subject matter before us, I would like to express my grateful appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for both his sense of propriety in reserving this time and his generosity in inviting me to be among those participating in these special orders.

I have the privilege to serve on Subcommittee No. 6 of the House District of Columbia Committee, which is so ably chaired by the gentleman. Through this relationship and other frequent official and personal contacts with him, I have come to respect considerably his abiding interest in legislative matters affecting our Capital City. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel the gentleman's concern for the welfare of the Metropolitan Police Department and those who administer the vital process of law enforcement in Washington should be of concern to all of us.

Policemen and police officials are too frequently the target of unjust public criticism. This doubtlessly occurs since some of the jobs our free society entrust to them are not the most popular. However, the citizen who may be annoyed at having to pay a parking violation fine should not allow himself to become an unwitting soldier in the army of vice that is dedicated to the destruction of law and order in the United States. Let us remember that a breakdown of our legal processes is a goal of the totalitarian threats to our democracy.

The lot of a law enforcement officer is never an easy one. His duty summons him to spend difficult and long hours under unusual conditions, at best, in peril, at the worst. If, on top of these burdens we heap uncalled for and malicious criticisms, we do an extreme disservice to the corps of men and women whom we employ to protect our lives and property.

For some time, I have had the fortune to be associated with many officers of the law. As a city councilman of my home community in Rochester, N.Y., I was a member of the public safety committee and there gained deep understanding of the problems that beset police agencies the country over. While no two cities are the same, all face the similar barriers of public indifference to the many achievements of their law enforcement departments and usually exaggerated reaction to the rare occasions when the misdeeds of a single individual are allowed to stigmatize an entire department.

I have yet to see evidence, Mr. Speaker, of a police department where the taxpayers served by it did not get more than a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent in its operation. Washington, D.C., is no exception.

At the helm of Washington's Metropolitan Police Department there is an able chief, Robert V. Murray. Chief Murray enjoys the respect of his men, his fellow law enforcement officers across the United States, and the citizens of this unique American city. This results from the dedicated service he has rendered as a professional policeman for many years.

I know Chief Murray and I know the intensity of his devotion to making Washington and Washingtonians safe and secure. Their welfare is his daily mission.

During consideration of H.R. 7525, the District of Columbia omnibus crime bill, I was especially impressed with the strength of Chief Murray's arguments to restore adequate enforcement measures so that the police in Washington could perform effectively. Obviously, Chief Murray and others who advanced similar arguments made a distinct impression on the Members of the House of Representatives, based on the convincing vote for its passage.

That Chief Murray should be the target of any criticism for his support of providing the Metropolitan Police Department with the same "tools" available to virtually every other police department in the country is nothing short of ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, please let my remarks stand as a vote of confidence to Chief Murray and the Metropolitan Police Department. For as long as they demonstrate their competence as they have to date, they shall continue to have my unfailing support.

---

## NAVY NUCLEAR SURFACE VESSEL PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am a member, has a solemn responsibility to act as a watchdog over the national atomic energy program, including the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense. The purpose of our watchdog function is to assure that adequate progress is being made in our research and development programs and that public funds authorized for these purposes are being spent wisely and well.

In the majority of situations, we are convinced that our research dollars have been spent wisely. We point with pride to the development of such things as the nuclear submarine with its unique and unmatched characteristics.

The committee has also been vitally interested in the extension of our naval nuclear propulsion technology to surface vessels. Last month the committee held executive hearings in order to review progress in the Navy nuclear surface

vessel program. The evidence presented by the AEC, the Department of Defense, and the Navy demonstrated the outstanding success of this program.

Fine naval officers, such as Vice Admiral Hayward and Captains Wilkinson, Peet, and dePoix, who are responsible for the operation of our three nuclear-propelled surface vessels, were unanimous in praising the superiority of these warships. Moreover, they, and personnel of the AEC, testified that important technical strides have been made since the first nuclear surface vessels were built.

Still, for some unknown reasons, the Department of Defense refuses to apply the results of this outstandingly successful development effort. Without question, the United States is preeminent in the development of these nuclear propulsion systems and yet the Department of Defense refuses to permit the Navy to capitalize on this superiority.

During our recent hearings, we inquired in great detail as to plans for utilizing nuclear power in the next aircraft carrier, CVA 67.

As you know, the Secretary of Defense, on October 25, after delaying for 10 months the construction of the carrier which was authorized in the fiscal year 1963 program, suddenly decided to install a conventional powerplant in CVA 67. This will be the second aircraft carrier built since the *Enterprise* and neither will be nuclear propelled.

The principal argument in support of this decision was economic—nuclear power costs more, or so they say. However, every witness who testified before our committee, including the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Naval Operations, agreed that nuclear power was superior for warship propulsion.

This view of the superiority of nuclear power was not given to us by armchair strategists. One naval officer who was involved in the operations of the nuclear carrier, *Enterprise*, for 2 months during the Cuban blockade, told us of his experiences. He described how the superior performance of the *Enterprise* exceeded anything possible with conventional carriers. He described the ship's superior speed, maneuverability, reliability, and more efficient aircraft operation.

It appears that the opinions and views of those with firsthand experience, and other experts in this field, were simply not considered in arriving at this decision against the use of nuclear power in the next aircraft carrier. Apparently, the "cost argument" won the day at the Pentagon.

And this brings me to the other sad part of this story. The cost comparisons used by the Department of Defense in evaluating a nuclear versus a conventional carrier were specious and involved a considerable amount of "jockeying" of cost figures. For example, the Department of Defense testified that a nuclear carrier can carry a greater number of aircraft—a clear advantage. Then, to support its contention that nuclear power is not economical, the Department of Defense charged the cost of the additional aircraft to the nuclear carrier and indicated that this was a detriment to the use of nuclear propulsion.

In addition, the ability of a nuclear carrier to carry more aircraft fuel and more armament was also presented as a cost factor adverse to nuclear propulsion. Finally, the cost of the nuclear reactor cores, which would provide fuel for 7 years of carrier operation, was also charged against the nuclear carrier, while no equivalent fuel charge was made against the oil-fired carrier.

In summary, it appears that important factors were not weighed by the Department of Defense in deciding against the use of nuclear power for CVA 67. More tragically, it appears that we are now ready to settle for second-best propulsion systems in our first-line warships.

Mr. Speaker, we on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are now faced with the immediate problem of deciding if research and development in this field of atomic energy should receive continued financial support from the Government. Frankly, I believe it will be difficult to justify such continued support in the face of the refusal by the Department of Defense to utilize the superior product of this program.

I understand that the chairman of the Joint Committee is now arranging to have the classified portions of our hearings on the nuclear surface vessel program deleted in order that the hearing record can be made public. I am glad that this will be done because I am sure that the record of these hearings will assist the Congress in evaluating the important factors involved in this decision, which may have a profound effect on the future national security.

When the Members of Congress have reviewed this record, they will see that the Department of Defense has underestimated the military advantages and overestimated the cost of a nuclear carrier. Moreover, any objective observer will have to conclude that the increased cost of nuclear power is more than offset by the military advantages of a nuclear carrier.

When the Congress of the United States appropriates $3 to $4 billion every year for foreign aid, there is something wrong when we will not spend the small amount necessary to equip this aircraft carrier with the advantages of nuclear propulsion throughout its expected lifetime of about 30 years.

According to the testimony received by the committee, this aircraft carrier is the only major warship included in construction plans for a 3-year period—1963–65. We should make it the best warship we can.

---

## THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I gladly join with many of my colleagues in both the Senate and House of Representatives in sponsoring the proposal to rename the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center "as a mark of respect and affection for President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as a recognition of his abiding desire to promote and encourage the arts in America, and as a commemoration of his great services to the Nation and people of the United States."

Legislation for this purpose has been sent to the Congress by President Lyndon B. Johnson and has been introduced in both the Senate and House with bipartisan support. The change in name has been approved by the family of the late President.

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy symbolized the vitality and youthful vigor of what has been called the American experiment. He saw a country 188 years young, and sought to move it forward to a greater maturity, both at home and abroad. It was his sense of history and his belief in the destiny of this country, that provided him with his guidelines for action, and stimulated his eloquent appeals for peace and progress.

By now, many words have been spoken of our late President's abilities, virtues, and accomplishments. Little more can be added to the eulogies and the beautiful tributes that have already been expressed. If there is little left unsaid, there is still much to be done.

In a moving editorial urging that the National Cultural Center be enhanced at the time it is rededicated as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, the Washington, D.C., Post says that before ground is broken, surely there ought to be time to reconsider the function and purposes of a memorial center:

> A wise first step would be to consider supplementing construction funds with an endowment to support performing companies and to keep ticket prices within the reach of all. Perhaps, as Congressman McDOWELL also suggests, the Memorial Center might appropriately sponsor national prizes for excellence in the arts.
>
> Moreover, the adaptability of the Center to important noncultural events—including, conceivably, national political conventions—could also be weighed and discussed. A related question is location. Above all, the Center should be accessible, and although the present site near the Potomac has palpable scenic virtue, the question of alternate location should be reconsidered. These are matters that warrant informed discussion when hearings take place on a memorial center that ought to preserve the spirit as well as the memory of President Kennedy.

There is much food for thought in this editorial. The Washington Post reported on December 22, 1962, that a plan to locate the proposed National Cultural Center downtown instead of in the site along the Potomac was being pushed by the President's Advisory Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue. The Committee was set up by President Kennedy to develop plans for making Pennsylvania Avenue the showcase thoroughfare envisioned by Pierre L'Enfant more than 150 years ago. At its meeting on December 13, 1962, according to the Washington Post, the President's Advisory Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue considered these criticisms of the Center's

present site and design plans: First, the site is so far from the center of Washington that it could do little to enrich the city's cultural life; second, the present location is not served by major public transportation facilities; third, housing all performing arts stages in a single building might result in a structure so large as to be out of proportion to the rest of the city.

Both the full Committee and the subcommittee are headed by Nathaniel A. Owings, and present at the December 13 meeting were such close friends of President Kennedy as William Walton, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, and Paul Thiry, chief architect of the Seattle World's Fair. It can be assumed, I think, that they knew what President Kennedy had in mind.

It would seem fundamental that if this is to be the great memorial which all of its sponsors want, then it should have a site second to none. The present site was adopted as a compromise after an ideal site opposite the National Gallery of Art on the Mall was denied the National Cultural Center in favor of a National Air Museum.

The New York Times on December 4, 1963, published an article on the National Cultural Center and declared:

> There have been numerous protests over the site, which is bounded by a freeway, a parkway, and a bridge approach—a "spaghetti maze" of streets, according to critics. A location somewhere along Pennsylvania Avenue between the White House and the Capitol has been suggested.

The present site is overshadowed by highways and bridges, and is hampered by traffic, as has long been recognized by the Commission of Fine Arts, the Washington Building Congress, the Washington Post, many individual civic and cultural leaders, and President Kennedy's Advisory Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Some of the trustees of the National Cultural Center have tended to oppose a better site for the National Cultural Center on the grounds that a better site would make fundraising from private sources more difficult. This reasoning is extremely difficult to follow. Whether this position ever had merit may be doubted. However, now that the Congress is considering renaming the National Cultural Center, and making it a memorial to President John F. Kennedy, whatever merit this position of the Center's trustees had originally completely vanishes.

The Congress simply cannot afford to spend millions of dollars on a memorial, and permit it to be located in an inferior site, and the Congress must take steps at this time to see to it that the best possible site in the Nation's Capital is set aside for this great memorial. The least we can do is to study the matter, to see what the pluses, if any, of the present site are, and see if there are better sites.

President Kennedy was interested, and deeply interested, in the establishment of an American Music and Art Prize. Pierre Salinger spoke of this interest of President Kennedy's in a speech to the National Symphony Orchestra report luncheon on March 8, 1961, and wide publicity was given to it at that time, only a very few months after the President had assumed office. National prizes are well known abroad, where they make major contributions to the discovery, encouragement, and advancement of young artists and thus serve important national purposes.

Young American artists should be similarly encouraged, and it is to the great credit of President Kennedy that he confidently looked forward to the day when festivals and competitions for young artists would be held in the National Cultural Center.

Our Nation's young artists have won top places and prizes in the national competitions in European countries. Van Cliburn came to international attention when he won top prize in such a competition in Moscow a few years ago.

President Kennedy welcomed young artists to the White House and he often spoke of young artists performing in the National Cultural Center. With his help the National Cultural Center and the American Educational Theater Association have invited some 15 university theater groups to participate in a national university theater festival in the Nation's Capital in May 1964.

It has been announced that a tent will shelter the festival participants and audiences. The shelter tent would be erected on the site of the National Cultural Center.

So here was President Kennedy supporting an area of our national life which he understood, encouraged, and assisted, and so festivals and competitions should be a part of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center when it is finally built in the Nation's Capital, for it would give a national focus and importance to such a memorial center.

The Washington Post editorial suggests supplementing construction funds with an endowment to support performing companies and to keep ticket prices within the reach of all. The National Gallery of Art, which is largely devoted to European art, has had major financial support on an annual basis from its very beginning. Therefore, in the measure I have introduced I have provided that the Congress shall meet the operating deficit of the Memorial Center by an annual appropriation of a sum equal to, but not more than, the sum appropriated each fiscal year by the Congress for the National Gallery of Art. The funds so provided would be available for all purposes of the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, including festivals and competitions. Certainly the Memorial Center must be as important to our country as the National Gallery of Art.

Second, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia would be directed, under the terms of my measure, House Joint Resolution 851, to include an annual appropriation of not less than $300,000 in the District of Columbia budget to help meet the operating deficit of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center including the cost of presenting in it the National Symphony Orchestra and other groups and individual artists resident in the Nation's Capital who are qualified.

Washington, D.C., one of the country's major cities, does less than any other major city to aid the arts. It spends each year about $25,000 at the present time for the arts, whereas such cities as Baltimore, Newark, Detroit, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, and New York spend from 20 to 40 times as much. The amount other cities annually spend for the arts was the subject of a study by the Library of Congress some time ago, and I include it as part of my remarks. Certainly, the Nation's Capital, like the capital cities of other great nations of the world, and like major cities in our own country should aid the arts. President Kennedy understood this, for he was a keen student of history, and he understood the place of the arts in our national life.

I am certain that our citizens, in all of the States of our country, and in all of our cities, would more willingly contribute to the Memorial Center in Washington if the City of Washington, D.C., itself would make a major contribution to it. For this reason, I have provided for such a contribution in my joint resolution.

With the major contribution by the Federal Government to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center envisioned by the bills which have been introduced in the Congress new factors must be taken into account in the appointment of trustees.

Trustee appointments must be made of a stature which will assure the Nation that the importance of this great project will be maintained, and its status as a presidential memorial, on a level with our other presidential memorials, will be fully recognized.

A living memorial has special problems and hazards unknown to the monument type of memorial.

I would urge the appointment of our past Presidents as trustees of the Memorial Center. President Truman was and is deeply interested in music and the National Cultural Center, and President Eisenhower signed the National Cultural Center Act into law.

The Congress should now require, by amendment or otherwise, that the trustees of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Last August, when the life of the National Cultural Center was extended for 3 years by a vote of 10 to 1, the Congress authorized the appointment of 15 additional trustees.

Fortunately, few of the newly authorized trustees have been appointed, so a unique opportunity is present to President Johnson to appoint as trustees persons who are well known to the country at large, who have the confidence of all of our citizens, and so will fully represent the Nation and the new and vital concept of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

Furthermore, since Federal funds are involved, steps must now be taken, as

in the case of other Federal projects, to provide for an annual audit by the Comptroller General of the United States.

I include as part of my remarks the Washington Post editorial, to which I have referred, and the text of my House Joint Resolution 851.

I include also some remarks by one of the country's leading concert managers, Mr. Patrick Hayes, who was one of the earliest friends and supporters, and one of the most vigorous proponents, of the National Cultural Center, and a close, personal friend of President Kennedy as well.

Finally, I include the Library of Congress study of what other cities of our country do to aid the arts financially.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 7, 1963]

A MEMORIAL CENTER

The rededication of the National Cultural Center to the memory of John F. Kennedy can be considered an accomplished fact. The trustees of the Center have approved this obvious and spontaneously generated proposal; President Johnson has submitted to Congress a bill providing for a Federal contribution to match private gifts. Since about $13 million has been raised in cash and pledges, the $30-million goal will be within easy reach once Congress has approved the needed legislation.

But before ground is broken, surely there ought to be time to reconsider the function and purposes of a memorial center. A wise first step would be to consider supplementing construction funds with an endowment to support performing companies and to keep ticket prices within the reach of all. Perhaps, as Congressman McDOWELL also suggests, the Memorial Center might appropriately sponsor national prizes for excellence in the arts.

Moreover, the adaptability of the Center to important noncultural events—including, conceivably, national political conventions—could also be weighed and discussed. A related question is location. Above all, the Center should be accessible, and although the present site near the Potomac has palpable scenic virtue, the question of alternate location should be reconsidered. These are matters that warrant informed discussion when hearings take place on a memorial center that ought to preserve the spirit as well as the memory of President Kennedy.

BROADCAST BY PATRICK HAYES, WGMS, SUNDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1963, 1 P.M., WOODWARD & LOTHROP

Good afternoon. The groundswell was instantaneous and total for the idea that the National Cultural Center be named after President Kennedy. Who first had the idea may never be known, and it does not matter. It was in everyone's heart. We first heard it from a neighbor up the street with whom we visited during that lonesome weekend—would it not be fitting to rename the Cultural Center after the late President? Early in the week both the Star and Post ran editorials in favor of doing this—the Star put its editorial on the front page, upper right fold, just under the day's headline. The next day there appeared a poll of the Board of Trustees of the Center itself, all in favor. It was, of course, discreetly revealed that the plan had been discussed with Mrs. Kennedy, who approved of it. Then still later in the week bills were introduced in Congress which would make the change of name legal, and also provide for matching funds from the Government to insure the Center's completion.

Ordinarily, the perspective of time is wise before building or dedicating monuments to statesmen who have died. The Washington Monument was many decades in the making, and the Lincoln Memorial was not begun for a few decades after Lincoln's death. There is still no memorial in Washington to Woodrow Wilson, or to Franklin D. Roosevelt, although they are being planned. Decades of perspective, however, could not have improved upon the immediate opportunity of having the National Cultural Center dedicated to and named after John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The Center was already a part of his life, and as the late President's friend, William Walton, points out this morning in a full-page article in the outlook section of the Post, President Kennedy will be remembered for three specific achievements in the arts among others—the rebuilding of Lafayette Square, the eventual improvement of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, and the Cultural Center. Plans for all three are underway, with the Lafayette Square project ready for immediate action.

The overwhelming ground swell of approval for the renaming of the Cultural Center should not overwhelm reason as to the project itself. Originally conceived as a National Center for the Performing Arts, it is now proposed that it be a memorial to the late President. Should not all of the original questions be asked again in light of this development? Is the present location the exact and perfect one? Is the present design the exact and perfect one? If the upgrading of Pennsylvania Avenue is to become one of the late President's monuments, might an idea expressed a year or so ago be considered now—to locate one of the components of the Cultural Center along the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue; or all three components? The river site along the Potomac is still an idyllic one, but not overly large for the size of the present design, and a smaller building is worthy of serious consideration. The best imagination of architects and planners should be invited for informal or even public expression.

There is to be a meeting in mid-January of the Board of Trustees of the Cultural Center, together with as many of the Advisory Committee as can attend. This meeting was set well before the tragic event of 9 days ago, and now with radically new developments in the Cultural Center movement, this meeting will be a critical one. What is decided upon and built will last for a hundred years or more. It must be right—nothing less than perfection and excellence will do to memorialize a man who practiced the arts of perfection and excellence so constantly and so well.

*Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire*

| City | Amount of municipal financial support | Source of municipal financial support | Type of activity supported |
|---|---|---|---|
| Akron, Ohio | $36,000 | General fund (indirect support in lieu of tax for facility). | Art museum. |
| | $5,000,000 | Direct tax construction cost | Plans for the construction of a municipal auditorium and "cultural grouping for arts, library and arena." |
| | 1 or 3 parts of a $100,000 recreation program | General fund (part of "recreation program") | Band concerts. |
| Atlanta, Ga | $7,500 | General fund | Atlanta Symphony Guild. |
| | $6,000 | do | Atlanta Pops Concert. |
| | $5,000 | do | Municipal Theater Under-the-Stars. |
| | $10,000 | do | Atlanta Art Association for Benefit High Museum and School of Art. |
| Baltimore, Md | 1959 appropriations: | | |
| | $25,594 | do | Municipal Museum. |
| | $119,994 | do | Bureau of Music. |
| | $288,000 | Endowment funds (estimated income) | Walters Art Gallery. |
| | $15,000 | General funds (pensions) | |
| Birmingham, Ala | $90,000 (this year's appropriation) | General funds | Birmingham Museum of Art. |
| Buffalo, N.Y | Appropriated in 1958–59: | | |
| | $73,430 | Real estate tax and other current revenues | Albright Art Gallery. |
| | $30,000 | do | Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society, Inc. |
| | $27,300 | do | Kleinhans Music Hall. |
| Chicago, Ill | Calendar year 1958: | | |
| | $232,405.87 | Payments from Chicago Park District, an independent municipal corporation in the city of Chicago. | Art Institute of Chicago. |
| | $232,369.11 | do | Museum of Science and Industry. |
| | $232,405.92 | do | Chicago Natural History Museum (field museum). |
| Dallas, Tex | $80,000 | General revenues, "the major part of which is ad valorem tax." | Fine Arts Museum. |
| Detroit, Mich | 1959–60 gross appropriation, $543,081 | Local taxes, grants and gifts, and revenues | Arts Commission. |
| Evansville, Ind | 1959 contribution, $9,200 | Civil City of Evansville | Evansville Museum of Arts and Sciences. |
| | Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400 | | |
| | 1959 contribution, $9,200 | School City of Evansville [1] | Do. |
| | Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400 | | |
| Hagerstown, Md | $12,500 (provided for in annual budget) | General revenues | Washington County Museum of Fine Arts. |
| Houston, Tex | $19,500 | do | Museum of Natural History. |
| | $20,000 | do | Museum of Fine Arts. |
| | $3,000 | do | Civic Theater. |
| | $25,000 | do | Houston Symphony. |
| Providence, R.I | Current appropriations: | | |
| | $24,877 | General revenue | Museum in Roger Williams Park. |
| | $1,500 | do | Band concerts. |

See footnotes at end of table.

*Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire*—Con.

| City | Amount of municipal financial support | Source of municipal financial support | Type of activity supported |
|---|---|---|---|
| Reading, Pa | $140,000 (approximate expenditures for 1959). | General revenues (budgeted annually according to estimated needs). | Recreation Bureau (sponsors orchestra, Nature Museum, etc.). |
| | $3,028 (1959) | do | Bureau of parks weekly band concerts. |
| Richmond, Va | $5,000 | Direct appropriation | Valentine Museum. |
| Rochester, N.Y | 1959–60 expenditures: | | |
| | $10,000 | General revenues or real estate taxes | Civil Music Association. |
| | $20,000 | do | "Opera Under the Stars." |
| | Not indicated | Not indicated | Museum. |
| Sacramento, Calif | 1959–60 budget amounts: | | |
| | $4,500 | General ad valorem taxes | Philharmonic Orchestra. |
| | $4,000 | do | Park band concerts. |
| | $66,866 | do | Crocker Art Gallery (city owned). |
| | $17,000 | do | Children's art and dancing classes (city recreation department). |
| St. Louis, Mo | 1958 revenue: $320,007.53 | Permanent levy of $0.02 per $100 valuation on all real and personal property (established under State law in 1907). | St. Louis Art Museum. |
| St. Paul, Minn | 1959 city budget appropriations: | | |
| | $13,500 | Appropriations "financed as part of the overall city budget." | St. Paul Gallery and School of Art. |
| | $10,000 | do | St. Paul Civic Opera. |
| San Antonio, Tex | $81,000 (approximate budget for ensuing year). | Supported primarily by general fund | Witte Museum. |
| | $81,000 | do | 2 municipal auditoriums. |
| | $1,500 | do | San Pedro Playhouse (auditorium devoted primarily to theatrical productions). |
| San Diego, Calif | 1959–60 city budget: | | |
| | $57,159 | General revenues | Fine Arts Gallery. |
| | $19,289 | do | Serra Museum (local history). |
| | $48,715 | do | Natural History Museum. |
| | $45,949 | do | Museum of Man (anthropology). |
| | $10,000 | do | San Diego Symphony. |
| San Francisco, Calif | 1958–59 budget: | | |
| | $158,365 (taxes, $120,665; other $37,700) | Budget of the city and county of San Francisco | Art commission. |
| | $35,493 (taxes) | do | War Memorial Art Museum. |
| | $255,456 (taxes, $254,856; other, $600) | do | California Palace of the Legion of Honor (art musuem). |
| | $367,942 (taxes, $367,692; other, $250) | do | De Young (art) Museum. |
| Scranton, Pa | An average of about $28,740 per annum over the past 10 years. | General funds | Everhart Museum. |
| Seattle, Wash | $233.37 | City's annual budget funds without regard to income source. | Art commission. |
| | $34,097.55 | do | Art museum. |
| | $18,000 | do | Public music. |
| | $62,743.57 | do | Art division of the library department. |
| Springfield, Mass.[2] | $33,127.93 | General tax revenues | Museum of Natural History. |
| | $31,092.45 | do | George Walter Vincent Smith Museum. |
| | $18,161.40 | do | William Pynchon Memorial (Connecticut Valley Historical Museum). |
| | $1,267 | do | Springfield Museum of Fine Arts. |
| | Not indicated | do | Fine arts department of library. |
| Syracuse, N.Y | $25,000 appropriation annually | General tax levy | Syracuse Museum of Fine Arts (privately chartered institution). |

[1] City budget for 1960 based on 1 cent per $100 valuation of the city. Funds provided by taxes earmarked for this specific purpose.

[2] Included in the library budget is the position of musical adviser, which is the way in which the city contributes to the salary of the conductor of the Springfield Symphony Orchestra.

Source: Compiled by Anne M. Finnegan and Helen A. Miller, Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, July 29, 1959.

### H.J. RES. 851

Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, to authorize an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That as a mark of respect and affection for President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as a recognition of his abiding desire to promote and encourage the arts in America, and as a commemoration of his great services to the Nation and people of the United States, the National Cultural Center provided for by the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1698), as amended, shall be known hereafter as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law the President, in cooperation with the trustees of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, shall assist the composition of creative works by young artists by, among other things, national competitions and awards and promoting the publication and performance of such creative works.

SEC. 3. The President and the Congress shall determine, on the basis of studies which the National Capital Planning Commission is hereby authorized and directed to make, or to have made under its direction, where the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center shall be constructed so that it will not be overshadowed by bridges and highways, or be handicapped by traffic.

SEC. 4. Section 5(c) of the National Cultural Center Act is amended by adding the following new language immediately before the period at the end thereof: ", except that the Comptroller General of the United States shall make an annual audit and forward it, together with his recommendations, to the President and the Congress".

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, for payment to the trustees of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, $5,000,000 to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act, subject to the requirement that the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution shall find that the aggregate amount of the funds otherwise received by the trustees of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, together with the amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section, is sufficient to construct the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

SEC. 6. (a) To meet the operating deficit of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for payment to the trustees of such Memorial Center, in addition to the funds provided for in section 5 of this Act, a sum equal to, but not more than, the sum appropriated each fiscal year by the Congress for the National Gallery of Art. The funds provided by this section shall be available for all purposes of the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, including festivals and competitions.

(b) The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall include an annual appropriation of not less than $300,000 in the District of Columbia budget to help meet the operating deficit of such Memorial Center including the cost of presenting in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center the National Symphony Orchestra and other qualified professional, educational, or amateur performing arts groups and individual artists resident in the District of Columbia.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY PROCEDURE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to observe that Calendar Wednesday is going to take place this coming Wednesday. The reason I objected to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday was that it was my understanding the Committee on the Judiciary of the House had a measure that they wanted to bring on the floor of the House for a debate and a vote. If I am in error and they do not have such a

measure, we can determine that. But I have since learned that possibly other committees that are ahead of the Committee on the Judiciary in the alphabet, and as we know Calendar Wednesday is a call of the committees in alphabetical order, my understanding is that possibly some of the committees that are ahead of the Committee on the Judiciary might call up bills. I want to make this observation. If that is done, this will be done by the Democratic chairmen of those committees and can only be done really with the consent of the majority of those committees. Now we have had none of those committees in the preceding months request that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with. Only one person needs to object and we will have Calendar Wednesday. Not one of those committees has shown any inclination to utilize Calendar Wednesday. There is no question that if these committees attempt to utilize Calendar Wednesday this Wednesday so that the Committee on the Judiciary cannot reach its turn that will be done solely for the purpose of preventing the Calendar reaching the Committee on the Judiciary. I think there is no doubt that the majority party will be responsible for this occurrence if it comes about.

Calendar Wednesday was placed in the rules of the House almost 50 years ago just so the Committee on Rules could not prevent legislation voted out by the legislative committees from reaching the floor of the House. It, in effect, is not a discharge petition. It, in effect, is bypassing the Committee on Rules and is for that purpose. It has been properly utilized in the past. Of course, it cannot be utilized if the majority does not wish the matter to be on the floor of the House. This is not a device where the minority can work its will against the majority. It is only if the majority seeks to work its will. I might add also it requires understanding and proper usage by the Speaker and of those who control the machinery of the House. But properly used, as it has been used in the past—in 1950 to pass a civil rights bill on the floor of the House and in 1960, to pass the area redevelopment bill which also passed the House under Calendar Wednesday. This is a proper technique. So we will see this coming Wednesday whether or not, if indeed the majority wish that this matter be on the floor of the House for debate and vote.

## A TRIBUTE TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include a beautiful and expressing poem, a tribute to and in commemoration of our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, which came from the mind of and written by George N. Welch, president of the Charitable Irish Society of Boston, Mass.:

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, 35TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

It was a lovely day in Texas,
In Dallas, a cultural town,
The multitudes were gathered
To see the President and Jacqueline
And receive them with welcome profound.
The welcome was tumultuous
And all was going well
When suddenly shots rang out
And on the gathering cast a spell.
For the President was shot and dying
And the Governor wounded too
By the hand of a fanatic
With a distorted sense of view.
Now he has gone from us
And our lives are filled with pain
For nowhere in this vale of tears
Shall we see his like again.
Superbly endowed by heritage
Education and training
For the greatest office of all
Made it almost imperative
That John F. Kennedy answer the call.
The call that came from the people
Throughout the length and breadth of the land
That J.F.K. should be our President
And on that office place his brand.
As our President he has striven
With all his might and main
To bring peace and order
Throughout the world,
And for this he was cruelly slain.
So we pay him this tribute
Futile though it may seem
As we long for the glint of humor
That in those Irish eyes did gleam.
Taken off in the bloom of his manhood
With his herculean tasks undone,
The awesome responsibility ended
His race of life prematurely run.
But wherever real men gather
Throughout the entire world,
They will talk of his courage and wisdom
And manners beyond compare,
These things he had in abundance
They were part of his daily fare.
We shall miss his encyclopedic memory
And his analytical, panoramic mind.
As well as his humble approach to problems
When answers were hard to find.
The mighty and the humble
Have paid tribute at his bier,
Heads of state from far off places
Have come to shed a tear.
We have lost a great President,
And in the annals of time
His stature will increase and grow,
Until the world regards him
One of our greatest men
In this planet here below.
This valiant warrior for peace
And the brotherhood of man,
Has joined the ranks of the martyred
During his short earthly span.
May the symbolic flame
Which burns o'er his grave
Be as eternal
As his unquenchable spirit.
May the Great God above
Receive his valiant soul,
And give him the peace and serenity
Which was his earthly goal.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. BARRETT, indefinitely, on account of official business.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today and the balance of this week, on account of illness.

Mrs. HANSEN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and the remainder of the week, on account of death in family.

## 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. WILSON of Indiana, to extend the time of his special order from 15 to 30 minutes on Thursday, December 12.

Mr. WHITENER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. WESTLAND, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 60 minutes, on Thursday, December 12.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. BOGGS, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $630.

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

Mr. CAMERON in five instances.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. DOWNING.

Mr. MORRIS.

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

Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. GOODLING.

## 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. 633. An act for the relief of Michelle Su Zehr (Lim Myung Im); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 689. An act for the relief of Lila Everts Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 692. An act to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1169. An act 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; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile deliquents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1332 An act for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Leitzel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Pietro Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1466. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1518. An act for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Hipolito Mora Lorilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1757. An act to ratify certain conveyances of land on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1760. An act for the relief of Dr. Margot R. Sobey III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1781. An act for the relief of Antonio Credenza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1822. An act for the relief of Apostolos Gerontis and his wife, Anastasia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Alva Arlington Garnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1943. An act for the relief of Mrs. William H. Quasha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1951. An act for the relief of George Elias NeJame (Noujaim); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1958. An act for the relief of Ivanka Pekar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1976. An act for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Antero Sanchez (Hernandez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2040. An act 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Pietrina Del Frate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2085. An act for the relief of William Maurer Trayfors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2100. An act to continue for a certain period certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2213. An act to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2218. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for the purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

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

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 10, 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:

1419. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the uneconomical management of commercially available items in the supply system of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1420. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the retroactive qualification of certain union-negotiated multiemployer pension funds"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1421. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the silt project, Colorado, has been completed, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1422. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, relative to stating that a loan in the amount of $39,230,000 has been approved for the United Power Association of Elk River, Minn., pursuant to Senate Report 497, Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1964; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1423. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of the books of the Quartermaster General of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 630, 74th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## 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. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8171. A bill to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include all the Riverton reclamation project except the Muddy Ridge area, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2228. An act to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1011). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1012. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 9390. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to require that certain firearms transported in interstate or foreign commerce must be consigned to the recipients through local law enforcement officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9391. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 by the addition of certain provisions for injunctions against Communist organizations; grand jury investigation of enforcement; priority of trials; more severe punishment in cases of violations by employees on the staffs of the White House, Congress, and Supreme Court; power to deny bail; appropriate supervision of convicts during confinement; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9392. A bill to designate the Allegheny Reservoir on the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as the Leon H. Gavin Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9393. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aides employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9394. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the Small Business Administration to insure business loans made to small-business concerns by private lending institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9395. A bill to clarify the Renegotiation Act of 1951 with respect to its preemptive effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 9396. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9397. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 with respect to the purposes for which loans may be made thereunder and the rates of interest on such loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.J. Res. 854. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 9398. A bill for the relief of Pesie and George Szekely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9399. A bill for the relief of Glenn D. Humes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 9400. A bill for the relief of E. Christian Des Marets, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9401. A bill for the relief of Antonio Santini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9402. A bill for the relief of Mario Vinci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9403. A bill for the relief of Pedro Velasquez Espinoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9404. A bill for the relief of Clarita D. Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 9405. A bill for the relief of Miss Fructuosa Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 9406. A bill for the relief of Clarence L. Aiu and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

497. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to support legislation that would place a reproduction of the face of the late President John F. Kennedy on U.S. silver dollar coins and on certain currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

498. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to remind President Johnson that one of the best ways to achieve his announced economic and thrifty goal, is by seriously considering the official reports of the General Accounting Office, under the Comptroller General of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

499. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the length of terms of office of the President, and Members of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

500. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to pass a resolution calling the present Presidential Succession Act a good law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

501. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to pass a resolution commending former Florida Gov. Leroy Collins, for his recent speech in Columbia, S.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

502. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., transmitting additional material relating to presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

503. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the Speaker acting as President in case of disability to the President, or becoming President in case of death of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

504. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate to cause all hearings open to the public, held by Congress, to be joint committee hearings, except in certain cases; to the Committee on Rules.

505. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate legislation naming important Federal installations, places, or buildings, after former Presidents Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Committee on Public Works.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz Stresses the Importance of a Strong National Effort in Education as a Response to the Challenge of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in an article in the December issue of the Rotarian magazine, the Secretary of Labor, Hon. W. Willard Wirtz, made the following statement:

The casual, and classical, view of automation is that it creates as many jobs as it destroys, even more. If this is right at all—and there is increasing question about it—what it leaves out is that the new jobs almost all require some skill, whereas this was not true before.

The basic question is whether the new technology—including computers, atomic energy, space age developments, whole manufacturing processes controlled by automation—is outrunning the achievement of the U.S. school system in preparing our youngsters for the employment complexities of such an era. There is evidence that education and employment are falling out of step. We can no longer proceed upon the assumption that the principal mission of the school system is to prepare our young people for life in only its broadest sense.

Instead, we must begin giving intensive consideration to the role of the school in the basic preparation of individual employment skills. And because the matter is one of grave national consequence, some form of Federal action is clearly required. Such action is embodied in the National Education and Improvement Act of 1963, presently before the Congress.

I concur wholeheartedly with Secretary Wirtz in his assessment of the urgent need which confronts us in the field of education and in areas of retraining for those citizens displaced by technological expansion. It has long been my view that the gravity of this menace requires that immediate and imaginative steps be taken to insure that the most modern facilities and full educational opportunity are made available to all who seek them, and to those who need our encouragement and help in providing training for meaningful endeavors.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and its Subcommittee on Labor, Education, and Employment and Manpower, it has been my privilege to participate in the consideration and revision of legislation designed to alleviate in part the shortcomings to which Secretary Wirtz refers. I am confident that measures enacted during this session will have significant value in raising the level of our educational system and in building increased public awareness of the needs which exist.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Education: Answer to Unemployment," by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, in the December 1963 issue of the Rotarian, be printed in the RECORD.

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

EDUCATION: ANSWER TO UNEMPLOYMENT

(By W. Willard Wirtz)

At one time, not so long ago, a man who was physically capable of working could usually find a job. Today, however, this is not so. A widening chasm lies between many of the unemployed and the jobs they seek, and more and more we are finding that the only bridge across it is education and training.

If a new axiom is needed, it's as simple—and persistent—as this: The less schooling, the less chance for a job. What is distressing about it is its provability, for among the 4 to 5 million U.S. unemployed are legions who don't have even the most modest academic tools.

Recent data show that in the United States more than 300,000 people looking for jobs had less than a fifth-grade education, and almost 1½ million had less than an eighth-grade education. People so ill prepared are at an initial disadvantage in today's highly skilled labor market, and will become progressively more disadvantaged as the Nation pushes its way toward greater technological achievement.

The close correlation between unemployment and educational attainment can be seen in the monthly reports on the labor force. In March 1962, for instance, the unemployment rate was 9.2 percent for people with less than a grade-school education, but only 4 percent for those with some college education.

Earnings of workers are also relative to their educational attainment. A recent study by the Bureau of the Census reveals that additional schooling is clearly associated with a very substantial increase in lifetime income. Over a lifetime, the difference between the total earnings of men with 1 to 3 years of high school and those of high school graduates is better than $46,000. The difference in lifetime earnings between a high school graduate and a college graduate is close to $180,000. Urban males with 4 years or more of college education had annual incomes of $6,780 in 1958, as compared with the income of $2,504 for urban men with less than 8 years of schooling.

About three-fourths of the heads of families with incomes under $3,000 a year, had not completed high school. Approximately 58 percent of the family heads making $15,000 a year and over had some college education. Only 21 percent of family heads with incomes of $15,000 or more a year had not completed high school, the survey showed.

Facts such as these provide a picture of the increasingly tighter link between education and employment, a consequence, largely, of the complexity of so much modern work. Where there was once a place for the youth who left high school without a diploma, who took an unskilled job and worked his way up, today that place is filled, often, by a machine. That 700,000 16- to 21-year-old youths are presently out of school and out of work is dramatic evidence of this fact.

The future in the United States for the unskilled worker is dim.

Between 1950 and 1960, total employment in the United States went up 11 percent. During this period the number of "professional, technical, and kindred workers" increased 67 percent; and the number of "craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers" went up 12 percent. The number of laborers (not counting those on farms and in mines) went up only 4 percent.

Over the past 15 years, the percentage of white-collar workers in the work force has risen from 35 percent (1947) to 44 percent (1962). The percentage of blue-collar workers has dropped from 41 percent to 36 percent.

In the 10 years following 1952, the number of white-collar workers increased by about 7 million. The number of laborers (again leaving out the farm and mine group) went down by 150,000.

All this is a result primarily of the developments we lump together under "automation"

and technological change. The casual, and classical, view of automation is that it creates as many jobs as it destroys, even more. If this is right at all—and there is increasing question about it—what it leaves out is that the new jobs almost all require some skill, whereas this was not true before.

The basic question is whether the new technology—including computers, atomic energy, space age developments, whole manufacturing processes controlled by "automation"—is outrunning the achievement of the U.S. school system in preparing our youngsters for the employment complexities of such an era. There is evidence that education and employment are falling out of step. We can no longer proceed upon the assumption that the principal mission of the school system is to prepare our young people for life in only its broadest sense.

Instead, we must begin giving intensive consideration to the role of the school in the basic preparation of individual employment skills. And because the matter is one of grave national consequence, some form of Federal action is clearly required. Such action is embodied in the National Education and Improvement Act of 1963, presently before the Congress.

This bill's provisions would help to underwrite a revitalized educational program for the Nation—ranging from improved teacher quality, to higher teachers' salaries, to college construction. Of great interest to the Department of Labor are provisions which would greatly strengthen the country's vocational-education system. The proposed law would moderize and expand the present program of Federal grants to the States in this field, and it would benefit far more individuals than is now possible. It would provide financial assistance for the implementation of a new and highly promising concept, the area vocational-educational school. It would assist the development of a large number of ancillary services, notably teacher training and teaching techniques and materials. Finally, it would establish a direct link between the vocational-education planning of the States and the employment-pattern appraisals of the local offices of the public employment service.

Behind all this is the intent to correlate a man's education and the productive role he is to play in an advanced industrial society. Such a purpose does not recoil from the fact that a problem of nationwide proportions is at hand. Nor does it seek to abrogate what are traditionally and constitutionally State and local responsibilities.

What is sought here is an acceptance of the challenge presented by the advance of technology. It recognizes that the Nation's present unacceptable rate of unemployment may climb even higher as a result of the inadequacies of our present school system.

Another Federal program based upon the same philosophy and equally important in terms of the dilemma is that of the Manpower Development and Training Act, administered by the Department of Labor. This program, a little more than a year old now, is directed toward the opening up of job-training opportunities to unemployed or underemployed workers all across the Nation.

Good as it is, however, the measure, as originally construed, leaves something to be desired. The law does not permit us, presently, to pay training allowances to jobless youths between the ages of 16 to 19, and limits the kind of an allowance we can pay to young people between 19 and 22. It also places a 5-percent ceiling on the amount of appropriated funds for the act which can be used for any aspect of youth training.

Amendments to the MDTA now being sought by the administration would lower the training-allowance age to 16 and increase the proportion of funds for youth training to 15 percent.

Some 26 million young people will pour into the U.S. labor market during this decade, and all of them will represent the mass product of the American school system. Only if the link between education and employment is strongly forged will the outlook for these youngsters be a bright one.

## Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my third rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from June 12 through August 12, 1963:

| Roll-call No. | Date | H.R. No. | Vote | | | | Brief description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | R.B.C. | Yea | Nay | Not voting | |
| *79 | June 12 | 4996 | Yea | 204 | 209 | 18 | On passage of area redevelopment bill (1 Member answered present). |
| 80 | June 13 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Byrnes, Republican, of Wisconsin (59 Members absent). |
| 81 | do | 6755 | Yea | 283 | 91 | 58 | 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rates. |
| 82 | June 18 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (58 Members absent). |
| 83 | do | 7063 | Yea | 301 | 93 | 39 | Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce. |
| 84 | June 19 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Kyl, Republican, of Iowa (50 Members absent). |
| 85 | do | 247 | Yea | 263 | 126 | 42 | Suspending equal-time requirements for 1964 presidential campaign. |
| 86 | June 24 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Cohelan, Democrat, of California (98 Members absent). |
| *87 | do | 6177 | Yea | 99 | 237 | 98 | District of Columbia appropriations; a motion to recommit. |
| 88 | June 25 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Ford, Republican, of Michigan (47 Members absent). |
| 89 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (58 Members absent). |
| 90 | June 26 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois (38 Members absent). |
| 91 | do | 7179 | Yea | 410 | 1 | 22 | Department of Defense appropriation bill. |
| 92 | July 9 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (46 Members absent). (R.B.C. in conference re highway and flood control projects affecting the 25th Congressional District.) |
| 93 | do | 3179 | Yea | 314 | 82 | 37 | A bill to provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals be entitled to retirement privileges equal to judges of U.S. courts of appeals. |
| 94 | July 16 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Conte, Republican, of Massachusetts (67 Members absent). |
| *95 | do | 4897 | Not voting | 40 | 338 | 53 | Motion to recommit bill to extend geographic jurisdictional reach of wartime sedition statute (2 Members answered present). (R.B.C. in conference with Mr. Robert Rope, city manager, City of Industry.) |
| 96 | July 17 | 5297 | Nay | 144 | 245 | 44 | Motion to recommit conference report on Department of Interior appropriations. |
| 97 | do | 5297 | Yea | 331 | 50 | 52 | On passage of conference report for Department of Interior appropriations. |
| 98 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio (52 Members absent). (R.B.C. at committee reception for President of the Afghan National Assembly.) |
| 99 | July 18 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois (83 Members absent). |
| 100 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri (83 Members absent). |
| *101 | do | 5171 | Yea | 96 | 258 | 79 | Motion to recommit bill giving GSA control of Federal data processing equipment. |
| *102 | July 24 | 6518 | do | 272 | 102 | 58 | A bill to improve air pollution control programs. |
| 103 | July 25 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (55 Members present). |
| 104 | do | 4683 | Nay | 29 | 343 | 60 | Motion to recommit bill to promote orderly transfer of administrations. |
| 105 | July 30 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Patman, Democrat, of Texas (47 Members absent). |
| 106 | do | 3872 | Yea | 379 | 11 | 41 | To return to conference a bill to extend life of Export-Import Bank. |
| 107 | July 31 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (37 Members absent.) |
| 108 | do | 453 | Yea | 234 | 166 | 32 | Resolution to consider conference report re Philippine war damage claims. |
| 109 | Aug. 1 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington (45 Members absent). |
| 110 | do | 467 | Yea | 387 | 1 | 44 | Resolution to consider NASA appropriations. |
| 111 | do | 7500 | do | 334 | 57 | 41 | Appropriating $5,200,000,000 for NASA. |
| 112 | Aug. 5 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (88 Members absent). |
| 113 | do | S. 1652 | Yea | 293 | 33 | 106 | Extending National Cultural Center Act for 3 years. |
| 114 | Aug. 6 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (41 Members absent). |
| 115 | do | 4955 | Nay | 181 | 217 | 34 | Motion to recommit Vocational Education Act (1 Member voted present). |
| 116 | do | 4955 | Yea | 377 | 21 | 35 | On passage of Vocational Education Act. |
| 117 | Aug. 7 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (53 Members absent). |
| 118 | do | 477 | Yea | 303 | 72 | 59 | Resolution to consider debt ceiling. |
| 119 | Aug. 8 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Alger, Republican, of Texas (46 Members absent). |
| 120 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (58 Members absent). (R.B.C. in committee for testimony of Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.) |
| 121 | do | 7824 | Nay | 164 | 229 | 41 | Motion to recommit, with instructions to reduce debt ceiling. |
| 122 | do | 7824 | Yea | 221 | 175 | 38 | To extend present $309,000,000,000 temporary debt ceiling. |
| 123 | Aug. 12 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Diggs, Democrat, of Michigan (115 Members absent). |
| *124 | do | 7525 | Yea | 114 | 222 | 97 | Motion to recommit District of Columbia criminal procedure bill. |

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 79

The bill increasing appropriations for area redevelopment was defeated in the House but received subsequent Senate approval. The measure will probably be scheduled for further House action and will receive analysis in a future rollcall.

ROLLCALL NO. 87

This bill, as passed to the Senate, authorizes increasing the Federal subvention to the District of Columbia from $32 to $45 million for fiscal 1964. I supported a motion, which was defeated, to recommit the bill to committee with instructions to raise the authorization to $53 million. The motion was predicated on the fact that if the Federal Government were a taxpayer in the District of Columbia, as is private industry, the property that it owns in the District would pay a property tax bill of $53 million this year. Nearly every parent in the 25th District who has children in the public schools now fills out a form indicating whether he works for the Federal Government or for an industry that contracts primarily with the Federal Government. This is because Congress has decided, through the Federal impacted school program, that if it is responsible for creating an additional load on the local property taxpayer for the support of education, because of children whose parents work for tax-exempt facilities, it should pay its pro rata share of the increased cost in education. I believe that this approach is sound and should be followed in the District of Columbia.

During debate there was virtually no disagreement on the fact that the Capital is in dire financial trouble resulting from soaring costs of District government and prolonged neglect of the District's needs in the areas of education, police and fire protection, recreation, prevention of crime and juvenile delinquency, and so forth. The conditions of school facilities are a particular disgrace. Not only do those who live and work in Washington recognize this fact but in recent months four national magazines have concluded that the Nation's Capital is a national shame primarily because the Congress has failed to provide adequate funds to do a decent job of governing. In my judgment, failure to support the financial formula was a failure by Congress to meet its responsibilities as the world's largest school board, city council, board of supervisors, and State legislature, all rolled into one.

ROLLCALL NO. 95

Although I am recorded as "not voting" on the Justice Department's proposal to extend geographic application of the so-called Wartime Sedition Act, had I been present I would have supported the motion to recommit. If enacted into law, this bill will permit prosecution of Americans abroad for making false statements with intent to interfere with the operations or success of military or naval forces of the United States, or to obstruct the recruiting or enlistment of these forces. Since violation of the act is punishable by 20 years in prison, it is conceivable that many of the most vociferous critics of any administration could be put behind bars, because the law implies that a false statement is any statement which runs counter to information presented by the Government. If rigidly interpreted and enforced, citizens who objected to President Eisenhower's use of Federal troops in Arkansas, or President Kennedy's similar action in Mississippi, could be jailed. Congressman JAMES UTT, Republican, of California, might face imprisonment for alleging that Senator GOLDWATER has information suppressed by the Pentagon showing Russia has a 2-to-1 superiority over the United States in nuclear weaponry.

GOLDWATER says:

I never in my life said anything like that.

Robert Welch, Gus Hall, and others who hold extremist philosophies which I deplore, might, under the Sedition Act, very well be jailed for many of their allegations. While I reject the ideology of extremists of both right and left, I believe it is imperative that we defend their right to hold these views and their right to speak their minds. Sedition does not involve action. It means only speech. The Sedition Act, in my judgment, is in direct conflict with the first amendment:

Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech.

Under the Sedition Act, a dictatorial administration could violate this freedom with impunity.

ROLLCALL NO. 101

I voted to recommit H.R. 5171 because I strongly objected to the perfunctory way it had been handled by the Government Operations Subcommittee. Only 1 day's hearings were held during which two witnesses testified—the Comptroller General and the Administrator of the General Services Administration. The latter, it is important to note, has a vested interest in passage of the bill because his agency would become the sole purchaser and operator of all data processing equipment used by Federal departments and agencies. Under this setup, the potential bureaucratic power of GSA would be tremendous. I was distressed to learn that the subcommittee had failed to call as witnesses—either for or against the bill—administrators of agencies which would be directly affected by its enactment, agencies such as the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Internal Revenue Service, Bureau of the Budget, and so forth. The subcommittee also did not see fit to hear the testimony of representatives of private industry who are the chief users and suppliers of data processing equipment. In light of these proceedings, I could not in good conscience vote for the measure, regardless of the economy merits which its sponsors purported it to have.

ROLLCALL NO. 102

Residents of the 25th District should be particularly pleased with House passage of the Clean Air Act for it is a long-range, well-conceived plan which can do much to help combat smog. I have long been an active proponent of anti-smog legislation, and while a member of the California Legislature authored a bill creating the Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board. Under the provisions of H.R. 6518, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to establish a national research and development program for air pollution prevention and control, and to help set up State, regional, and local air pollution control agencies through Federal grants. The bill is not an encroachment upon States rights for it says in hard language that State and local governments have primary responsibility for smog prevention and control. Here are some of the bill's provisions: First, directs HEW to encourage air pollution control programs between all levels of government; second, permits two or more States to enter into compacts for air pollution control; third, directs HEW to make studies of specific smog problems when requested by a local agency or when the Secretary determines that the problem has an interstate effect; fourth, authorizes HEW to research, collect, and distribute information on smog, and to establish training projects and research fellowships for the study of air pollution.

ROLLCALL NO. 124

House passage of the omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia is the best argument I know of for giving Washington citizens home rule. This hastily drawn proposal, in my opinion, strikes at the very roots of many constitutional guarantees rather than at the alleged crime "epidemic" it purportedly aims to curb. The measure was opposed by the District Commissioners, the Department of Justice, and the District Bar Association. Its most ardent supporter was the Chief of Police. Police chiefs are not generally known as authorities on jurisprudence, and the District chief is no exception.

Under H.R. 7525, for example, unlike the law of any jurisdiction that I know of in the United States, the police could pick up a person suspected of having committed a crime—or a person suspected of being a witness to a crime—and hold him incommunicado until they are through with interrogation. Such detainment without benefit of counsel clearly violates constitutional safeguards. This provision in the bill also denies to the "detainee" the right to secure his liberty by seeking bail or posting collateral, the right to habeas corpus, and the right not to be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.

It is apparent that proponents of such rough-shod legislation were stampeded by widespread publicity that Washington is the Nation's leading crime city. This allegation has been refuted by a recent FBI report which ranks the District seventh in crime for all major U.S. cities. The bill's proponents, out of myopia rather than intent, have in effect sacrificed due process of law on the altar of crime control. They have aimed their attack at crime control without giving any consideration to crime prevention. There is no attempt to seek better schools, better housing, better living and working conditions, and better human relations. On the contrary, a realistic attempt to cope with these problems was rejected on rollcall No. 87 when the House failed to provide fair and adequate appropriations for governing the District. Crime prevention is a very complex and expensive process, involving

many disciplines and programs. In my judgment, we cannot escape expense and effort in this area by passing a bill which makes a mockery of American justice and jurisprudence.

CORRECTION

Rollcall No. 20 in my first congressional report is mistakenly listed as consideration of H.R. 5517, final passage of appropriations for the accelerated public works program. This rollcall correctly dealt with H.R. 5389, a measure authorizing a change from silver to gold backing of $1 and $2 bills. The proposal, which I opposed, passed 251 to 122. There were 60 Members not voting. In my judgment, the conversion from silver to gold backing for some $2 billion would further dilute our dwindling gold reserves, and further injure our balance-of-payments situation. Defeat of the bill would also have been an economy move in that it costs the Government 3 cents a year to keep a gold-backed dollar bill in circulation, as opposed to no cost when the dollar is backed by silver. With repeal of silver-backing, the Government puts itself in the surplus silver business to the tune of $2 billion, and goes into competition with silver mines for the industrial and jewelry silver markets.

## Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my fourth rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from August 13 through October 21, 1963.

| Rollcall No. | Date | H.R. No. | Vote | | | | Brief description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | R.B.C. | Yea | Nay | Not voting | |
| 125 | Aug. 14 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio (37 Members absent). |
| *126 | do | 6143 | Yea | 287 | 113 | 32 | On passage of higher education aid bill (1 Member answered present). |
| 127 | Aug. 20 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Laird, Republican, of Wisconsin (35 Members absent). |
| 128 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Utt, Republican, of California (47 Members absent). |
| 129 | Aug. 21 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Derounian, Republican, of New York (32 Members absent). |
| 130 | Aug. 22 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Adair, Republican, of Indiana (36 Members absent). |
| 131 | Aug. 23 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. O'Brien, Democrat, of New York (26 Members absent). |
| *132 | do | 7885 | Nay | 222 | 188 | 23 | Foreign assistance authorization bill, motion to recommit for cuts. |
| *133 | do | 7885 | Yea | 224 | 186 | 23 | On passage of foreign assistance authorization bill (1 Member answered present). |
| 134 | Aug. 27 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Michel, Republican, of Illinois (50 Members absent). |
| 135 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Martin, Republican, of California (54 Members absent). |
| 136 | Aug. 28 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (34 Members absent; R.B.C. at civil rights march with congressional delegation). |
| 137 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Snyder, Republican, of Kentucky (93 Members absent; R.B.C. at civil rights march with congressional delegation). |
| 138 | do | 7500 | Nay | 176 | 200 | 57 | To recommit conference report on NASA appropriations authorization bill. |
| 139 | do | 7500 | Yea | 249 | 125 | 60 | On passage of NASA conference report. |
| 140 | Sept. 10 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Van Pelt, Republican, of Wisconsin (90 Members absent; R.B.C. at National Conference of Business Committee for Tax Reduction). |
| 141 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (116 Members absent; R.B.C. at tax conference). |
| 142 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (90 Members absent). |
| 143 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Thomson, Republican, of Wisconsin (90 Members absent; R.B.C. in office working on backlog accumulated during Labor Day recess). |
| 144 | do | S. 1576 | Yea | 335 | 18 | 80 | An aid program to help combat mental illness and retardation. |
| 145 | Sept. 11 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (98 Members absent). |
| 146 | do | 504 | Yea | 336 | 0 | 97 | Creation of a select House committee to examine scope and effectiveness of federally sponsored research programs. |
| 147 | Sept. 17 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bell, Republican, of California (89 Members absent). |
| 148 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (92 Members absent). |
| 149 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Rumsfeld, Republican, of Illinois (85 Members absent; R.B.C. in conference re his bill on U.S. World Film Festival). |
| 150 | Sept. 24 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington (47 Members absent). |
| 151 | do | 527 | Yea | 320 | 66 | 46 | To permit consideration of the tax reduction bill. |
| 152 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (49 Members absent). |
| 153 | Sept. 25 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Van Pelt, Republican, of Wisconsin (25 Members absent; R.B.C. attending to personal matters). |
| 154 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Derounian, Republican, of New York (29 Members absent; R.B.C. attending to personal matters). |
| 155 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, of Ohio (19 Members absent). |
| *156 | do | 8363 | Nay | 199 | 226 | 7 | Motion to recommit tax reduction bill. |
| *157 | do | 8363 | Yea | 271 | 155 | 6 | On passage of tax reduction bill. |
| 158 | Sept. 26 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (102 Members absent). |
| 159 | Oct. 1 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (99 Members absent). |
| 160 | do | 5555 | Not voting | 333 | 5 | 94 | On passage of conference report on military pay bill (R.B.C. receiving innoculations for trip to South Vietnam at time of vote. Would have voted yea). |
| 161 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi (115 Members absent). |
| 162 | do | 539 | Yea | 314 | 12 | 106 | To permit consideration of H.R. 7044, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. |
| 163–176 | Oct. 2 / Oct. 21 | | Absent / do | | | | R.B.C. on factfinding mission to southeast Asia with subcommittee of House Foreign Affairs Committee. During this period there were 6 quorum calls and 7 rollcalls, all on measures of negligible controversy. |

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 126

The 1963 Higher Education Facilities Act was the third aid-to-education bill passed by the House this year, ample evidence of broad congressional consensus on the need for Federal help in most sections of the Nation. Passage of these bills also punctures the political myth that Republicans oppose Federal aid because it means Federal "control." H.R. 6143 stipulates that no Federal department, agency, or employee is permitted to exercise direction, supervision or control over personnel, curriculum, instructions or administration of any educational institution under the act.

The bill, a "bricks and mortar" measure, authorizes a 3-year, $1.2 billion program of grants and loans to public and private nonprofit colleges and universities to help build classrooms, libraries and laboratories. To be eligible for aid, an institution must show that new construction is urgently needed to meet enrollment demands, that construction will be done as economically as possible, and that Federal funds will be limited to one-third of development costs. Matching grants will be made to the States for expanding undergraduate facilities, with at least 22 percent of the funds reserved for junior colleges and technical institutes. Provisions are also made to assist graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 132 AND 133

In the aftermath of the House vote on the foreign aid authorization bill, Congress—and the Nation at large—is scanning the political horizon to see if this ill-advised action indicates more than a temporary breakdown of bipartisan foreign policy. The conservative Los Angeles Times showed its concern in an editorial stating that the Kennedy administration is "understandably nettled" by the House's indiscriminate butchering of the bill—slashing the authorization to $3.5 billion, more than $1 billion under the President's initial request, and $600 million below the Foreign Affairs Committee recommendation. Noting actions which the President has taken to improve our foreign assistance program, the Times deplored the House's "meat-ax cut," and called on Congress to "go along" with the President's "rockbottom" figure of $4 billion.

Gen. Lucius Clay, Republican chairman of a committee charged with studying and recommending improvements in our assistance program, has frequently warned that excessive cutbacks in foreign aid could seriously jeopardize U.S. security. "Immediate forced reductions could require rapid deterioration in military forces," said General Clay, "with consequent political disturbances in several of the countries now receiving military aid from the United States. In point of fact, we might well reduce the resources of our own defense budget rather than to discontinue or too sharply reduce the support which makes possible the contribution of the foreign military forces to the security of the free world."

With foreign aid placed in its proper role as an important arm of free world security, the House action on August 23—a day that has come to be known as "Black Friday"—deserves careful examination. The Republican motion to recommit the bill for a cut from $4.1 billion to $3.5 billion was unusual in the history of foreign aid fights. Recommittal motions have seldom been made on foreign aid authorization bills, and they have never involved instructions to cut funds. In fact, the House has rarely made cuts in the foreign aid authorization bill reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee on which I sit.

It is particularly disturbing that the GOP assault on foreign aid was aimed at the Alliance for Progress and the military assistance program. Republican strategy did not permit Members to vote on the Alliance as a separate measure. The $150 million slash in Alliance funds was lumped into the overall cut. This prompted one Arizona Congressman—who believes in cutting with a knife instead of an ax—to declare in a floor speech: "I had no opportunity to support a reduction in foreign aid and also cast a separate vote concerning the Alliance for Progress. Had I been able to do so, I would have opposed the Alliance for Progress authorization cut. This program is built on a concept of self-help. It is through this means that we will best be able to fight communism in the Western Hemisphere. It is, in my opinion, a way of building the citadel of democracy within the members of the Organization of American States. It is the one avenue to stop Fidel Castro's regime and communism in our part of the world." This view is shared by many Congressmen—Republicans and Democrats—who warn that to cripple our efforts now, when the program is beginning to show results, is not in our best interests.

The $225 million cut in military assistance funds will prevent the carrying out of military plans laid out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to aid U.S. allies. To be sure, the cost of freedom is not cheap—but there are intelligent ways to maximize the benefits of our dollars in the fight against communism. Military assistance to our allies is one of them. It helps keep the Communist bloc encircled by 2.5 million fighting men in such nations as South Vietnam, Korea, Turkey, and Pakistan. It costs 10 times as much to keep a U.S. soldier overseas—not to mention the potential loss of American lives—as it does to keep his allied counterpart in the field with adequate equipment. In my judgment, and in the judgment of our Nation's top military and civilian advisors, the military assistance program helps provide the United States and the free world with maximum strength at the lowest possible cost to American taxpayers.

I do not believe that we need sacrifice security for economy. I believe that with sound policy decisions and efficient administrative procedures, this Nation can have both security and economy. And because our country needs both, I am not prepared to use either as stakes in a political crap game which, according to present indicators, may float its way right up to the 1964 elections. My attitude is apparently not shared by the Republican leadership in the House. Despite telephone appeals by former President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State, Christian Herter, Minority Leader Halleck would not call off his partisan attack. The total of 156 GOP Members that he whipped into line was believed to exceed the number of Republicans who actually felt strongly for deep cuts in foreign aid. It is against this background that I stand with President Kennedy in calling the action of the House GOP leadership "shortsighted, irresponsible, and dangerously partisan."

ROLLCALL NOS. 156 AND 157

President Kennedy's $11.1 billion tax reduction bill passed the House after a Republican attempt to recommit the measure was defeated. Only 1 GOP Member voted against recommittal, while 173 voted for. On final passage, 48 Republicans joined 223 Democrats in securing the largest tax cut in the Nation's history. The GOP drive to tie the tax cut to reduced Government spending fell short when southern Democrats, who have a reputation for being fiscal conservatives, rejected the artificial GOP thesis that by putting a Presidential ceiling on spending the United States would earn a tax reduction. Democrats properly pointed out that Congress is basically responsible for reducing expenditures because it is the branch of government that appropriates the money—the legislative branch spends only what it wants to spend, not what the executive branch asks it to spend. If the GOP motion had passed, I doubt whether any Republicans would have voted next year to cut spending in their congressional districts. The move was obviously Republican strategy to go on record for economy while not having to vote for elimination of pet projects. As one Florida conservative pointed out, the GOP limited-spending proposal was "only an image, and when you reach for the substance, it simply is not there." The wisdom of this observation was reflected by the majority of citizens in the 25th District who wrote urging that I support the President's tax cut proposal.

Enthusiasm for the bill was high not only among individual voters, but among the Nation's business community as well. The 2,400 members of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, for example, advocated a tax cut and reduced Government spending but, displaying sound knowledge of the traditional roles of the executive and legislative branches, did not endorse making cuts and spending dependent on each other. Members of the committee include Henry Ford III, chairman of the Ford Motor Co.; Roger Blough, chairman of United States Steel Corp.; Frederick Kappel, chairman of American Telephone & Telegraph; and David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce said the bill as reported by the Ways and Means Committee "deserves the support of every businessman when it reaches the House floor." Subsequent GOP action punctured another political myth: "Republicans are 100 percent pro-business, while Democrats are anti."

The aim of the program is to create jobs by lifting the repressive weight of tax rates imposed in wartime, when the demand for consumer goods must necessarily be restrained. Today, however, our economy needs to grow more rapidly and produce employment opportunities. H.R. 8363 is designed to stimulate demand and incentives to invest, to narrow the gap that now exists between what we produce and what we could produce, and to help reach full employment. Simply put, it gives consumers more money to spend. And because they have more to spend, they demand more goods and services. As consumer demand increases, business hires more workers to produce more good and unemployment decreases. As the unemployed return to the status of income-earners, they now have money to spend, the demand for goods is further increased, more workers are hired, unemployment is again cut, and so forth.

Under the bill, virtually every American taxpayer—whether high or low income, single or married—will pay less in taxes if and when the proposal is passed by the Senate and put into effect. The largest share of the individual tax cut will go to those with incomes of $10,000 and less—the people who need it most, who account for nearly 85 percent of all taxable returns, and who are most likely to put a large part of their tax savings into the spending stream.

On the average, families with incomes of $3,000 and less will have their taxes cut by nearly 40 percent. Those with incomes in the $3,000 to $5,000 range will get cuts of more than 26 percent. Families with incomes in the $5,000 to $10,000 range will get tax reductions averaging about 20 percent. Those with incomes of more than $10,000 will have their taxes cut by about 15 percent.

---

## Twenty-second Anniversary of Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, December marked the 22d anniversary of

the day that the late President Roosevelt said "shall live in infamy." It was 22 years ago Saturday that the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and plunged this Nation into the most costly war in the history of civilization, not only in the terms of dollars but in terms of lives lost.

This was a war that could have been avoided had mankind heeded the warnings of those leaders who believed in freedom and dignity. Our own American President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as early as 1937 warned against the rise of the dictators in Europe and the Far East.

But the world was in no mood to listen.

The seeds of World War II were again clearly visible at Munich when Prime Minister Chamberlain agreed to capitulate to Hitler. Again, the world was in no mood to listen.

The years just before Pearl Harbor are replete with volumes of evidence clearly showing the diabolical intentions of Hitler and his storm troopers. But again, the world was in no mood to listen.

On September 1, 1939, when Hitler's storm troopers plowed through Poland, we again had a clear and concise warning of things to come. But even at this late date, the world was in no mood to listen.

The thousands of American boys and fighters for freedom from all nations of the world could have been spared had the world been willing to recognize its responsibility with courage.

Here on Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the National Archives Building, those two imposing monuments constantly remind us that "What is past is prolog. Study the past."

Mr. Speaker, this day shall pass in vain unless we Americans can pause to reflect upon the lessons of the past.

Our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy, tried to marshal the forces of courage in America to recognize the fact that only through strength and preparedness can we pave the way toward a lasting peace.

President Kennedy has stated so magnificently his principles when he stated:

> Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

President Kennedy well knew that World War II was the result of a world which had failed and refused to prepare itself against despotic aggression. He had welded our Military Establishment into the most awesome defense complex in the world. He did this to make good on his magnificent pledge:

> Let us never negotiate out of fear but let us never fear to negotiate.

We can find comfort on this 22d anniversary of Pearl Harbor, in that President Lyndon Johnson feels the same deep understanding for the need of a strong Military Establishment.

In his first message to a joint session of the Congress, President Johnson has quite properly warned our would-be adversaries not to test our patience.

Mr. Speaker, let us bow our heads in reverence to those who gave their lives at Pearl Harbor and the harrowing years that followed. But let us also at once, on this 22d anniversary of Pearl Harbor, pay our respect to those gallant Americans, both in the military and the civilian sector, whose heroic contribution made victory ultimately possible. Let not the 22 years dull our memory.

The words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt are as vivid today as they were on December 7, 1941, when he said that day shall live in infamy.

---

## Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my fifth rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from October 22 through December 4, 1963:

| Roll-call No. | Date | H.R. No. | Vote | | | | Brief description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | R.B.C. | Yea | Nay | Not voting | |
| 177 | Oct. 22 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, Iowa (75 Members absent). |
| 178 | do | 8821 | Not voting | 350 | 1 | 81 | To facilitate restoration to Treasury of funds made available to States for unemployment compensation and social security (R.B.C. on radio program re South Vietnam mission). |
| 179 | Oct. 23 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Younger, Republican, California (69 Members absent). |
| 180 | do | 5945 | Yea | 320 | 44 | 69 | To establish procedure for prompt settlement of Puerto Rico's political status. |
| 181 | Oct. 24 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Kyl, Republican, Iowa (152 Members absent). |
| 182 | Oct. 28 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, Ohio (138 Members absent). |
| 183 | do | 782 | Yea | 279 | 11 | 42 | Making continuing appropriations for fiscal 1964 for certain governmental departments and agencies. |
| 184 | do | 314 | do | 119 | 164 | 149 | Granting authority for 7 members of Education and Labor Committee to visit 7 European cities for purposes of scientific investigation. |
| 185 | Oct. 29 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, Florida (68 Members absent). |
| 186 | Oct. 30 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, Iowa (69 Members absent). |
| 187 | Oct. 31 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Younger, Republican, California (66 Members absent). |
| 188 | do | 6500 | Yea | 356 | 1 | 76 | On passage of conference report for 1964 military construction authorization. |
| 189 | do | 8195 | Not voting | 173 | 158 | 96 | One-year extension of the Mexican farm labor program (6 Members answered present; R.B.C. enroute to California for community workshop program El Monte—would have voted "nay". See rollcall No. 59). |
| 190 | Nov. 6 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, Iowa (95 Members absent). |
| 191 | do | 6143 | Yea | 258 | 92 | 83 | On passage of conference report on higher education aid bill. (See rollcall No. 126). |
| 192 | do | 8920 | do | 258 | 98 | 77 | To revise District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. |
| 193 | Nov. 7 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Van Pelt, Republican, Wisconsin (76 Members absent). |
| 194 | do | 564 | Not voting | 212 | 149 | 72 | Resolution to permit consideration of H.R. 8969. (R.B.C. in office with Pastor Owen Geer of East Whittier Methodist Church; paired "for"). |
| 195 | do | 8969 | Nay | 172 | 197 | 62 | Setting temporary debt ceiling limit at $315,000,000,000 for remainder of fiscal 1964—motion to recommit. (2 Members answered "present"; see rollcall No. 52). |
| 196 | do | 8969 | Yea | 187 | 179 | 64 | On passage of debt ceiling limit (2 Members answered "present"). |
| 197 | Nov. 13 | | Absent | | | | During this period R.B.C. was in California conducting a series of Federal-community workshop programs. He also spent 1 day in Connecticut for a speech. There were 6 quorum calls and 4 rollcalls, all on measures of negligible controversy. |
| 206 | Nov. 19 | | | | | | |
| 207 | Nov. 19 | 9140 | Yea | 358 | 27 | 48 | Public works appropriations bill. |
| 208 | Nov. 20 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, Ohio (56 Members absent). |
| *209 | do | S. 777 | Yea | 252 | 133 | 47 | To amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. |
| 210 | Dec. 2 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Cohelan, Democrat, California (109 Members absent). |
| *211 | do | 9124 | Nay | 176 | 154 | 104 | To revise college and school ROTC programs. |
| 212 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Martin, Republican, California (105 Members absent). |
| 213 | do | 10 | Yea | 301 | 18 | 115 | To give the Nation's young people greater opportunity to work in Washington during summer months. |
| 214 | Dec. 3 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, Illinois (64 Members absent; R.B.C. at State Department). |
| 215 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gubser, Republican, California (71 Members absent). |
| 216 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, Illinois (91 Members absent). |
| 217 | Dec. 4 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Hoeven, Republican, Iowa (33 Members absent; R.B.C. attending to office matters). |
| 218 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Beermann, Republican, Nebraska (41 Members absent). |
| *219 | do | 6196 | Yea | 179 | 224 | 29 | Motion to recommit Cooley cotton bill, a multimillion dollar subsidy measure (2 Members answered "present"). |
| *220 | do | 6196 | Nay | 216 | 182 | 29 | On passage of Cooley cotton bill (7 Members answered "present"). |

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 209

Mr. Speaker, the main issue on this rollcall was whether the House would accept the $20 million authorization figure set by the Senate for operating the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 1964 and 1965, or go along with the $30 million figure recommended by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In evaluating the merits of this legislation, it is important to note that the ACDA has been the target of various extremist groups throughout the Nation. Through distortions, half-truths and innuendos many Americans have been led to believe that the ACDA is engaged in a direct conspiracy with Moscow to weaken the security of the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. ACDA cannot, nor can the President, obligate our Nation to reduce its armed forces or disarm without congressional consent. This safeguard is explicitly provided in section 33 of the ACDA Act—Public Law 87-297.

The ACDA's chief function is as a support resource for U.S. officials in their conduct of arms control and disarmament negotiations. ACDA, for example, was useful in helping bring to successful conclusion negotiations for a "hot line" between Moscow and Washington, and the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I participated in extensive hearings on the authorization bill and as a result I am firmly convinced, as was a majority of the committee, that ACDA's request for an increased budget was justified. As was pointed out during floor debate, ACDA was instrumental in developing a verification system—through extensive and expensive research—which permits the United States to monitor Soviet adherence to the test ban treaty. In my opinion, we must continue to base our support of the treaty on scientific information provided by effective technical devices. We cannot leave it to the belief that we can trust the Communists.

There can be no question that ACDA strengthens U.S. security, in addition to promoting the cause of peace. Yet during its first 2 years the Agency operated on a $20 million budget, less than the cost of two B-52 bombers. As one Congressman asked, "Can we appropriate $50 billion for the armaments of war, and find $30 million too much to pay for an instrument of peace?" It was unfortunate, in my judgment, that during floor procedure the requested increase was cut from the bill. I voted, nevertheless, to accept the $20 million authorization figure—the best that could be obtained during this session of Congress.

ROLLCALL NO. 211

My main objection to H.R. 9124 was that it came to the floor under suspension of the rules, a parliamentary procedure which automatically prevents a measure from being amended in any manner whatsoever. Suspension of the rules is normally applied to noncontroversial legislation, bills of limited import upon which the Congress, although informally, is known to be in substantial agreement.

Yet the measure to revise college and high school ROTC programs was brought before the House and described by its floor manager as "perhaps one of the most important, if not the most important piece of legislation that this body has been called on to pass judgment upon." It seemed incredible to me that after this assertion he would bring the bill up under a rules suspension. If the measure was indeed of such great consequence, it certainly should have been open to amendment during the debate on its merits and demerits.

In his recent message to a joint session of Congress, President Johnson emphasized the importance of getting value earned for each dollar our Government invests. Without an opportunity to amend proposed legislation, the chances of getting maximum value are greatly diminished, and there were several areas in H.R. 9124 which were open to serious question as far as spending and subsequent rewards were concerned.

The bill calls for the high school ROTC program, which is a good one as presently carried out in some 250 schools across the land, to be expanded to cover 2,000 high schools. This represents a cost increase of from $5 million annually to $25 million—a hike of 500 percent. And this for a program for which the Secretary of Defense has said there is no military need. The committee report on the bill also indicated that it was opposed by other top civilians at the Pentagon.

In addition, the measure provides that the Holloway plan, presently used by only the Navy, be extended to cover other military branches. This plan permits graduates of civilian colleges, whose 4-year tuition has been paid by the Government, to become regularly commissioned officers for at least 4 years of obligatory service. There is no question that the plan has some merit. But it also has drawbacks. At present, only 62 percent of Holloway plan graduates stay in the Navy beyond the minimum number of years required, and only 38 percent remain for a prolonged period as career officers. These figures compare to an 80-percent retention rate for graduates of the Naval Academy. In effect, the Holloway plan gives a $1 return for every $3 invested. It is for this reason that I question the economic wisdom of shifting the Holloway plan to areas where our officer recruitment needs are being met by OCS programs and others.

If nothing else, the bill should have been amended to require that obligatory service under the Holloway plan be increased from 4 to 5 years, as was done for graduates of our military academies under legislation passed by the House earlier this year. Under suspension of the rules, such an amendment was not possible. It is for these reasons that I voted against the bill.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 219 AND 220

The Cooley cotton bill, in my judgment, is about the poorest piece of legislation passed during this session of Congress. It was also the most lobbied bill of the year. Bombardment supporting the measure came from many quarters, including heavy salvos from the House's biggest guns. All this for a bill which, in effect, is nothing more than a multimillion-dollar subsidy for the cotton textile industry.

A vote for the Cooley cotton bill was certainly not a vote for economy. It proposes a triple subsidy for cotton: One for producers, one for exporters, and now one for the mills. It is estimated that the proposal will cost the American people more than $635 million—over and above the present cotton program—during a 3-year period. Such a measure is certainly not in keeping with President Johnson's recent call for increased thrift and frugality in government.

The bill provides that the country's 34 leading textile mills, which already dominate 70 percent of the industry, will get about $350 million of the subsidy. Burlington Mills, the largest firm, will reap some $28 million. This handout represents about 80 percent of the firm's operating income in 1951. Statistics show that another will get a subsidy representing a 370-percent increase in its income. Other income hikes via the subsidy route hit 270, 200, 185 percent, and so on.

Provisions of the Cooley bill were carried to such outrageous extremes that it was fought by both the Farmers Union and the Farm Bureau, probably the first legislative alliance in the history of these two opposing groups.

If signed into law, this bill will permit domestic mills to buy American cotton at the same subsidized low price as foreign competitors. Since 1956 foreign buyers have been able to purchase U.S. cotton at world price levels. Recently these have been about 24 cents a pound, or roughly 8½ cents below the supported domestic price. The argument used by the textile mills is that foreign competition is driving them out of business. This is absurd since only 8 percent of the textiles in the United States are imported and 92 percent are domestic.

The competition which concerns cotton textile mills does not come from abroad. It comes from America's own synthetic textile mills. And even this domestic competition is not as extreme as the cotton mills would have consumers believe. From 1947 to 1961, although employment in the textile industry dropped 25 percent, actual fiber production fell only 2 percent. The unemployment drop is chiefly attributable not to foreign competition, but to automation, technical improvements and the widespread use of synthetic materials.

If the Cooley cotton bill becomes law, we will have opened a Pandora's box of subsidies. All industries which are having difficulty keeping up with technological and economic change will begin arriving at the public trough for a handout. And American consumers and taxpayers will pay the feed bill. This is not my idea of sound economics, and I will continue, regardless of pressures, to cast my vote against this type of legislation.

**Commissioning of the U.S.S. "James Monroe (SSB(N)-622)," Newport News, Va., December 7, 1963—Address by Hon. J. Vaughan Gary, of Virginia**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great pride for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a superlative address given by an outstanding Member of this body at commissioning services for this Nation's 14th Polaris submarine, the U.S.S. *James Monroe*.

Our colleague, J. VAUGHAN GARY, of Richmond, Va., who has served the capital city of Virginia with great ability and great integrity for 20 years, is known to all of us as an extremely effective Member of the House Appropriations Committee with a deep understanding of our Nation's security needs.

His remarks on any occasion would be deserving of our attention, but I believe his address at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. this past Saturday contains a number of points of very great significance to all of us.

I would like with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to give our colleagues an opportunity to read VAUGHAN GARY's outstanding address, and under unanimous consent I would like to include his address in the RECORD.

The text follows:

Admiral Smith, Admiral Grenfell, Admiral Taylor, Captain Sandeford, Captain Cobean, distinguished guests, and friends of the Navy, as we gather here today to celebrate the commissioning of our 14th Polaris submarine, the U.S.S. *James Monroe*, I hope you will not accuse me of falling back on an old cliche in saying what a high privilege it is for me to be aboard and have a part in these memorable ceremonies. Since late summer I have cherished the invitation extended me by the Secretary of the Navy. And now that this exceptional ship has been officially delivered to the Navy and turned over to the care of its two gallant crews, my pride in the U.S. Navy, its officers, men, and its fleet runneth over. Particularly at this time I also share your pride in Roger Staubach, whom I hope to see perform in characteristic Navy fashion against the Army this afternoon. And last but by no means least, it is also a pleasure for me to speak in the hometown of my friend, TOM DOWNING, who so ably represents this district in the Congress of the United States.

I had just completed the preparation of my remarks for this occasion when the shocking announcement of the heinous crime which took the life of our great President and your Commander in Chief exploded like a bombshell over the air. The entire world was first startled then stunned. We share a profound grief over the tragic passing of former President John F. Kennedy at the prime of his life, when he had so much to offer his country. But we cannot stop the world in its orbit. It must go on.

If President Kennedy were living today I know that he, as one of your valiant naval heroes, would applaud the progress you are making in assuring the peace of the world through the deployment of Polaris submarines in every strategic sea. His order to you would be: "Carry on."

One thing that makes this Nation great is the continuity of the Government it is our privilege to enjoy. The Polaris submarine program in the last 10 years has progressed under two Commanders in Chief and we can rejoice that it will continue with the same vigor under our new Commander in Chief, Lyndon B. Johnson.

As a Virginian, I take pride in the fact that this ship was built by Virginians working for one of our great defense corporations, the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., headed by my good friend, Mr. William Blewett, who is on board with us today. This great enterprise has built many of our most seaworthy and best warships and has thereby contributed immeasurably to the industrial life of Virginia and to the fighting power of the U.S. Navy. We in Virginia are extremely proud of its record.

I had the privilege of visiting one of the outstanding products of its handiwork a year or two ago when I cruised on Guantanamo Bay on the mammoth nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*. As she flexed her muscles amid the deafening roar of jets being catapulted from and landing on her decks, I was amazed at her maneuverability, speed, and power. My heart filled with pride, as a Virginian and as an American, and I returned to Washington with a far greater feeling of security than I had enjoyed before.

I also share the pride of the citizens of Virginia in the fact that the ship we commission today is named after an illustrious son of Virginia. At relatively the same place and relatively the same time, five men were born in Virginia, the counterpart of which cannot be found in any other nation in all history. These men—Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Madison and Marshall—not only rocked the cradle that nurtured our great Republic, but their influence is still felt throughout the entire world today.

This newest addition to the Navy fleet bears the name of James Monroe, one of those immortal patriots.

James Monroe, the fifth President of the United States, was born April 28, 1758, in Westmoreland County, Va. He attended the College of William and Mary, fought in the Third Virginia Regiment, at White Plains, Brandywine, Monmouth, and Trenton. He studied law with Thomas Jefferson, was a member of the Virginia House of Delegates and of the House of Representatives of the United States. He was a U.S. Senator, Minister to France, and four times Governor of Virginia. Jefferson sent him to France as Minister in 1803 to conduct negotiations for the purchase of the Isle of New Orleans from France and east and west Florida from Spain. Exceeding instructions, he signed a treaty for all of Louisiana, a venture for which we Americans of today should call him blessed.

He served as Secretary of State and Secretary of War. In 1816 Monroe was elected President and in 1820 he was reelected with all but one vote, this being cast for John Quincy Adams, so that only Washington might have the distinction of a unanimous election to the Presidency of the United States. After his term as President, eschewing complete retirement from political life, he accepted the office of justice of the peace in his native Commonwealth of Virginia. What a man. What a career.

It appears that James Monroe served everywhere except in the Navy, but he crossed the Delaware River with Washington for the attack on Trenton, where he was wounded during the American Revolution, and as President he was given credit for opening the Mississippi River to navigation for the United States.

As President of a young and struggling republic, James Monroe exhibited the same determination and courage which had characterized his actions when he served with Washington at Valley Forge. In his message to the Congress on December 2, 1823, he made a statement with reference to our international relations that came to be known as the Monroe Doctrine and this doctrine has remained, through the years, as one of the tenets of our foreign policy. In that pronouncement, he stated that we would not interfere in the internal concerns of any European power but that we would view any encroachment by such powers on the independent nations of this hemisphere "as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition to the United States."

There are those, including Mr. Khrushchev, who assert today that the Monroe Doctrine no longer exists but the falacy of that assertion was clearly demonstrated last year when the Soviet Union attempted to establish offensive missile bases in Cuba. The action of President Kennedy at that time was prompt and firm.

And the response will continue to be the same whenever any foreign power commits an act of aggression against this hemisphere.

When the Monroe Doctrine was stated, our Nation was weak but the expansive oceans which almost surround us were bulwarks of defense to our safety. Today, in the event of hostilities, these oceans will serve as avenues of attack. Therefore, in view of our extensive coastlines, our commitments throughout the world, and particularly our adherence to the Monroe Doctrine, we must not only maintain the strongest and best Navy in the world but it must be the most modern.

I am glad to know that this conviction permeates the Navy even to the young midshipmen. It was my privilege to visit the Naval Academy a short time ago. While I was being escorted around the grounds by several of my appointees, we were discussing the rapid changes in weapons and techniques. "Yes," one of the boys remarked, "we have a saying here at the Academy—if it works, it's obsolete." To keep up with modern progress in technology we must be certain that our country does not lag in the fields of science and education.

The U.S.S. *James Monroe* is evidence of the Navy's belief in modernization. This last word in striking force has been added to the Navy not for the purpose of aggression. We will never wage a war of aggression. Our cherished desire with respect to other nations is that they may enjoy the opportunity of freedom with us and that we may enjoy the opportunity of living in peace and harmony with them.

Therefore, we must seek every available avenue of peace and take every advantage, though it may be slight, to advance the cause of better understanding among nations, but we must approach this objective with the full realization that we are dealing with one regime that has no integrity and cannot be trusted. This was the course pursued by President Kennedy in successfully negotiating a nuclear test ban treaty, which, we hope, will prove to be one of his chief accomplishments.

It was my privilege to visit Europe in 1947. I well remember that upon my return to the United States, I made the statement that the one thing which impressed me most during my trip was the fact that regardless of what country we were in there were unmistakable evidences of the fact that the rulers of the Soviet Union had embarked upon a course

of world domination and that nothing short of that accomplishment would satisfy them. The events which have transpired since have confirmed that opinion.

As I utter these remarks, my thoughts wander back 22 years to that black day in history—December 7, 1941—when a deceitful, treacherous and double-dealing enemy made its infamous attack on Pearl Harbor. A monument erected over the sunken grave of the battleship Arizona today memorializes the 1,102 brave men who lie buried in its hull. This catastrophe would not have happened if we had been alert and prepared. The monument, therefore, should also be a constant reminder to us that we must never let it happen again.

It is our fervent hope that the U.S.S. *James Monroe* will serve as a deterrent to war and that any nation which is bent upon aggression will know that she and her sister ships will be lurking in the depths of the seas ready at all times and at a moment's notice in the event of attack to unleash from their hidden recesses the most devasting force of destruction ever heaped upon an enemy.

Sir Alex Douglas-Home, the new Prime Minister of Britain, in a major review of the world situation, said recently in London: "I believe we may be over the watershed of danger with the Soviet Union, but if so it is because the deterrent has deterred and, above all, because the Polaris submarine, as a second-strike weapon, has convinced the Soviet Union that war is too dangerous."

In conclusion, may I say to Captain Cobean, Captain Sandeford and their gold and blue crews that this ship is delivered into your hands with the full confidence that you will operate it in the true tradition of the U.S. Navy.

I hope the life of Monroe will be an inspiration to you. You will be crossing greater Delawares, of course, but there may be Valley Forges in your future when the great capacity of your ship will test your endurance to the limit.

Like Monroe—President and justice of the peace—your tasks will be both great and small but remember, there is no greater reward than the satisfaction of a job well done.

You have a great ship and with it you stand as guardians of the liberties of the American people. May the God of our fathers in whom we trust guide your destinies, for freedom must not and shall not perish from the earth.

## Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have often found it difficult to secure information on the voting records of legislators who have represented me. Recognizing that citizens in my congressional district have probably experienced the same problem, my periodic reports from Washington are a complete tabulation of all rollcall votes, including quorum calls. On measures which are considered to be of greatest significance, I endeavor to give a brief explanation of the reasoning behind my vote.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include my first report covering the period from January 9 through April 30, 1963:

| Rollcall No. | Date | H.R. No. | Vote | | | | Brief description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | R.B.C. | Yea | Nay | Not voting | |
| *1 | Jan. 9 | | Present | | | | Quorum call on original organization of the Congress. |
| 2 | do | | McCormack | | | | Election of Speaker—straight partisan vote: McCormack, 256; Halleck, 175. |
| *3 | do | 5 | Yea | 249 | 183 | 1 | Motion to cut off debate on permanent enlargement of Rules Committee from 12 to 15 members. |
| *4 | do | 5 | do | 235 | 196 | 2 | Final passage of the enlarged Rules Committee. |
| 5 | Feb. 27 | 284 | do | 254 | 154 | 27 | Final passage of supplemental appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. |
| *6 | do | 249 | do | 386 | 20 | 30 | Final passage of appropriation to continue the work of the HUAC. |
| 7 | Mar. 11 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (51 Members absent). |
| 8 | do | 2438 | Yea | 388 | 3 | 44 | Final passage of 4-year extension of existing draft law. |
| 9 | Mar. 12 | 4374 | do | 378 | 21 | 36 | Final passage of Winston Churchill citizenship bill. |
| 10 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (35 Members absent). |
| 11 | Mar. 13 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia (31 Members absent). |
| *12 | do | 2440 | Nay | 226 | 179 | 29 | Amendment to military appropriations increasing same by $363,000,000. |
| *13 | do | 2440 | do | 149 | 258 | 27 | Motion to recommit military appropriation bill by Mr. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri. |
| *14 | do | 2440 | Yea | 374 | 33 | 28 | Final passage of military authorization bill. |
| 15 | Mar. 14 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Passman, Democrat, of Louisiana (38 absent) (R.B.C. at Africa Subcommittee hearing). |
| 16 | Apr. 4 | 5366 | Yea | 386 | 17 | 32 | Final passage of Post Office appropriation bill. |
| 17 | Apr. 9 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Halleck, Republican, of Indiana (39 Members absent). |
| 18 | Apr. 10 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois (23 Members absent). |
| *19 | do | 5517 | Yea | 228 | 184 | 21 | Amendment of public works appropriation bill to restore money cut in committee. |
| *20 | do | 5517 | do | 251 | 122 | 60 | Final passage of accelerated public works appropriation. |
| 21 | Apr. 23 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (38 Members absent). |
| 22 | Apr. 24 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio (30 Members absent). |
| *23 | do | 12 | Nay | 171 | 239 | 24 | Motion to recommit bill authorizing loans to students in medical, dental and nursing education and grants to schools in health fields by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio. |
| *24 | do | 12 | Yea | 288 | 122 | 24 | Final passage of Health Professions Educational Act. |
| 25 | Apr. 25 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Derounian, Republican, of New York (37 Members absent)(R.B.C. in conference at office). |
| 26 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Jensen, Republican, of Iowa (38 Members absent). |
| 27 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Michel, Republican, of Illinois (55 Members absent) (R.B.C. in conference in Speaker's dining room). |
| 28 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, of Ohio (42 Members absent). |
| 29 | do | 4997 | Nay | 196 | 205 | 32 | Motion to recommit feed grain bill by Mr. Harvey, Republican, of Indiana. |
| 30 | do | 4997 | Yea | 208 | 196 | 29 | Final passage of feed grain bill. |
| 31 | Apr. 29 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (112 Members absent) (R.B.C. at conference re right-wing movements). |
| 32 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Stinson, Republican, of Washington (97 Members absent). |
| 33 | do | 1762 | Yea | 292 | 50 | 91 | Final passage of an act to promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation. |
| 34 | Apr. 30 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Cederberg, Republican, of Michigan (48 Members absent) (R.B.C. at cold war hearings, Foreign Affairs Committee). |

* Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 1

This quorum call was the first recorded vote of the session and provides an opportunity to explain the purpose of a quorum call. Any Member can request a quorum call at any time. The presiding officer then counts the number of Members in the Chamber. If there is less than a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives or of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union present, the presiding officer will notice the absence of a quorum and the Clerk will be directed to call the names of the Members. When the Clerk starts to call the names, three bells ring throughout Capitol Hill to notify Members that a quorum call has been asked for. If Members are sitting as the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union—virtually all debate is carried on when Members are sitting as the Committee—100 Members constitute a quorum. It takes approximately 40 minutes to call the names of all the Members and, therefore, the device of a quorum call is frequently used as a delaying tactic.

This tactic is frequently used by the minority party to give them time to round up votes. Of the first 16 quorum calls this session, 12 were called by Republicans, 3 by Democrats, and 1 was organizational.

The record indicates that members of the Rules, Ways and Means, and Foreign Affairs Committees, as well as each of the joint House-Senate committees, tend to miss more quorum calls than the balance of the Members. This is because each of these committees has a continuous authorization from the House to meet while the House is in session. The tremendous volume of work of these committees and the nature of the witnesses who appear before them has prompted the House to give extra consideration to these committees.

Procedure on my committee—Foreign Affairs—is for general committee meetings to be called at 10 a.m. every morning, Monday through Thursday, with subcommittee meetings most afternoons at 2. The House goes into session at 12 noon every Monday through Thursday and frequently on Friday. The House stays in session generally until after 4 p.m. and frequently until after 6 p m. There is no time out for lunch, coffee breaks, et cetera. Thus, office work must be fitted in before 10 a.m. or after adjournment, and on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, and unfortunately some of it must be done while either the House, the committee, or both, are in session.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 3 AND 4

Under the Rules of the House of Representatives, proposed legislation is referred by the Speaker to the committee of original jurisdiction. This is the committee that makes the policy decision as to whether the proposal is one that should be submitted to the entire membership for consideration. When the committee of original jurisdiction gives its blessing to a bill, under the rules the chairman of the committee refers the bill to the Rules Committee. Rules' function is to decide how much time should be devoted to the debate on each proposal and to schedule that time so that there will be adequate time for each proposal. Rules may not amend a bill; its function is purely housekeeping. However, if a majority of Members happen to be opposed to a particular bill, although they have no power to change it, they can refuse to give a rule which means they refuse to assign time for debate to that matter. In effect, they kill the bill by denying the membership of the House an opportunity to debate the issue.

During the 87th Congress when Sam Rayburn was the Speaker, Mr. Sam determined that it would not be possible to get many proposals assigned time for floor debate because of the nature of the composition of the committee. The chairman was Judge SMITH from Virginia. With his southern colleagues on the committee, and the Republicans, they were in a position to thwart the will of Congress by making an "unholy alliance." To assure that this did not happen, Mr. Sam proposed that the Rules Committee be expanded from 12 to 15 members. This would give an opportunity to appoint three new members who, hopefully, would not use the power of the committee in a manner adverse to the interest of the entire House. Mr. Sam's proposal was adopted by the 87th Congress, for that Congress only. It proved to be a great help in restoring the Rules Committee to its proper role in the legislative process.

Rollcalls 3 and 4 had to do with making this provision a permanent feature of the rules for the 88th and all subsequent Congresses. I voted on both of these rollcalls to keep the committee at its expanded membership of 15 and thus assure that when the committee of original jurisdiction makes a policy decision on a bill, the will of the 435 Members of Congress will not be frustrated by 6 persons who are operating under an "unholy alliance."

ROLLCALL NO. 6

This was to provide the funds necessary to continue the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. A controversy developed early in the session in an effort to abolish this committee. Many persons believe, and with much reason, that the committee at times has acted in true "McCarthy" fashion in denying due process and condemning innocent persons by innuendo. At the time of this controversy, I clearly stated that I was concerned over past acts of the committee and would therefore support a move to transfer the area of inquiry handled by this committee to the Judiciary Committee. I was hopeful that the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee could be conducted in a manner similar to the Senate Internal Security Committee, which is a subcommittee of Senate Judiciary.

As a result of parliamentary maneuvers in securing permanent enlargement of the Rules Committee, the 88th session of Congress unanimously adopted the resolution by a voice vote creating the House Un-American Activities Committee along with all other standing committees for the 88th Congress. Although I would have preferred to see jurisdiction of the committee transferred, I could not support a motion to deny Congress the right to investigate in the area of un-American activities, which would have been the case had the appropriation for the committee been denied.

ROLLCALL NOS. 12, 13, 14

All three of these rollcalls dealt with military construction appropriations for fiscal 1963–64. My vote in each instance was in support of the administration position to provide adequate funds for the acquisition of the planes, ships, guns, and so forth needed to maintain our superior Military Establishment. The Republicans, almost to a man, voted to increase the President's requested budget by $363 million to build three additional RS–70 planes. I voted against this proposal although it passed. There is no indication that the three prototype RS–70's currently under construction will be successful military aircaft. There is need for a substantial breakthrough in the technology of weapons systems on these planes that does not appear on the horizon. At present they would have to be equipped with a weapon system similar to the B–52. It does not seem logical to build an aircraft that costs $100 million and have it no more effective than our existing B–52's which cost about $5 million each. It is very doubtful that this money, although authorized, will ever be spent.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 19–20

During the 87th Congress a program called the Accelerated Public Works Construction Program was developed to provide in depressed areas much needed employment in the form of necessary public works; work which was scheduled to be done soon, however, was to be accelerated because of the employment problem. It was the feeling of the 87th Congress that it would be more beneficial to provide a Public Works program with tax dollars than to use the same dollars for public welfare. To qualify for this program it was necessary for the local agency to submit a plan which called for the maximum number of man-hours of labor, the minimum amount of material cost, and a project that could be completed within 12 months from the start. The original program called for a total investment of $900 million, plus local matching funds, to be spent in a 24-month period. The 87th Congress approved the program in principle, appropriated the $450 million for the first 12 months and left the obligation to the 88th Congress to appropriate the balance. Many communities throughout the country, acting upon the program started in the 87th Congress, had incurred substantial costs in connection with this program in preparing plans, submitting applications, and arranging financing for local participation. During debate on this bill, it was interesting to note that many Members who voted against the appropriation argued in favor of the projects in their districts. There is no project in the 25th Congressional District which comes under this legislation since, thankfully, we are not a depressed area with chronic unemployment. However, I believe that Congress had the obligation not to "welch" on its previous commitment to these communities which had projects underway and I voted to fulfill our obligation.

ROLLCALL NO. 24

The Health Professions Educational Act provides a system of matching fund grants to accredited medical, osteopathic, dental, and nursing schools. The Federal Government will provide 50 percent of the funds necessary for new construction of educational facilities when the facilities are directly related to increased enrollment. The bill provided 75 percent of construction funds to public health and paramedical school facilities, also predicated on increased enrollment. The bill also provides a system of interest-bearing loans to students who have completed their first year in these schools, upon the recommendation of the school and administered by the school.

The loans, together with the accrued interest, are to be repaid after graduation. In the interest of attempting to provide an incentive for physicians to practice in rural areas, there is a forgiveness feature of up to 50 percent of the loan to an individual physician if he establishes a practice in certain designated rural areas where there is an extreme shortage of medical personnel.

All of the medical and dental schools in California contacted me in favor of this legislation. They pointed out in detail that California must license 2,500 physicians a year to maintain our inadequate physician-patient ratio and yet our schools are capable of graduating only 700 doctors a year; that there are only 5 of our 50 States which graduate enough physicians to meet these needs, and the plight of dentistry and nursing is nearly as bad. The schools pointed out that many persons with the desire and ability for a medical education are unable to secure it because of their parents' limited financial ability. All in all, I believe the arguments in favor of the bill were overwhelming and I supported it.

## Discharge Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for a number of days now, I have received impassioned pleas from friends and constituents to sign the discharge petition which was placed at the Clerk's desk today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Many of these communications have stated the opinion that it is absolutely vital and necessary that I sign this petition in order to demonstrate my fealty to the cause of civil rights. All of these opinions, I realize, are sincerely expressed. I respect the authors of those opinions as men and women of courage and conviction. However, I want to take this opportunity to explain why I cannot in good conscience be swept along with the tide of public opinion that is currently calling for signatures on this petition. It is my honest feeling that the various media of communication in this country have done a real disservice to the cause of civil rights by improperly conveying the impression that the issue is now whether or not a Member will sign the discharge petition. I had been under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the cause for which we are all striving is the far larger and more noble cause of civil rights in the broadest sense of implementing constitutional guarantees with respect to voting rights and all of the privileges and immunities of first-class citizenship without regard to race or color.



Mr. Speaker, I think that a brief chronology of the events which have led up to the present conflict of civil rights legislation is in order. Mr. CELLER, who is sponsoring the petition, has for many years been chairman of the House Judiciary Committee which he controls with a comfortable 21 to 14 Democratic majority. He introduced a civil rights bill in the 87th Congress back in 1961, but he did not even begin to hold hearings until May of this year although 40 Republican bills were introduced in January. He did nothing to produce a bill for floor action in the 87th Congress. Where was his sense of urgency then? And it was not until October 29, 1963, that Mr. CELLER finally had a bill reported out of his committee. I think it is important to point this out because it clearly shows where the responsibility for delay should really rest. It was not until December 4, 1963, a date which was reached only last Wednesday, that additional views accompanying the report on this legislation were finally filed with the House. Therefore, for the mass media of communications to mislead the American people as it has in this instance by ascribing the delay to a bottling up within the Rules Committee is nothing but gross misrepresentation.

Further, it was not until after the sordid events in Birmingham that the President sent a civil rights message to Congress on June 19, 1963, attaching great urgency to this matter. Thereafter, when the Attorney General, Mr. Robert Kennedy, testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, he admitted that he had not even taken the time to read any of the more than 40 Republican bills that had been offered and which I referred to above. If you will look at the record you will find that there were only two civil rights bills passed in the last 80 years—in 1957 and in 1960. These bills received overwhelming support from the Republican membership in the House of Representatives. Even more significant than this fact is the fact that it was Congressman CLARENCE BROWN, who is now the ranking Republican member on the Rules Committee, who saw to it that these bills were not unnecessarily delayed within the Rules Committee. Mr. BROWN is still on the committee, and I have his assurance plus the assurance of the other four Republicans that they expect to vote out a civil rights bill. Furthermore, they do not expect to countenance any undue delay when hearings are held in January. When you couple these facts with the fact that a successful discharge petition would still require the bill to lay over until mid-January at the very earliest, I am unconvinced of the merit of this procedure.

It is my conviction that the political maneuvering on the part of some people who are civil righteous either in whole or in part because of political advantages that they see therein, is doing real damage to the cause of civil rights and jeopardizing the passage of the civil rights bill.

I made it clear many months ago that I was in wholehearted support of a civil rights bill, and would vote for it. This I fully intend to do. I will do it even though I do not expect any political advantage therefrom; indeed, I have every reason to believe that many of those who are most vocal in this regard are completely opposed to me in most of the stands that I take. Nevertheless, it is a matter of conscience with me, and I am proud and happy that I have an opportunity to cast an affirmative vote. At the same time, I feel deeply on the matter of some of the pressures that are being exerted with respect to the discharge petition. To those of us here in the Capitol in Washington, it is quite clear that the sponsor of the petition and others are seeking to use this as a political ploy to obtain some small partisan advantage and gain. They seek thereby to obscure the facts of their own negligence and untoward delay in bringing about the passage of this legislation.

In conclusion, let me say that it is difficult to disagree with our friends on this issue, particularly when we are not an enemy to the cause of civil rights, but have every intention of supporting the bill when it comes to the floor of the House of Representatives. However, for the reasons already set forth we simply cannot in good conscience lend ourselves to what we honestly feel is nothing more or less than political chicanery.

I would also like to point out further that many persons lose sight of the fact that once a Member of the House of Representatives signs a discharge petition on this particular bill, he is absolutely defenseless before the onslaught of demands that he act similarly with respect to the other pieces of legislation for which discharge petitions have already been filed or will be filed, some of which bills should never see the light of day. If we were to adopt the use of the petition with respect to this legislation, it is almost certain that some of these other bills would find their way to the floor. I think it is significant that our ranking Republican member on the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, has absolutely identical views with mine with respect to the use of the discharge petition for any purpose. Yet without the work of Mr. MCCULLOCH, a civil rights bill would never have been reported out of the House Judiciary Committee in a form so that it could pass the House of Representatives.

## Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my second rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from May 1 to June 12, 1963.

| Roll call No. | Date | H.R. No. | R.B.C. | Yea | Nay | Not voting | Brief description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35 | May 1 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (37 Members absent). |
| 36 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Mills, Democrat, of Arkansas (49 Members absent). |
| 37 | May 6 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Rogers, Democrat, of Colorado (133 Members absent). |
| 38 | do | 40 | Yea | 274 | 30 | 129 | Final passage of assistance to States re agricultural experiment stations. |
| 39 | May 7 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma (54 Members absent). |
| *40 | do | 245 | Nay | 384 | 2 | 47 | Final passage of measure purported to limit travel expenses for congressional staff members and Members of Congress. |
| 41 | May 8 | 5517 | do | 207 | 190 | 36 | Motion to recommit a Senate-House conference report on supplemental appropriations. |
| 42 | May 9 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma (46 Members absent). |
| *43 | do | 950 | Nay | 340 | 40 | 54 | Final passage of measure denying employees right of appeal or hearing in the event that the Secretary of Defense made a ruling that they were a security risk (1 Member voted present). |
| 44 | May 13 | 4274 | Yea | 278 | 53 | 102 | Final passage of measure authorizing supervised corporal punishment in Washington, D.C., school districts. |
| 45 | May 14 | 5517 | do | 241 | 130 | 62 | Final passage of conference report recommitted by rollcall 41. |
| *46 | do | 5517 | do | 168 | 207 | 58 | House-Senate conference report re Philippine war damage claims, to amend. |
| 47 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bass, Democrat, of Tennessee (62 Members absent). |
| 48 | do | 340 | Not voting | 153 | 217 | 64 | Final passage of measure to send representatives to International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva (R.B.C. in committee hearing with Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; had I been present I would have voted "aye") (1 Member voted present). (See also vote No. 58.) |
| 49 | May 15 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma (43 Members absent) (R.B.C. in committee meeting with Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs). |
| 50 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (38 Members absent). |
| *51 | do | 6009 | Nay | 195 | 222 | 15 | Motion to recommit increase in national debt ceiling (1 Member voted present). |
| *52 | do | 6009 | Yea | 213 | 204 | 17 | Final passage of national debt ceiling bill. |
| 53 | May 16 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Johansen, Republican, of Michigan (83 Members absent). |
| 54 | May 23 | 6060 | Yea | 362 | 9 | 64 | Automatic rollcall on question of whether to debate the equal pay for equal work bill. |
| 55 | May 28 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio (134 Members absent) (R.B.C. in conference with officials of United Aircraft Corp.). |
| 56 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Harris, Democrat, of Arkansas (154 Members absent). |
| 57 | May 29 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mrs. St. George, Republican, of New York (94 Members absent). |
| 58 | do | 368 | Yea | 277 | 52 | 104 | Appointment by Speaker of 2 Members to attend International Labor Conference, Geneva. (See vote No. 48 above.) |
| *59 | do | 5497 | Nay | 158 | 174 | 100 | Bill to extend Public Law 78 (bracero program) for 2 years (1 Member voted present). |
| 60 | June 4 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio (45 Members absent). |
| *61 | do | 3496 | Nay | 227 | 174 | 31 | Motion to amend Reorganization Act of 1949 to prohibit Executive creation of any new executive department. |
| *62-65 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum calls by Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi (average of 96 Members absent per call) to block discussion of civil rights under a special order. |
| *66 | do | | Nay | 53 | 277 | 103 | Motion to adjourn by Mr. Roosevelt, Democrat, of California. |
| *67-69 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum calls by Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi (139 Members absent). |
| 70 | June 5 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois (51 Members absent). |
| 71 | June 6 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois (64 Members absent). |
| 72 | do | 6754 | Yea | 288 | 79 | 65 | Final passage of Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. |
| 73 | June 11 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Baldwin, Republican, of California (62 Members absent) (R.B.C. in conference with Mr. James P. Grant, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near East and South Asian Affairs). |
| 74 | do | 6868 | Yea | 271 | 122 | 39 | Legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal 1964. |
| 75 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bromwell, Republican, of Iowa (82 Members absent). |
| 76 | June 12 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Quie, Republican, of Minnesota (28 Members absent). |
| 77 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (64 Members absent) (R.B.C. at Far East and Pacific Subcommittee for testimony of Mr. John Everton, U.S. Ambassador to Burma). |
| 78 | June 12 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Kilburn, Republican, of New York (48 Members absent). |

* Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 40

House Joint Resolution 245 purportedly limits travel expenses abroad for Congressmen and congressional staff members to a per diem allowance and transportation costs. In my judgment, adverse publicity early in the session on the junketing practices of certain Members stampeded Congress into adopting House Joint Resolution 245. At present there are adequate rules of the Congress, which, if rigidly enforced, would protect the public from any would-be malefactors. House Joint Resolution 245 is not foolproof. Its provisions can be circumvented just as existing rules can be thwarted. I considered my vote against the resolution to be a small exercise of protest in contrast to a large exercise of pacification. I also consider the proposal to be discriminatory, in that Congressmen on official business overseas will not be reimbursed for such necessary expenses as phone calls, cables, interpreters, and so forth. Executives in the private sector are reimbursed for all necessary expenses relative to their work, and I see no reason why Members of Congress should not be accorded the same consideration. It is significant that the House failed to include travel within the United States in the proposal. If the resolution is indeed aimed at accomplishing great reforms, I would think its applicability should not be limited to travel abroad.

ROLLCALL NO. 43

Sections 302(a) and 302(b) of this bill provide for a full field examination before a new employee of the National Security Agency is cleared, and establishes a board of appraisal to review each case. I, of course, subscribe to these provisions. Section 303, however, vests the Secretary of Defense with the summary and unreviewable power to discharge as a security risk any employee of the NSA. No hearing whatever is to be granted to the employee. No matter how many years he may have been employed, he is not entitled to know what the charges are against him, nor who made them. It was because of this section that I opposed the bill. It not only exposes individuals to possible injustice, it exposes the Agency itself to a risk that it will lose valuable personnel because some slanderer subjects them to suspicion. Hearings and appeal procedures are an asset, not a liability, because they strengthen morale and diminish the chances of mistaken identity, prejudice, and other errors of judgment. They grow out of a long Anglo-American experience in the administration of justice—out of a knowledge that confrontation and cross-examination are invaluable tools for the discovery of truth.

ROLLCALL NO. 46

At issue on this vote was whether the United States should pay $73 million in war damage claims directly to the Philippine Government, or disburse this sum—through the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—to the individual damage claimants. The amendment which I supported called for the latter method, with the stipulation that claim-

ants certify they would not pay fees to former Philippine War Damage Commission personnel. This would preclude payments to lobbyists who, while members of the War Damage Commission, had also been on the payroll of various corporations entitled to reimbursement under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. The purpose of the act was to provide public rehabilitation of the Philippine economy through payments to individuals and private corporations and organizations. The act explicitly stated that "Compensation shall be payable only to qualified persons." Members who voted against the amendment on this rollcall advocated payment of claims to the Philippine Government and not to the qualified persons as cited in the 1946 law. In my judgment it was not proper to bring a third party—the Philippine Government—into negotiations between the United States and private parties with financial claims against our Government. The United States has no guarantee that the Philippine Government will pay the $73 million to qualified persons under the 1946 act. I found no justification to circumvent existing law once the loophole allowing payment of fees to lobbyists had been closed.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 51 AND 52

It is interesting to note that on final passage of the national debt ceiling bill, only one Republican (former Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN) voted for the increase. The GOP undoubtedly analyzed the bill in political terms—a means of financially crippling the Kennedy administration—rather than in terms of national welfare. H.R. 6009 increases the temporary national debt limit by $2 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963, and by an additional $2 billion during the first 2 months of fiscal 1964. The bill was passed after the House rejected (rollcall 51) a GOP motion to recommit the measure to Ways and Means with instructions to amend it to continue the temporary $305 billion debt ceiling. In rebutting arguments that increasing the debt ceiling was a signal for greater spending, I pointed out that congressional restraint in passing new programs is the only effective way to control Government spending since the ceiling is a measure of what the Government must borrow to pay for the programs that Congress authorizes. Various emergency actions which the Treasury might take in managing the debt if the ceiling were not raised included: Drawing down Treasury cash balances and endangering current policies that limit the flow of dollars abroad; halting the sale of savings bonds; disposing of Federal properties such as mortgages and stockpiled metals on a crash basis which would limit credit for home buyers and hurt the mining industry; and slowing down existing defense and space commitments. Apparently the GOP felt these consequences to be in the national interest. I did not. During debate a conservative southern Democrat told Republicans that:

The greatest disservice that any of us who claim to be conservatives can do is, under the guise of conservatism, follow policies which are not sound or give the public an erroneous impression of the Nation's fiscal position.

It is also important to recall that during the Eisenhower years the debt ceiling was raised periodically and substantially with the strong support of Republicans and Democrats. As one Member pointed out to the GOP:

I hope my Republican colleagues will reread their old speeches and again reach their conclusion of yesteryear, because—

"Nor all their piety nor wit
Can cancel half a line
Nor all their tears
Wash out a word of it."

ROLLCALL NO. 59

This year the administration proposed a 1-year extension of the bracero program plus an amendment designed to strengthen the protection for domestic farm labor. The House Agriculture Committee, however, reported a 2-year extension without the amendment sought by the Department of Labor. Contrary to popular misconceptions about the bracero program, it is not administered without cost to American taxpayers. In fiscal 1963 an estimated $1.4 million in Labor Department funds was spent to insure that American farmers complied with wage and other regulations applicable to braceros. Farmers, however, are not required to offer American workers equivalent workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage, housing or transportation expenses. In 1962 there were 226,948 braceros imported to the United States for farm jobs, this in the face of about 5.5 million Americans in the ranks of the unemployed. The record indicates that the bracero program depressed the wages and working conditions of American migrant farm laborers, who had no systematic program of recruitment and work contracts to assist them in competing with bracero labor, and who were not offered the same fringe benefits as Mexican laborers. With the termination of Public Law 78, I believe that a similar recruitment program should be provided for domestic migrant laborers. I am also confident that with abolishment of the bracero program an adequate supply of American workers can be found to do stoop labor if offered decent wages and working conditions.

ROLLCALL NO. 61

H.R. 3496, a bill to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949 with an amendment prohibiting the President from recommending establishment of any new executive department, was passed by a conservative coalition. On this rollcall 158 Republicans joined with 65 southern Democrats to give President Kennedy what, in effect, was an undeserved rebuke. Only three Republicans voted against the measure. The act grants authority to the President to transmit to the Congress for its approval or its disapproval reorganization plans in the executive branch. It was under this authority that President Eisenhower recommended a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The President's recommendations are sent to the House Committee on Government Operations. Extensive hearings are held on the proposal. If any Member of Congress files a resolution of disapproval of the plan, and the resolution is approved by the Congress, the President's plan to reorganize is dead. This is standard legislative procedure: The Executive proposes and the Congress disposes—it either accepts or rejects. With the amendment embodied in H.R. 3496 Congress withdrew the power of the President to propose. Those who voted for the amended bill voted to turn the clock back, not just back of Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, Truman, and Roosevelt, but back of President Hoover, who first suggested the legislation. It is interesting to note that in 1953, when a bill to renew the authority of President Eisenhower to initiate reorganization plans (including the authority to set up new departments) came before the House, it was passed by a vote of 389 to 5. Democrats supported the proposal 184 to 2. Republicans were for it 205 to 3. Democrats gave a Republican President similar support in 1955, 1957, and 1959. In 1963, with a Democrat in the White House, Democrats asked Republicans to give a Democratic President the same powers and responsibilities—no more, but no less—than Democrats gave to a Republican President. It is unfortunate that when the vote was taken the GOP had its eye only on partisan politics and the 1964 campaign, not on efficiency and economy in Government.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 62–69

Under House rules it is impossible to conduct a filibuster of the Senate variety. However, repeated quorum calls can be used to stall speeches on controversial issues when they are being discussed under a special order. It is this tactic which southerners may use to temporarily block northern discussion of civil rights. After regular business had been transacted on June 4, Representative LINDSAY, of New York, took the floor to discuss the civil rights crisis under a special order. The southern bloc, led by Representative WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, walked off the floor, leaving Mr. LINDSAY without a quorum. Mr. WILLIAMS then made the point of order that a quorum was not present and asked for a rollcall. Mr. LINDSAY was precluded from speaking while this procedure was in progress, about one-half hour. As you will remember from our discussion on rollcall No. 1, it takes about 40 minutes to complete a quorum call. When a quorum had assembled, Mr. WILLIAMS again walked out, and with him went the number of southern Members necessary to make up the quorum. Then Mr. WILLIAMS came back, noticed the absence of a quorum and again the process was repeated several times. I remained on the floor until late in the evening, giving Mr. LINDSAY, a Republican, my support. At one point, a motion was made to adjourn, a move which, if successful, would have given token victory to the southern coalition. I voted against adjournment

on the principle that all Members, regardless of party or philosophy, have a right to present their views in the Congress. I was gratified when southerners finally gave up their obstructionist fight and permitted Mr. LINDSAY to proceed with his speech on civil rights.

## Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of December 7, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT: LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

In the aftermath of the assassination of President Kennedy it is vital to the security of the United States that we keep the record straight. Now, more than ever, Americans must remember the words of Abraham Lincoln: "As freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide." Only Americans can destroy America.

What are many columnists, commentators, and editorial writers doing today? They are blaming the people of the United States for a foul deed done by a self-avowed Communist. Too many Americans are parroting the line laid down by the Communists in Tass and Pravda. "Beware the extremists of the right and left wing," we are being told. "Americans are filled with hate," we hear over and over again. Ignored completely is the basic American character of compassion, kindness, sympathy so dramatically exhibited in the unity of the entire Nation following the tragedy; the outpouring of sympathy and love for Mrs. Kennedy and the children; a quarter of a million Americans standing all through the cold night outside the Capitol in silent tribute; the immediate and magnificent response of giving concrete help to the widow and children of the slain Dallas police officer, J. D. Tippit; even the contributions, out of our sense of sympathy, to the widow and children of the alleged assassin, Oswald.

Now, what are the facts?

1. The President was killed by a Communist. The hate was in the heart of the killer—hate of America, hate for what is our national purpose, hate for any type of authority.

2. Prior to the moment of the killing, President Kennedy and his party were being honored with enthusiasm, respect and love by thousands of Dallas citizens.

3. The Communists are the purveyors of hate in today's world. It is they who encourage lying, deceit and murder to accomplish their goals.

Of course, there are extremists—there have always been since the dawn of history. If, by extremists, we mean any who would take the law into their own hands by violence or killing, we abjure such action. We hate the deed, but in Christian charity try not to hate the individuals. It is important that we make a clear distinction, short of those who advocate murder, between the so-called rightwing and leftwing extremists.

1. The rightwing belief is based on preservation of the Constitution, to keep America free, to protect the security of the Nation.

2. The extremist on the left (and this does not include the sincere liberal who seeks the common good and believes it can be accomplished only through big government) but the far-out leftist whose goal is communism, the abrogation of our Constitution, and the destruction of America.

3. The great bulk of the American people belong to neither extreme, but are dedicated to this Nation and its free institutions, including the freedom of debate and opposition.

THE DANGER

Once we have made this clear distinction, we ask ourselves, what is the real danger? The threat to America is getting the American people to fall into the Communist trap and ending our will to resist. How?

1. By carrying out the policy of the 1960 Communist manifesto to eliminate the anti-Communists.

2. Get the American people to condemn themselves as bigots, breeders of hate, assassins, degenerates. Entice their own writers, clergymen, educators, politicians, any who can be duped into emphasizing American faults, drown us in self-criticism and self-guilt, ready to accept socialism which by definition escalates into communism.

Our danger comes from the extremist on the left who is dedicated to the Communist conspiracy to conquer the world and destroy the United States. We can handle the extremist on the right, short of those advocating violence (and there are some and always will be as long as man is man) because we can reach him through reason and debate because the objective of the right is the preservation of our limited Government under the Constitution.

THE ANSWERS

What do we do about the danger?

1. We adhere to American principles.

2. We do our best to preserve the spirit and the letter of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

3. We recognize the issues which divide our people, we debate them freely, and we compromise our views to arrive at solutions which will strengthen our country and the freedoms of our people.

4. We encourage, not stifle opposition. To intimidate, by calling them "hate mongers" any who disagree, will only play into the hands of the enemies of our system.

5. We do all possible to keep our people informed, wipe out ignorance, end blind prejudice for any reason.

We maintain uninhibited faith in the collective judgment and wisdom of the people. Under our system of government, divinely inspired, it is a natural law that, given all the facts, the people, in their final judgment, will not be wrong.

## Estes Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected passing of my long-time colleague and friend, the Honorable Estes Kefauver, is not only a great personal loss, but a loss to the State of Tennessee and the entire Nation as well.

I first came to know Estes Kefauver when I was elected to this House in the 78th Congress. We served here together until the fall of 1948 when he was first elected to the other body. He was a hard-working and devoted Member of the U.S. Congress, and I am sure many will agree that this country is a better place today because of his continuous crusade against crime and corruption, racketeering and monopolistic practices in industry. Estes had a genuine concern for the welfare of his fellow men and because of his unyielding dedication to duty and service, he will long be remembered and missed by millions of Americans.

I greatly admired and respected Estes for his honesty, his ability and for his courage, and I am deeply saddened by his passing. Mrs. Kefauver and the children have my heartfelt sympathy and prayers in their great loss.

## Television Overcommercialization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a statement I made on "Congressional Conference," broadcast over station WOR-TV, channel 9, New York, on Sunday, December 8, 1963.

The statement follows:

Permit me to offer praise to the broadcasting industry (both radio and television) for its reporting of the events of the frightful and frightening days, commencing with the firing of the fateful bullet that laid low our late, martyred President.

The industry measured up to highest standards. The achievement is worthy of proud commendation.

The television and radio stations and networks themselves have presented a shining contrast to their ordinary course of business as usual with their comprehensive noncommercial news coverage of the assassination and burial of our late, beloved President Kennedy and the succession of President Johnson.

Advertising revenues, of course, make such a public service possible but broadcasters must recognize, as their audience does, the difference between enough and too much.

The mad, almost weird, scramble of TV and radio stations to push as many commercials as possible at the audience has become a national scandal. The air is saturated with such commercials and the public is surfeited and suffocated.

The airwaves are a public resource. Operators of radio and TV stations are licensees of the U.S. Government through the agency of the Federal Communications Commission. Hence, it is clear that any abuse of the license granted by FCC must be examined by it. And it is an abuse, I maintain, when many TV and radio stations thrust 30 minutes of commercials on the air for every hour of program. A public franchise, giving each broadcaster a limited monopoly of the public airwaves, should not become a license to bombard the public with inane advertising for nearly half the broadcast day.

Obviously, then, the industry has failed to regulate itself. The National Association of Broadcasters in 1948 proposed a limit of

12 minutes of commercials for every broadcast hour—or 1 minute for commercials out of every 5. Many broadcasters, however, do not belong to NAB, and many of those who do failed to live up to its code. The NAB, instead of enforcing its own code, relaxed it this year so that now 18 minutes of commercials to every hour of broadcast—roughly 1 minute out of every 3—is deemed reasonable. But, as I stated before, many stations go far beyond even that 1-to-3 ratio.

The viewing and listening public is virtually a captive audience. Unlike the newspaper reader who can skip past the advertisements to the story which attracts his interest and read it through from beginning to end, you, the television viewer, cannot escape the intrusive interruption of commercials if you are to watch the program of your choice.

Certainly the industry is entitled to a reasonable profit on its investment, but it is equally reasonable that in the public domain a balance be struck between the public interest and the private interest of the licensee.

Broadcasters have enjoyed phenomenal profits in many cases. Radio and TV stations are changing hands for $3, $4, $7, even $10 million these days. Recently, $8 million was offered for a TV station which was worth only $3 million in 1960. A $5 million capital gain on a $3 million investment over 3 years represents a pretty fair profit by any standards.

The networks and their affiliated stations too are enjoying record profits and sales, with sensational advances reported in some instances. How can such broadcasters justly complain about a more reasonable balance between the public and private interest?

While the Federal Communications Commission has sought information as to the number of commercials and licensee uses, it has not sought information as to the amount of time devoted to commercials in each hour of the broadcast day. Without such information it cannot get a true picture.

There are those who oppose any FCC regulation of commercials but its public duty is plain. The overuse of commercials is self-evident. The victims of such overuse, the viewers and listeners of TV and radio, agree, I am sure, that the insistent, intrusive, incessant, inescapable cries of vendors and pitchmen over the air must, in a measure, be inhibited.

---

## Effect of Meat Imports on Cattle Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been watching the livestock and meat situation in the United States and I must say that it has been with a great deal of concern. The cattle market is always somewhat erratic, but since November of last year, cattle prices began an unusual decline, and as always, stockmen and others in the trade searched for a reason. Attention was focused on cattle and veal imports which recently have increased in large amounts. I am well aware of the special report on the livestock situation where the Department of Agriculture found no evidence justifying the citing of beef imports as a cause of the price break for fed cattle. They point out that although total beef and veal imports are at record levels, most of that imported was manufacturing beef. Very little high quality fed beef was imported. It is pointed out that during the increase in imports, fed cattle prices were also rising. However, as we look at the present market, the question comes to mind: imports are increasing, then why are prices falling? For example, last November the average price for choice steers in Chicago rose to a high of $30.13 a hundred, and thereafter began a fall which ended at a disastrous low of $22.61 a hundred in May of this year—a decline of almost 25 percent. Average prices in the following 2 months rose to $24.11 in September, $5.74 a hundred below September 1962. Choice slaughter steer prices in the first half of this year were 9 percent below the first half of 1962. Declines have occurred in other classes of cattle; prices of stocker and feeder steers at Kansas City in the first 6 months of this year were 4 percent below the same period a year earlier. Chicago prices of commercial cows were down 3 percent, cutters and canners were down 3 percent and the wholesale price of fresh choice beef carcasses in New York down from $0.502 per pound in September 1962 to $0.426 in September 1963.

A considerable census of opinion attributes the price declines to the increased volume of meat imports into the United States over the past few years. Imports of beef and veal in 1962 were more than twice the 1956–60 average, and more than four times the 1951–55 average. Moreover, beef imports in the first half of 1963 outpaced those for the first half of 1962 by more than 20 percent. Simple logic would indicate that these increased imports do, indeed, bear down on the price our cattlemen are receiving for livestock, especially when one considers that such imports in 1962 accounted for almost 11 percent of total domestic production as compared with only 4 percent in 1957. The United States has increased its share of the total world meat imports to over 25 percent in 1962—1,850.4 million pounds—compared with 14.8 percent—889.1 million pounds—for the 1956–60 average. In fact, the United States exported 29 percent—103.2 million pounds—less meat in 1962 than the 1956–60 average—145.3 million pounds—while for the same period of comparison our total imports rose an astounding 108 percent. In 1962 exports further decreased approximately 8 percent while imports rose another 39 percent. Even more important, examine the figures for the first 6 months of 1963. Nearly all types of red meat imports were higher than during the same period in 1962. Beef and veal imports at 491 million pounds were 21 percent above the first half of last year, with the major beef item—boneless—20 percent above the previous year at 407 million pounds.

About 96 percent of U.S. manufacturing meat imports came from 8 countries in 1962, Australia and New Zealand supplying 56 or 20 percent, respectively. Last year the United States was the leading market for Australian meats, and has been the major market for New Zealand's boneless beef exports for the past 3 years, taking over 90 percent of their production. All of this is particularly interesting in view of the study of nontariff agricultural protectionism by the Department of Agriculture. This study shows that all our major trading partners practice a higher degree of agricultural protectionism than the United States through nontariff barriers. These nontariff import controls involve such things as import quotas, embargoes, variable levies, monopolies, preferential treatment, import licensing, bilateral agreements, and so forth. Using such nontariff import controls as the criteria, the Department of Agriculture found that the following percentages of a country's domestic agricultural production was protected from outside competition: Australia, 41 percent; New Zealand, 100 percent; Denmark, 100 percent; France, 95 percent; and West Germany, 95 percent. The study indicates that the United States is among the most liberal in the world in its agricultural import policies.

Statements credited to officials in the U.S. Department of Agriculture minimize the impact of imports on domestic meat-animal prices. They point out that imports, two-thirds of which are coming from Australia and New Zealand, constitute lower quality beef used in making manufactured and processed products, such as frankfurters and luncheon meat. However, representatives of the American National Cattlemen's Association maintain that such imports have a direct impact on cattle prices. The National Livestock Feeders Association has pointed out a possible fallacy of the Agriculture Department theory:

> Processed products constitute very real competition in the sale of fresh beef and veal. The availability of large quantities of imported manufactured boneless beef and veal has resulted in a continuously larger proportion of processed products being offered consumers, in comparison to the volume of fresh cuts which come principally from carcasses grading USDA Good and Choice. Boning beef comes principally from old bulls and cows and from low grade steers and heifers. Without the very large volume of imports, there would be a substantial downward substitution of the cheaper cuts from carcasses of higher grades for use as boneless beef. This provides price and supply movement stimuli to the fresh beef market.

We hear quite a bit about the United States not being able to supply the canner and cutter quality of animals and that most of the imports are of that type; however, one must remember that the average age of a cow herd is increasing, and that when a rancher has an area of good grass, a cow will be kept for another winter if there is a possibility she will survive and produce another calf. Because the cow will still have the same slaughter value the following year, many ranchers are optimistic about returns from feeder calves and will carry through the winter many aged cows not barren. Obviously, the time will occur when it is no longer of benefit to return her, however, with foreign beef consistently underselling domestic by some 5 cents a pound the processor who buys domestic beef has no choice but to pay the farmer

less. This depressing effect of cheap foreign meat cannot help but cause havoc in the cattle industry.

These various points of view, it seems to me, though they come from highly authoritative sources, are so divergent as to prompt Congress to concern itself with a thorough study of the question. In glancing through USDA statistics, I note that steer and heifer slaughter under Federal inspection in the first 6 months of this year was about 9 percent above a year earlier. Such increased slaughter would seem to support the U.S. Department of Agriculture position that increased slaughter—and not imports—was the cause of the price decline.

But let us look at the facts a little further, red meat production is continuing at a high rate, up 4.3 percent from the first half of 1962, and we are told that a per capita consumption will reach 167 pounds for 1963, a 3-pound increase over 1962. With an expansion in demand for beef from the increased population, higher incomes, and continuation in consumer's preference for beef, one would think that cattle prices would also remain at a high level. At the same time, one cannot escape the inherent logic in the Cattlemen's Association and Feeder's Association statements that sizable imports of beef directly affect the price which producers in this country receive.

I should also call attention to the fact that prices received for farm products in the first 6 months averaged about the same as last year, with lower prices for livestock nearly offsetting higher prices for crops. On the surface, this may appear to be economically sound; however, while farm income has remained the same, the rest of the economy has moved ahead. Indeed, in the June quarter the farmer's share of the food dollar fell to 36 cents, the lowest quarterly average in 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, the livestock segment of our agricultural economy is extremely important. Last year, sales of nearly $20 billion of livestock products accounted for almost 56 percent of total farm income while sales of nearly $12 billion of meat animals alone made up about a third of total farm income.

We are both the world's largest exporter of agricultural products and because of our high purchasing power and liberal policies, the world's second largest importer of agricultural products, exceeded only by the United Kingdom. Over half our agricultural imports are products that compete with our own farm production.

But as realists we are not seeking completely free trade, for many reasons—economics, political, and social, no country is either prepared or willing to remove all protections from its agriculture. The basic question has to do with the degree of protection. Nations must participate in active two-way trade. The two-way trade in agricultural products practiced by the United States is of a vigorous healthful nature. More countries should follow our lead.

I am not sure what would be the proper approach to our meat import problem, and of course, I do not think anyone would demand total exclusion of foreign meats since some is necessary to meet the demand for processed and manufacturing products. However, imports are jeopardizing one of the most important segments of agriculture, and I believe it would be proper to put into effect import quotas or increase the duty on live cattle and meat products. I strongly urge that we give this problem our serious attention.

*U.S. average beef cattle prices per 100 pounds, 1953–63*

| Year | Prices received by farmers for all beef cattle | Choice slaughter steers at Chicago | Feeder steer prices at Kansas City | Commercial grade cows at Chicago |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1953 | $16.30 | $24.14 | $17.35 | $13.92 |
| 1954 | 16.00 | 24.66 | 18.97 | 13.28 |
| 1955 | 15.60 | 23.16 | 18.60 | 12.98 |
| 1956 | 14.90 | 22.30 | 17.37 | 12.72 |
| 1957 | 17.20 | 23.83 | 20.33 | 14.83 |
| 1958 | 21.90 | 27.42 | 25.56 | 17.76 |
| 1959 | 22.60 | 27.83 | 25.61 | 19.11 |
| 1960 | 20.40 | 26.24 | 22.93 | 16.21 |
| 1961 | 20.20 | 24.65 | 23.30 | 16.07 |
| 1962 | 21.30 | 27.67 | 24.53 | 15.89 |
| 1963 [1] | 20.22 | 24.15 | 23.70 | 15.75 |
| January | 21.60 | 27.27 | 24.53 | 15.30 |
| February | 20.40 | 24.93 | 23.89 | 15.24 |
| March | 19.60 | 23.63 | 23.45 | 15.68 |
| April | 20.30 | 23.77 | 24.12 | 15.86 |
| May | 19.70 | 22.61 | 23.50 | 16.44 |
| June | 19.70 | 22.69 | 22.74 | 16.17 |

[1] 1st 6 months.

Source: USDA. Statistical Reporting Service, July 1963 (Statistical Bulletin No. 333) and USDA, Economic Research Service. Livestock and Meat Situation Reports, 1963.

*U.S. imports of cattle and beef, compared with production, 1953–62—Cattle and calves and beef and veal*

| Year | Imports | | | | Meat production [3] (million pounds) | Imports as a percentage of production (percent) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Live animals | | Meat (million pounds) | Total [2] (million pounds) | | |
| | Number (thousand head) | Meat equivalent [1] (million pounds) | | | | |
| 1953 | 177 | 62 | 271 | 333 | 13,953 | 2.4 |
| 1954 | 71 | 35 | 232 | 267 | 14,610 | 1.8 |
| 1955 | 296 | 93 | 229 | 322 | 15,147 | 2.1 |
| 1956 | 141 | 43 | 211 | 254 | 16,094 | 1.6 |
| 1957 | 703 | 221 | 395 | 616 | 15,728 | 3.9 |
| 1958 | 1,126 | 340 | 909 | 1,249 | 14,516 | 8.6 |
| 1959 | 688 | 191 | 1,063 | 1,254 | 14,588 | 8.6 |
| 1960 | 645 | 163 | 775 | 938 | 15,835 | 5.9 |
| 1961 | 1,023 | 250 | 1,037 | 1,287 | 16,341 | 7.9 |
| 1962 | 1,232 | 280 | 1,445 | 1,725 | 16,311 | 10.6 |

[1] Estimated at 53 percent of the live weight of all dutiable imports of cattle.
[2] Canned and other processed meats have been converted to their carcass weight equivalent.
[3] Total production.

Source: USDA. Economic Research Service, Livestock and Meat Situation, May 1963 (LMS-130).

*U.S. steer and heifer beef production under Federal inspection, by month, 1962–63*

[In millions of pounds]

| Month | Steer beef production in the United States | | Heifer beef production in the United States | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1962 | 1963 | 1962 | 1963 |
| January | 654 | 678 | 188 | 214 |
| February | 574 | 591 | 173 | 196 |
| March | 647 | 662 | 190 | 222 |
| April | 601 | 710 | 169 | 214 |
| May | 699 | 782 | 192 | 227 |
| June | 700 | 732 | 184 | 199 |
| Total | 3,875 | 4,155 | 1,096 | 1,272 |

Source: USDA. Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture Livestock and Meat Situation, October 1963.

## Independence Day of Tanganyika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1961, Tanganyika achieved her independence. We wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Tanganyika, Julius K. Nyerere, on the occasion of the second anniversary of Tanganyika's independence.

Two years have now passed since the new green, black, and gold flag of Tanganyika was first raised in the Dar-es-Salaam and rockets rose 300 miles to the north from Mount Kilimanjaro's icy summit in celebration of Tanganyika's independence. Many changes have taken place in these 2 years, but few of them have been in the news. The changes have been peaceful—the gradual progressive political and economic development of a stable nation toward well-defined objectives—not the shocking, disrupting stories of violence that make interesting newspaper copy.

Still, one of the changes in particular was so momentous that it received wide coverage in the foreign press. On December 9, 1962, Tanganyika ceased to be a legal part of the British monarchical system, a dominion, and declared itself a Republic. Tanganyika retained membership in the British Commonwealth, but the institution of the British Governor-General was jettisoned forever. Dr. Julius K. Nyerere was chosen President of the new Republic in an election in which he received more than 98 percent of the total votes cast.

The country of which Dr. Nyerere is President on Africa's east coast is a land of natural beauty, of ancient legend, but yet of modern outlook. Tanganyika is four times the size of its former colonial master, Great Britain. On its northern frontier Mt. Kilimanjaro rises in a giant floating sugarloaf. To the east lies the Indian Ocean where colorful Arab and native craft plow the coral-reefed sea. To the west is Lake Victoria and the source of the Nile.

In northern Tanganyika archeologists have discovered what are probably the oldest traces of man on earth; deep valleys and gorges reveal the fossils of prehistoric ages. The coast of the country has been known to voyagers for nearly 2,000 years; in contrast, the interior has been known to the outside world for little more than 100 years. Tanganyika was the object of several waves of colonization. The Arabs came in the 8th century; the Portuguese in the 14th. Both these people were interested in Tanganyika chiefly as a stopping place on their profitable trading voyages to India and the Far East. British explorers penetrated the interior in the middle 19th century; by the end of the century German hegemony had been established, only to be ceded to Britain under a League of Nations mandate at the end of World War I.

But the Tanganyika of today is very different from the Tanganyika of the past. Under the skillful leadership of President Nyerere and his party, the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), the economy is gradually being developed in spite of a low potential of natural resources. Increased production of sisal, cotton, and coffee—the country's three most important commercial products—is being encouraged. The transportation network is being improved. The Government has accepted aid from international agencies, Britain, West Germany, and the United States. Peace Corps volunteers—roadbuilders, geologists, secondary school teachers—have been welcomed.

On the second anniversary of your independence we congratulate you, President Nyerere, and the people of Tanganyika, for skillfully putting your resources to the most profitable use and for working cooperatively with friendly countries who desire to assist Tanganyika to reach its development goals.

## Gettysburg 1863–1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, history was made in Gettysburg 100 years ago.

One hundred years later, November 16, 17, 18, 19, 1963, that history was rather thoroughly reviewed by men in various professions.

The following is another in that series of lectures this one delivered by Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, First District of Iowa, before the Sons of the Union Veterans and other patriotic groups:

THE LITERATURE OF GETTYSBURG

(By Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL, Congressman from First District of Iowa)

Those of us who are here today know that we are here again trying to evaluate an elemental force in human nature beyond anything in the whole spectrum of biographical literature from Plutarch to Carl Sandburg.

We are in the community where one of the noblest utterances ever delivered on this soil was made.

It was spoken a century ago.

Next Tuesday we share with each other a profound emotion of reverence toward the author like that felt by participants in some devout, even mystical, ceremony of worship.

The whole world and all of time will little note nor long remember what we say here today.

But historians and interested citizens will note this commemoration as a reflection on and an extension of what was said on this now sacred spot in that imperishable 2 minutes or so after one of the most decisive battles in the history of mankind.

Somehow our emotions are keyed to the brooding genius who, even as I speak, hovers over this hallowed place.

And whose voice, like eternity itself, can almost be felt whispering to us out of the infinite.

It does our hearts good and it enriches the soul to discuss, to evaluate, to reflect upon, to adulate this infinitesimal fragment of the world's literature we call the Gettysburg Address.

It is our literature because it is inspired by Lincoln.

It is American in every breath and syllable, every punctuation mark.

And it was given to mankind by one of our own.

SPRUNG FROM OUR SOIL—THE BEDROCK OF FREEDOM

It is as universal as the Lord's Prayer with which it bears—in my judgment—a measure of divine resemblances.

The literature of Gettysburg and the address which we commemorate today has in it, not only for us but for the whole human race everywhere on this planet, something of a quality that touches all of us.

In whatever condition, it touches us at the noblest side of our nature.

It is my belief that this is its essential secret.

I dare—with reverence and humility—to equate it with the tone, the style, the inner nature and the all-encompassing compassion of the Lord's Prayer.

Is not this the reason that from the very moment of its utterance these brief, utterly sincere 10 sentences, spoken at a moment of overwhelming national bereavement, captured the imagination of the contemporary world?

There were, as you know, those who passed the Gettysburg Address by on the day that it appeared in the public prints and for sometime after.

Like the Lord's Prayer it failed in its own day to receive total recognition.

But there were those on the public level who caught its meaning and its impact at once: Surviving soldiers, poets, editors, reporters, publicists, clergymen, and orators of the day including the remarkable Edward Everett.

This of course was not a speech dashed off on the back of an envelope, but a speech, which had behind it 45 years of learning and deep experience that produced some powerful thinking.

Maybe this is the reason that all that I say here today—which is without value except for what it commemorates—is a sort of irreducible minimum, the tiniest morsel, of what is yet to be said and written about this Gettysburg Address for generations and thousands of years to come.

We have the evidence that the words moved men in the hour in which they were spoken.

The most obvious observations made about the phrases of Lincoln scattered over this blood-drenched field a century ago is their affinity with Holy Writ: "these honored dead," "the last full measure of devotion," "shall not have died in vain," "shall not perish from the earth."

I ask, with all the reverence I can bring to bear upon this humbly offered comparison, do not these words, in their rhythm, their sublime simplicity, their compactness, their ineffable music, the richness of their meaning, and their solace and dedication, have a kinship that is mystical and enduring with the most prayerful lines in Biblical literature: "Hallowed be Thy name," "give us this day our daily bread," "forgive

us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us" "deliver us from evil."

The inner meaning of both pieces of literature bring the loftiest emotions of the human soul into adjustment with the facts of our daily lives.

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us."

The highest aspirations to which man can reach touch hands with the needs of the moment: spiritual striving on the most idealistic scale wedded with what needs to be done in this hour of necessity and travail.

It is in this wise, it seems to me precisely, that the Lord's Prayer unites the kingdom of heaven with the hunger for one's daily bread.

Something of the immediacy of the impact of Lincoln's words on Lincoln's world, is conveyed in an article that appeared Monday morning, November 23, 1863, in the Daily Ohio State Journal, of Columbus.

Let me read you this revealing and moving literature. It appeared under the headline: "Dedication Day at Gettysburg."

It goes like this:

"Thursday, the 19th day of November, 1863, will long be remembered as the day when the President's calm but earnest utterance of this brief and beautiful address stirred the deepest fountains of feeling and emotion in the hearts of the vast throng before him; and when he had concluded, scarcely could an untearful eye be seen, while sobs of smothered emotion were heard on every hand. At our side stood a stout, stalwart officer, bearing the insignia of a captain's rank, the empty sleeve of his coat indicating that he had stood where death was revelling, and as the President, speaking of our Gettsyburg soldiers, uttered that beautifully touching sentence, so sublime and pregnant of meaning—'The world will little note, nor long remember what we here say, but it can never forget what they here did:'—the gallant soldier's feeling burst over all restraint; and burying his face in his handkerchief, he sobbed aloud while his *manly frame* shook with no unmanly emotion, and after a struggle to master his emotions, he lifted his still-streaming eyes to heaven, and in low and solemn tones exclaimed:

" 'God Almighty bless Abraham Lincoln.' And to this spontaneous invocation a thousand hearts around him silently responded 'Amen.' "

There may be a touch of reportorial hyperbole in some of the nuances of this newspaper story.

Yet it is indicative of the effect of the War President's words on the reporter who heard them and on the audience that was on the spot.

I am much less concerned with the reporter's slightly inaccurate quotation than I am with the plainly stirring emotion that the short speech created and the feeling it elicited of love and veneration for the speaker.

Moreover this very love and this very veneration seems to be timeless and grips the hearts and souls of generations of Americans—and people the world over—in every climate, almost as much as it did those who stood beside the living President and in front of him a hundred years ago.

There were of course editorials that gave praise to the Lincoln utterance on this soil and there were the encomiums from the pulpit.

Phillips Brooks was easily among the greatest pulpit orators of his day.

On April 23, 1865 (8 days after Lincoln's death), in Phillips Brooks' sermon at the Church of the Holy Trinity in Philadelphia, Bishop Brooks left us a literary gem.

Speaking from the title, "The Life and Death of Abraham Lincoln," this Protestant Episcopal bishop said in part:

"He (Lincoln) once stood on the battlefield of our own State, and said of the brave men who had saved it words as noble as any countryman of ours ever spoke.

"Let us stand in the country he has saved, and which is to be his grave and monument, and say of Abraham Lincoln what he said of the soldiers who had died at Gettysburg."

"He stood there with their graves before him, and these are the words he said—"

Here Phillips Brooks quoted the Gettysburg Address.

Then he added the hope and prayer: "May God make us worthy of the memory of Abraham Lincoln."

It seems to me there were few more proficient authorities on what were and what were not "words as noble as any countryman of ours ever spoke" than this enormously respected and famous clergyman—contemporary of Abraham Lincoln.

Then for me there is the subtle appeal and a most penetrating insight with literary beauty and some prophecy in the lines on Abraham Lincoln in "The Man of the People," by Edwin Markham. Markham was about 11 years old when the Gettysburg Address was delivered.

In fact, among the American poets he is one of the greatest.

We hear the prophecy and note great literature in: "His word were oaks in acorns;" "and his thoughts were roots that firmly gript the granite earth."

This, of course, is testifying in the compactly concentrated language of poetry to the immortality of Lincoln's speech.

"His words were oaks in acorns."

Still another poet, more our contemporary than Lincoln's, was James Oppenheim, who was inspired to write in this touching descriptive poem: "The Lincoln Child."

"And lo, as he grew ugly, gaunt,
And gnarled his way into a man,
What wisdom came to feed his want,
What worlds came near to let him scan.
And as he fathomed through and through
Our dark and sorry human scheme,
He knew what Shakespeare never knew,
What Dante never dared to dream—
That men are one
Beneath the sun,
And before God are equal souls—
This truth was his,
And this it is,
That round him such a glory rolls."

What Oppenheim makes poetically dramatic here is an element basic to the Lincoln character.

This element is the element of godliness, of spirituality as something separate from denominational religion.

The profound Biblical precept: "That men are one" permeates the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln.

(My, how that needs thinking on and response to today.)

It is embedded in Lincoln's character like the cornerstone of a great and magnificent piece of architecture.

We might ask, is it anywhere more manifest than in the Gettysburg Address?

It is clear to me that Lincoln never thought of the North and the South, or East and West, rather he thought of all sections as one Nation.

He found and tried to apply in his time the fundamental tenet that "all men are created equal."

And isn't this the very essence of the American dream?

Even here, at Gettysburg, where the two sections confronted each other on the level of the highest order of human drama, Lincoln still thought of one nation, and could not bring himself to deliver his funeral oration in honor of one part of the country and in derogation of the other.

For him, even in this high moment of intense crisis and antagonism, there were no soldiers of the Union and no soldiers of the Confederacy.

There were only just soldiers.

There was about this awful carnage only "the brave men, living and dead, who struggled here" not enemies and not antagonists.

The magnificent Carl Sandburg makes my point far better than I can make it.

Speaking before the joint session of Congress, February 12, 1959, to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth, Mr. Sandburg said:

"His words at Gettyburg were sacred, yet strange with a color of the familiar:

"We cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living, and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far beyond our poor power to add or detract."

Sandburg dramatically continues as he observes:

"He could have said 'the brave Union men.' Did he have a purpose in omitting the word 'Union'?

"Was he keeping himself and his utterance clear of the passion that would not be good to look back on when the time came for peace and reconciliation?

"Did he mean to leave an implication that there were brave Union men and brave Confederate men, living and dead, who had struggled there?

"We do not know, of a certainty.

"Was he thinking of the Kentucky father whose two sons died in battle, one in Union blue, the other in Confederate gray, the father inscribing on the stone over their double grave, 'God knows which was right?' We do not know."

It can be said with some confidence that Lincoln is the most quoted of our Presidents, and he inspired more quotes and noble litterature than any other President.

There are sublime passages in Lincoln that derive an immensely dramatic impact from the facts of his life and the majesty that accrues to his career from having been President.

The greatness and thoroughness that is Lincoln can be found in the Cooper Union speech.

Research, study and respect for history is evident in the capacity for clear reasoning which is shown in the debates with Douglas.

And they achieve a certain posture of validity and responsibility when he speaks as President of the United States.

In uttering the words in the first inaugural: "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection." The greatest of our Presidents launched himself into the rarefied altitudes where only the world's immortals are to be found.

This is also evident in that greatest utterance of compassion to be found anywhere in the whole history of statesmanship and leadership: the Biblical paragraphs in the second inaugural.

The words "with malice toward none, with charity for all" are like some indestructible light leading into a new horizon for the whole of the human race.

The impact of these words—and the other in large part—would not have been so great had he not been the President of the United States, upon whose fabulously competent shoulders rested a burden almost beyond human endurance.

And it is this unearthly responsibility that gives his words a flame, a meaning, an immortality, that they might not otherwise have had.

For the drama of his life is inescapably intertwined with the grandeur of his words,

and their transparently sincere, soul-searching, decency, and conviction, their unassailable logic.

They were simple words, of course, but that's only a fraction of their virtue for their simplicity was arrived at through immense complexities and confusion.

It is their clarity and their humanity which thrust whole shafts of light where there was only darkness and bedlam.

Shafts of light not only for the young Nation known as the United States of America in the middle of the 19th century but shafts of light that is dazzling today and will brighten the paths of men on their march to freedom to the end of time everywhere on this planet.

We here find abundant testimony to the admonition that it is our businesss as a nation and as individuals to make other men wise and better as we can find or make opportunity to do so.

Like him then let us try to find the right way, the right place and the right time to do what is right.

---

## The Assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the assassination of the President of the United States, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD newspaper and other articles which were published subsequent thereto:

[From the Washington Daily News, Nov. 27, 1963]

THIS WAS MR. KENNEDY'S THANKSGIVING MESSAGE

President Johnson yesterday urged that the late President Kennedy's November 5 Thanksgiving Day proclamation be read in houses of worship as a memorial tomorrow. He also asked the press to "make it available to all the American people." It follows:

"Over three centuries ago, our forefathers in Virginia and in Massachusetts, far from home on a lonely wilderness, set aside a time of 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 love which bound them together and for the faith which united them with 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.'

"And so too, in the midst of America's tragic Civil War, President Lincoln proclaimed the last Thursday of November 1863 as the day to renew our gratitude for America's fruitful fields, for our national strength and vigor, and for all our singular deliverances and blessings.

"Much time has passed since the first colonists came to rocky shores and dark forests of an unknown continent, much time since President Washington led a young people into the experience of nationhood, much time since President Lincoln saw the American Nation through the ordeal of fraternal war—and in these years our population, our plenty, and our power have all grown apace. Today we are a nation of nearly 200 million souls stretching from coast to coast, on into the Pacific and north toward the Arctic, a nation enjoying the fruits of an ever-expanding agriculture and industry and achieving standards of living unknown in previous history. We give our humble thanks for this.

"Yet, as our power has grown, so has our peril. Today we give our thanks, most of all, for the ideals of honor and faith we inherit from our forefathers—for the decency of purpose, steadfastness of resolve and strength of will, for the courage and the humility, which they possessed and which we must seek every day to emulate. As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words but to live by them.

"Let us therefore proclaim our gratitude to providence for manifold blessings—let us be humbly thankful for inherited ideals—and let us resolve to share those blessings and those ideals with our fellow human beings throughout the world.

"Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, in consonance with the joint resolution of the Congress approved December 26, 1941, designating the fourth Thursday in November in each year as Thanksgiving Day, do hereby proclaim Thursday, November 28, 1963, as a day of national thanksgiving.

"On that day 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 nations, and of ending misery and suffering, wherever they exist."

---

[From the Denver (Colo.) Register, Dec. 8, 1963]

DALLAS PRIEST RELIVES PRESIDENT'S FINAL HOURS—FATHER HUBER POINTS TO OUTBURST OF LOVE IN CITY WHERE J.F.K. DIED

(By Very Rev. Oscar L. Huber, C.M.)

The great day set for the visit of the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, had arrived. Dallas had worked feverishly to make this the most enthusiastic welcome ever to be given a President of the United States. On TV at 11:35 a.m., I saw his arrival at Love Field and heard the enthusiastic welcome given him. Then I walked down to Lemmon and Regan Streets, about three blocks from Holy Trinity Church, to await the motorcade that would bring the President along the planned route that would end at the Dallas Trade Mart, where a sumptuous luncheon and a spendidly arranged program were to highlight his visit.

There both sides of the street were lined with people eagerly awaiting the President—there also were the children of Holy Trinity school, their teachers, the Daughters of Charity, and lay teachers. Soon the car carrying the members of the Presidential party passed by. The President and Mrs. Kennedy were waving and smiling to everyone and these gestures of good will were enthusiastically returned by the happy onlookers along the way. It was a thrilling moment for me as I had never before seen a President of the United States.

I returned to the rectory—ate a brief lunch—had just finished when Father [James N.] Thompson, C.M., one of my assistants, who had finished his lunch previously and was watching the motorcade on TV—came to the refectory and announced that the President had been shot. We went to the recreation room where we heard, over TV, the President had been taken to Parkland Hospital—this hospital is within the confines of Holy Trinity parish. Within a short time we were on our way to the hospital. Shortly after we left the rectory, a telephone call came from someone at Parkland saying Mrs. Kennedy was requesting a priest to administer to the spiritual needs of the President. Within 10 or 15 minutes we were at the hospital. Father Thompson parked the car while I was escorted by a policeman to an emergency room where I found the fatally wounded President lying on a portable table. He was covered with a sheet that I removed from over his forehead before administering the last rights of the church.

Because of the President's condition, I administered conditionally the Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction, followed by the Apostolic Blessing. After this I recited for the President, from the ritual, prayers for the dying and for the repose of his soul, to which was added: "Eternal rest grant unto him, O, Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him. May he rest in peace. Amen."

During these ceremonies, Mrs. Kennedy was standing beside the President. She and others in the emergency room answered the prayers with which they were familiar. Mrs. Kennedy bent and seemed to kiss the President and then, I believe, placed on his finger her wedding ring. This, I have been told, signifies: "Together in life, together in death." Soon after this, followed by Mrs. Kennedy, and others who were present, I walked from the emergency room to the adjoining corridor. Sorrow and consternation bowed the heads of everyone present. The silence that pervaded the corridor was mute evidence that another President of the United States died at the hand of an assassin. Yes, it was evident—the President was dead.

During this most trying ordeal, the perfect composure maintained by Mrs. Kennedy was beyond comprehension. I will never forget the blank stare in her eyes and the signs of agony on her face. I extended my heartfelt sympathy and that of my parishioners to her. In a low tone of voice she thanked me graciously and asked me to pray for the President. I assured her I would do so. Shortly after this Father Thompson and I returned to Holy Trinity rectory.

At 5:30 the same afternoon of his death, I offered a Requiem Mass for the repose of the President's soul. Sunday morning at 9:30 a Requiem High Mass was offered for the President. On Monday, the National Day of Mourning, a Requiem High Mass was offered at 8:45 with Holy Trinity schoolchildren in attendance. In the evening at 5:30, a Solemn Requiem Mass was offered in the presence of an overflowing crowd.

I believe that in every place of worship in Dallas, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, services, attended by unprecedented crowds, were held for the President on the National Day of Mourning. To me this was a marvelous expression of love, devotion, and deep-seated respect for the President of the United States. The fantastic interest of the people shown by the meticulous preparations made for the visit of the President, merits for them a lasting place in the hall of loyalty. A striking demonstration of sorrow can be seen by the great number of wreaths that decorate the spot where the President was assassinated.

The people of Dallas, along with the whole world, deeply mourn the loss of our President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. May God grant him eternal rest. Likewise, may God lead the new President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson, safely along the arduous paths that lie ahead of him.

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Nov. 23, 1963]

OVERWHELMING TRAGEDY: ASSASSIN'S BULLET CLAIMS PRESIDENT

What can be said that would pass as adequate comment on the tragedy of President Kennedy's assassination?

So overwhelming is the impact of his slaying at Dallas that full realization of what the assassin's bullet wrought cannot be expected to be grasped immediately.

But shock, rejection of the deed, grief, and a sense of shame that this sort of thing happens in the United States today are reactions shared by everyone—and properly so.

The people of this Nation recoil from acts of violence. Their disapproval of such methods as a means to eliminate an official from office is paramount to any feeling they may have about th official's policies.

We grieve that John F. Kennedy has joined the ranks of the martyred Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, and William McKinley.

In so doing, he gave his life for what he believed.

And such strength of conviction must be respected, even by those whose beliefs may differ in great degree and whose convictions are also unwavering.

Mr. Kennedy injected into the Presidency a winning type of personal diplomacy that comprised a new formula for solidifying Western relations on the grassroots level.

The young and dynamic head of an attractive young family, the Chief Executive brought to the White House a vitality and an atmosphere of family life that hadn't been known there since the dawning years of the 20th century.

And he died as surely in the service of his country as had he fallen in military service. All but those whose gnawing rancor has overpowered Judeo-Christian ethic will say as much.

Out of this senseless bloodshed comes a burning truth which Americans cannot escape: Hate breeds more hate and, unstemmed, it and blood spill over into the streets.

For President Lyndon B. Johnson, the position suddently thrust upon him is necessarily even more complex than it was for his predecessor. May the prayers of a nation, brought together by bonds of sympathy, rest with him as they rest with the family of the late President.

The scar of yesterday's tragedy can never be erased but Americans of good will can see to it that American principle is again enshrined.

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 23, 1963]

A PRESIDENT DEAD—ALL MUST SUFFER

A few rifle shots rang out near a Dallas underpass around midday Friday. But the sound moved 'round the world with the impact of a nuclear bomb.

The President of the United States had been assassinated. John Fitzgerald Kennedy was dead.

With the suddenness of the rifle shots, 200 million people were immersed in a great sorrow. At home and almost equally abroad, people were engulfed in perplexity. Who would want upon him the blood of John Kennedy, kindly man, humanitarian; the blood of a President and statesman, the most influential spokesman for the Western World? A crime so useless, so futile, so destructive to the peace of mind of countless millions—how could a thing like that happen in a country like the United States?

But after all, there's no real mystery. For among humankind there are always men of imbalance, of twisted mind, warped concepts and strange causes, some with a deep and ugly malice toward their fellow beings. Often their hate centers upon those in high places. This time the target was President Kennedy, just as thrice before Presidents of the United States had died upon the evil impulses of such assassins.

People everywhere shiver and grieve at the President's death. It is a very personal loss for most, as well as the loss of a leader. While the Nation mourns, the greatest grief, as always, overwhelms the President's family, whose members all of us wish we could console.

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was sworn in as President a couple of hours after the tragedy Friday. How the change will affect the affairs of State or U.S. policies abroad, one can only surmise. History tells us that the jitters will wear off soon and orderly processes will resume.

Meantime, the horror of Friday, November 22, 1963, holds the Nation in a vise that will not loosen immediately—not in these troubled days when we suffer for the crime that has been perpetrated among us.

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 25, 1963]

A DAY OF MOURNING

A national day of mourning proclaimed by President Lyndon B. Johnson, coincident with formal funeral services in Washington for John Fitzgerald Kennedy, will find citizens of the United States somewhat recovered and ready to pay their respects today in a thousand ways to the memory of a dynamic Chief Executive brought to untimely end.

In his successor, they have a man qualified by long years of active dealing with the affairs of the country in legislative halls at Washington; the personal choice of the late President for second position in the executive branch; a Vice President who, thanks to the enlightened policy instituted by Mr. Eisenhower, and its adoption by Mr. Kennedy, became so conversant with affairs of state and world conditions that he can take the reins with far greater assurance than ordinarily would be the case.

But as if to pile outrage on outrage and shock on shock, an assassin came forward on the Sabbath to murder the alleged assassin of Mr. Kennedy, depriving the law of its proper course. The same police department that so promptly corralled the prime suspect and with other enforcement agencies built a circumstantial case that at least saved the Nation from a period of uncertainties, wild accusations and unfounded suspicions: The same police failed somehow to shield it and its prisoner from a second unforgivable crime.

The accused individual never admitted guilt. If this was brutality against brutality, coldbloodedness against coldbloodedness, stupidity against stupidity, with no more chance given one victim than another, it nevertheless grievously affronted justice; and it may very well have circumvented it, in that otherwise the full truth of the primary crime might more readily be established.

Needless to say, pursuit of all facts and possibilities remains imperative in this connection, as it does with regard to the second slaying. Judgments, meanwhile, must remain in suspense.

New Orleans is as unhappy to be associated in nativity with the late suspect as Dallas is to have been the scene of tragedy; as our new President must be, that it occurred in his own State. But there is, of course, nothing but unhappiness connected with the entire, ghastly event. The wound that was fatal to John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a wounding of the sensibility of all Americans, wedded to the principle of a Chief Executive serving and representing all the people, and thus identified with his safety and security. The wound fatal to his alleged killer scars another foundation of our common faith. There was far too much to mourn as it was.

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 26, 1963]

KENNEDY'S SPEECHES PUT HIM AMONG HANDFUL OF PRESIDENTS

During the dramatic unfolding of the great tragedy in which the American people have shared, one of the commentators observed that John F. Kennedy was the most articulate President since Abraham Lincoln.

He overlooked, to be true, Woodrow Wilson, a profound scholar, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, a fluent phrasemaker, but he was on solid ground.

For John F. Kennedy indeed brought intellectual brilliance, wide knowledge, and sound scholarship to the White House, as was often noted.

Carl Sandburg, the poet and biographer of Lincoln, expressed it beautifully and ably in a foreword to a collection of President Kennedy's speeches, published in 1962 under the title, "To Turn the Tide." Said Sandburg: "Not often has a President of our country had, besides content and substance to his speeches, the further merit of style as such. We recur to Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, the two Roosevelts, and we are near the end of the list. In the opinion of many, Kennedy belongs among those always having good solid content, often color and cadence in style, and there are moments in the cause of human freedom when his words move with a measured passion."

A few quotations from John F. Kennedy's early speeches in office may remind us that his words did indeed "move with a measured passion."

Eleven days before assuming, as he called it, "that high and lonely office," President-elect Kennedy addressed the Legislature of his native Massachusetts and pledged to characterize his administration with "courage, judgment, integrity, dedication."

The courage of which he spoke was "to stand up to one's enemies, and * * * to stand up, when necessary, to one's associates, the courage to resist public pressure as well as private greed." His idea of judgment concerned, "the future as well as the past * * * our own mistakes as well as the mistakes of others, with enough wisdom to know what we did not know, and enough candor to admit it." His concept of integrity envisaged "men who never ran out on either the principles in which we believed or the people, who believed in us, men whom neither financial gain nor political ambition could ever divert from the fulfillment of our sacred trust." Dedication consisted of "an honor mortgaged to no single individual or group, and compromised by no private obligation or aim, but devoted solely to serving the public good and the national interest."

In President Kennedy's inaugural address, undoubtedly one of the great inaugural speeches, he reaffirmed the faith of the Founding Fathers "that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God."

And then President Kennedy directed his words across the Iron Curtain and there could be no doubt in friendly chancelleries as well as in the Kremlin as to what they meant:

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

He called for an end to the deadly atomic race "to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war." He called for "a beachhead of cooperation" to "push back the jungle of suspicion." He urged: "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate." And the keynote of his speech is

as valid today as it was yesterday and will be for endless tomorrows:

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

In the light of events, this is a call for all factions in American life to rally behind the successor of John F. Kennedy—President Lyndon B. Johnson.

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 25, 1963]

PRESIDENT'S SLAYING THROWS PALL OVER 61ST TULANE-LSU GAME

The senseless, brutal killing of President Kennedy cast a pall over the 61st football game between Tulane and LSU.

As far as I'm concerned, the game should have been postponed until next Saturday. Apparently close to 10,000 ticket holders felt the same way, for although 64,000 seats were sold for the game, the attendance was estimated at 55,000 over the loudspeaker. I'd like to bet it didn't exceed 50,000. Threatening weather may have kept some at home, but the likelihood is that they didn't have any stomach for football in such a moment of national tragedy.

And for those who were there—or so it seemed to me, because that's how I felt—it was just another football game, not the Tulane-LSU game.

One may rationalize until he's blue in the face that the late John F. Kennedy, himself, a lover of sports, would have wanted the game to go on. Most of the other, but not all, self-respecting universities in the country didn't feel that way and why Tulane and LSU chose not to line up with the vast majority of these schools is anybody's guess.

I said it was just another game. As a Tulane fan, who hasn't seen his team beat LSU since 1948, it really didn't make much difference how it came out. As Tulane lost again, 20 to 0, I found little or no cause to grieve in the face of national grief. What is a lost game when we've lost a President? Had Tulane pulled the virtually impossible, an upset, I doubt if the long denied victory would have brought any feeling of exaltation to me. Does one, can one, feel personal joy while experiencing the impact of an unbelievable national catastrophe?

Normally, I would have devoted this space to the Tulane-LSU game. I will stop here after saying that LSU was a bigger and better and faster team than Tulane and demonstrated it ably and that Tulane, although outmatched, was not outclassed nor outfought.

News of President Kennedy's death came over my car radio Friday as I was driving up to Baton Rouge for a meeting. As the airport slipped by, the first flash came and then, mile by mile, the dreadful story unfolded. Everyone to whom I spoke at Baton Rouge or when I got home had the same reaction. This was a monstrous thing, cruel to a nation, and to a family. And anyone with an honest heart, whether he be pro-Kennedy or anti-Kennedy, liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican, must have done some soul searching since the fatal shots were fired.

There are those who hated John F. Kennedy with a blind hatred, because they opposed his policies. Can't one have an honest opposition without hatred and venom?

There are those who encouraged disrespect for the law because they didn't like the law any more than they liked Kennedy.

On the other hand, there are those who idolized Kennedy and were perhaps as blind in their idolatry as the Kennedy haters were blind in their hatred.

But the true stature of the man who was the youngest elected President of the United States is shown by the worldwide shock and dismay over the news of his assassination and by the glowing tributes of world leaders, most of whom had flown into Washington for today's funeral.

The consequences of an irresponsible, cruel act—the aim of a gun, the pressure of a trigger finger—were far reaching, for not only a nation, but the free world mourns. And, more intimately, three families have been shattered by the gunfire by Lee Harvey Oswald.

First it was the Kennedy family—suddenly bereft of a son, a husband, and a father.

Then, when Oswald was trying to get away, he killed Policeman Tippit, bringing shattering grief to the officer's family.

And when Jack Ruby killed Oswald in a bizarre development in this tragic story, he brought extra grief to the already grief stricken mother, wife, and children of the President's assassin.

From Oswald's initial shot stemmed a chain of grief which circled the world, starting from the Kennedy family and ending with his own.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 26, 1963]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: MURDER MOST FOUL

(By Walter Lippmann)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That done, all else will be manageable.

---

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1963]

KENNEDY SLUMPED OVER AND SAID NOTHING: CONNALLY DESCRIBES ASSASSINATION: "FROM GREAT JOY TO GREAT TRAGEDY"

DALLAS, November 27.—Texas Gov. John Connally, wounded during the assassination of President Kennedy, said today that after being shot the President "slumped over and said nothing."

"As I turned to the left, I was hit. I knew I was hit badly. I said, 'My God, they are going to kill us all.' "

"Then there was a third shot and the President was hit again. Mrs. Kennedy said 'Oh, my God. They killed my husband. Jack, Jack.'

"In the space of a few seconds, great joy and anticipation was turned to great tragedy."

Connally, in an interview from his hospital bed—the first since he was shot while riding with Mr. Kennedy last Friday—said he has had many thoughts since the tragedy and one of the most important was why Mr. Kennedy's life was taken and his was spared.

Connally recalled:

"It was a great morning. The crowds were great in Fort Worth. There were huge throngs in Dallas.

"Dallas was real warm, real understanding, and real appreciative.

"The ovation for Kennedy was tremendous.

"The President and his wife both remarked about how warm it was.

"Not 30 seconds before the President was shot, Nellie (Mrs. Connally) had said to the President that no one could say that Dallas did not love and appreciate him.

"Kennedy answered her, 'You sure can't'."

Then Connally described the actual shooting.

Connally said he did not think the assassin was after him only.

"The man did what he intended to do—he shot both of us," the Governor added.

Connally said that perhaps the President, through his death, was asked to do something that is hard to do in life, and that is:

"To shock and stun a nation and its people and the world to what is happening to us through this cancerous growth of extremism."

"This is the only answer I can give you on why he is gone and I am not," he added.

He said the world should avoid the type of extremism that breeds hatred.

"The genesis of our self-destruction—if we are going to be destroyed—comes from this extremism," he added.

Connally wept and dried his eyes with a towel during a pause in the interview, the first portion of which lasted 5 minutes.

NOT TOLD OF DEATH

The Governor said he was not told that the President was dead until Saturday, the day after the assassination.

"But it was no news, I was almost sure he would be after those two shots."

"My first conscious thoughts were, 'My God, what a horrible tragedy in a space of a few minutes.' It makes you ponder and wonder if you are making the contribution you should make to society because you never know when a thing like this can happen."

Connally said a monument should be built to President Kennedy, "but I hope that the people build not in the sense of absolving themselves. The monument should be through patience, tolerance, knowledge, human understanding, and dignity."

The Governor said he had been very close to the new President, Lyndon Johnson, serving with him in the Navy during World War II.

"I thought how ironic it was that the man who defeated him (for the Democratic nomination) named me Secretary of the Navy and on the day of the tragedy Johnson became President of the United States."

Asked to give his opinion of President Johnson, Connally said he was a person "of many complexities."

He said that President Johnson had a great understanding of human nature, was a man of his convictions and was forever working for perfection.

"No man ever assumed office better equipped to carry out the duties of the Office of President."

Connally said Mr. Johnson was born of hard times and his days of school were arduous.

"But he walked with many people of many nationalities and he understands the heartbeat of this Nation as no other man in this position has," Connally said.

NEWSMEN SEARCHED

Connally's interview late this afternoon in Parkland Hospital was conducted by Martin Agronsky of the National Broadcasting Co., picked by Connally as a pool reporter. Other reporters watched the interview on a closed television circuit as a part of the interview plan.

Prior to the actual news conference two still photographers and one silent movie cameraman were allowed in Connally's room. Newsmen were checked thoroughly and searched before being allowed near the door.

"We were asked not to reveal the location of the bed in the room or the other security measures that had been taken," a photographer said.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 26, 1963]

NO TIME FOR COLLECTIVE GUILT

In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole Nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

Any one who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, Members of our Congress and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

A Senator said that the responsibility lay on "the people of Dallas" because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was "reaping the whirlwind of hatred." One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the "hatred and malevolence" that are "eating their way into the bloodstream of American life." A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that "none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence." And these were but a few among many.

Such statements can only come from men who have not been broad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In retrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligent of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowds of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

It was most certainly a terrible negligence on the part of the local police authorities which permitted one man to take vengeance into his own hands. It was an outrageous breach of responsibility for them to have moved a man accused of so heinous a crime in so careless a fashion. It was outrageous precisely because all the American people were themselves so outraged by the crime of assassination that anyone who knew these people ought to have known that one among them might be deranged enough to do exactly what was done.

Yet the opportunity for negligence came because here the accused was being treated as any other accused, his detention in the hands of local police, the procedures those followed for the ordinary of murders. In another land he would have been efficiently buried by a secret police in a Lubyianka prison, never again to be seen or heard of until his execution.

One might say, we suppose, that some of this negligence could be laid to all of us. It is, after all, the eager interest of the people in the persons of their leaders that brings them into open caravans, and it is the desire of the people to follow the normal ways even in murders of State that left the accused to bungling local police.

In sum, there is in all of this—let there be no mistake—much to grieve, to regret, to blame. We can't escape remorse that there are madmen in our midst, that a President is dead, that we have been denied the right to show in open court the virtue of a free society. Now we pay the price of all sorts of negligence.

But this is something different from the charge in the indictment. It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious.

Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 26, 1963]

SOCIOLOGISTS DOUBT DALLAS KILLINGS INDICATE NATIONAL MORAL SLUMP—BUT THEY WARN THAT ECONOMIC TENSION, FAMILY TROUBLE STIR INCREASE IN VIOLENCE BY A FEW

(By Herbert G. Lawson)

A crowd outside the Dallas city jail cheers the news that Lee Harvey Oswald, accused slayer of the President, has been fatally shot. A Sioux City, Iowa, man stabs his stepfather to death in an argument over the late President. A Negro on a Staten Island, N.Y., bus accuses a white passenger of being a party to the Presidential assassination, and a fight is narrowly averted.

For 4 days the Nation has witnessed violence that has appeared almost incredible. Countless Americans are asking themselves how this explosive impulse arises and whether the entire public perhaps must shoulder the burden of guilt.

Sociologists and other students of behavior offer some tentative answers. They argue that such violence is not part of our fundamental character. But they warn that pressures in American life have generated an increase in violent crime by the demented and the dispossessed.

"Crimes of violence have been increasing in the last 4 or 5 years," says Gresham Sykes, executive officer of the American Sociological Association and former head of the sociology department at Dartmouth College. "It seems to spring from a derangement of the family. A person like Jack Ruby (Oswald's accused killer) is more likely to come forward to commit such an act in our society."

MORE ASSAULT CASES

Federal Bureau of Investigation figures confirm the recent increase in violent crime. Ironically, murders last year declined 2 percent from the 1958–60 average. But all reported crimes rose four times as fast as population in the past 5 years. Aggravated assault cases last year soared 14 percent above the 1958–60 average, while forcible robbery climbed 17 percent.

But the prevalence of violent crime, including the tragedies of recent days, is not a sign that violence is a national trait, according to Richard James, a New York psychologist. "The average citizen couldn't do these things," he says. "The whole tenor of the

country's reaction has been admirable. A friend of mine at the United Nations pointed out that in almost any other country in the world such an assassination would be followed by riots and civil disturbance."

Others note that the United States is not the only nation where violence or the threat of it is directed against the head of state. Following the Kennedy murder, Swedish Premier Tage Erlander was threatened with death by an anonymous caller, and special security guards were posted. French President Charles de Gaulle has been a target for assassins' bullets.

HIGH MURDER RATE

But a critical look at American society would have to concede that destructive impulses are widespread. Murder rates are several times higher in this country than in most, if not all, other industrial nations.

Even while dismissing the likelihood of a basic streak of violence in the national character, the experts concede the high U.S. murder rate may be due, to some extent, to habits of thought and action that have their roots deep in American history.

"We have a frontier tradition in which there is a tendency to take the law into our own hands," notes Lewis A. Coser, professor of sociology and an expert on homicide at Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

The funeral of William McKinley, 25th President and victim of an anarchist's bullet in 1901, provides evidence that such a vigilante attitude has long existed. According to one account of the funeral, the minister presiding at the Washington services said that if he "had been present at the shooting he would have provided the leadership the crowd needed for an on-the-spot hanging." Actually, the assassin, Leon Czolgosz, was tried, convicted, and electrocuted by New York State.

But sociologists who have studied the urges that have led to violent crimes say other factors are more important than the vigilante tradition. One clear-cut conclusion of their investigations is that geography, economic status, and the quality of law enforcement locally have much to do with crime rates.

For instance, the murder rate is nearly eight times as high in the South as in New England, notes Mr. Coser. Homicide is far more frequent among people at the bottom of the economic ladder. Negroes have the highest rate.

Cities vary greatly in their crime rates, suggesting that the quality of police action has considerable importance. Milwaukee has only about 5 percent as many robberies as Chicago and fewer than one-tenth as many assaults, on a per capita basis. Dallas ranks well down the list of per capita crime rates among the 20 largest U.S. cities. It is sixteenth in robberies and eleventh in assaults, according to FBI figures.

Mr Sykes of the sociological association suggests that the rise in violent crimes in the past few years "springs from derangement of the family." He cites trends to increased urbanization, crowded housing, and the absence of strong father figures in many lower-class families, which means that children often obtain their values on the street rather than in the home.

The loud and often violent propaganda of some fringe groups, such as racists in the South, may trigger violence, he says. "Anything that declares the world is divided into the 'goods' and the 'bads' can lead to violence," observes Mr. Sykes. In juvenile gangs and among some racist groups, he says, the tendency is to excuse violence against outsiders.

Was Lee Harvey Oswald a victim of family pressures that turned him against all society? Did the message of a "hate group" turn his inward frustration into violent action? The answer is unclear. "The unfortunate thing about this is that we'll never understand Oswald as an individual," says Mr. James.

---

[From the Clarion Herald, Nov. 28, 1963]

THE LAST FULL MEASURE

"Every day is a good day to be born and every day is a good day to die."

With serene faith, Pope John XXIII accepted the illness that on June 3 of this year terminated his brief but brilliant term as Supreme Pontiff.

His words are a consolation as all mourn the tragic death of another world leader on November 22—John F. Kennedy, President of the United States.

It is a consolation sadly needed, for, humanly speaking, the passing of President Kennedy seems far more untimely.

The Holy Father died at 82. In his short reign he achieved a greatness that few men in history have reached in decades. In his "Pacem in Terris," completed not long before his death, he left a heritage of hope for world brotherhood and peace. In his convoking of the Second Vatican Council he challenged not only the church but the world to a renewal of faith, to a refashioning of spiritual forces to meet the needs of a world in turmoil, to a uniting of all men in the brotherhood of Christ and the fatherhood of God.

President Kennedy died of an assassin's bullet at 46. He achieved greatness in the service of his country as a naval officer in World War II, followed by distinguished performance as U.S. Representative and Senator, and by truly notable service as President and world leader. Yet his work had only begun. As experience ripened into greater wisdom his native gifts of intelligence, courage, and leadership, how much more could he have wrought for America and for the world.

Upon the strong shoulders of Pope Paul VI fell the mantle of Pope John. Ably has he carried on the mission of the church and especially the concern to complete the ecumenical council.

To Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson are committed the responsibilities of Mr. Kennedy. With his training and experience there is no doubt that President Johnson will prove an able leader. But Kennedy's genius will be sorely missed, particularly in the struggle to make completely effective the American democratic ideal of full equality for all.

This struggle began a century ago with the efforts of another President, Abraham Lincoln, who also was prevented from completing his mission by an assassin's bullet. Just 100 years ago this month Lincoln made his immortal address at Gettysburg, concluding with this charge to the Nation:

"It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

The "last full measure of devotion" given to America by these two great Presidents today is a charge upon the conscience of all Americans that they shall not have died in vain.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star. Nov. 29, 1963]

TEXT OF MESSAGE—END HATRED, JOHNSON ASKS

(NOTE—Following is the text of President Johnson's personal Thanksgiving Day message to the American people, delivered over nationwide television and radio networks.)

My fellow Americans, on yesterday, I went before the Congress to speak for the first time as President of the United States.

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.

All of us have lived through 7 days that none of us will ever forget. We are not given the divine wisdom to answer why this has been, but we are given the human duty of determining what is to be, what is to be for America, for the world, for the cause we lead, for all the hopes that live in our hearts.

A great leader is dead; a great Nation must move on. Yesterday is not ours to recover, but tomorrow is ours to win or to lose. I am resolved that we shall win the tomorrows before us. So I ask you to join me in that resolve, determined that from this midnight of tragedy, we shall move toward a new American greatness.

More than any generation before us, we have cause to be thankful on this Thanksgiving Day. Our harvests are bountiful, our factories flourish, our homes are safe, our defenses are secure.

We live in peace. The good will of the world pours out for us, but more than these blessings, we know tonight that our system is strong, strong and secure. A deed that was meant to tear us apart has bound us together. Our system has passed. You have passed a great test. You have shown what John F. Kennedy called upon us to show in his proclamation of this Thanksgiving: That decency of purpose, that steadfastness of resolve, and that strength of will which we inherit from our forefathers.

What better conveys what is best for America than this. On Saturday when these great burdens had been mine only hours, the first two citizens to call upon and to offer their whole support were Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman.

Since last Friday, Americans have turned to the good, to the decent values of our life. These have served us. Yes; these have saved us. The service of our public institution and our public men is the salvation of us all from the Supreme Court to the States. And how much better it would be, how much more sane it would be, and how much more decent and American it would be if all Americans could spend their fortunes and could give their time and spend their energies helping our system and its servants to solve your problems instead of pouring out the venom and the hate that stalemate us in progress.

I have served in Washington 32 years—32 years yesterday. I have seen five Presidents fill this awesome office. I have known them well and I have counted them all as friends: President Herbert Hoover, President Franklin Roosevelt, President Harry Truman, President Dwight Eisenhower, and President John Kennedy.

In each administration, the greatest burden that the President had to bear has been the burden of his own countrymen's unthinking and unreasoning hate and division. So in these days, the fate of this office is the fate of us all. I would ask all Americans on this day of prayer and reverence to think on these things. Let all who speak and all who teach and all who preach and all who publish and all who broadcast and all who read or listen—let them reflect upon their responsibilities to bind our wounds, to heal our sores, to make our society well and whole for the tasks ahead of us. It is this work that I most want us to do, to banish rancor from our words and malice from our hearts, to close down the poison spring of hatred and intolerance and fanaticism; to protect our unity North and South, East and West; to hasten the day when bias of race, religion and region is no

more; and to make the day when our great energies and decencies and spirit will be free of the burdens that we have borne too long.

Our view is outward. Our thrust is forward, but we remember in our hearts this brave young man who lives in honored eternal rest across the Potomac. We remember him; we remember his wonderful and courageous widow that we all love. We remember Caroline and John and all the great family who gave the Nation this son and brother.

And to honor his memory and the future of the works he started, I have today determined that Station No. 1 of the Atlantic Missile Range and a NASA Launch Operation Center in Florida shall hereafter be known as the John F. Kennedy Space Center.

I have also acted today with the understanding and the support of my friend, the Governor of Florida, Farris Bryant, to change the name of Cape Canaveral. It shall be known hereafter as Cape Kennedy.

On this Thanksgiving Day, as we gather in the warmth of our families, in the mutual love and respect that 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 opinion, 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.

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 30, 1963]

BISHOP SCORES HATE CLIMATE—CALLS ON AMERICANS TO RECOGNIZE GUILT

The Episcopal bishop of Louisiana called upon Americans to recognize their guilt Friday night at a service of prayer and meditation occasioned by the assassination of President Kennedy.

The Right Reverend Girault M. Jones told worshipers at the Church House on St. Charles Avenue, "We have so completely forsaken the Biblical precepts of charity and of brotherhood that what was once a close-knit society is coming apart at the seams."

"We know that hatred leads to violence, and yet we have been willing to risk such consequences. We have identified political policies with one man, we have personalized worldwide social unrest by this man's image, we have shared in gossip, in offcolor jokes, and in deliberate misrepresentation * * * all in such a way as to plant the seeds of personal hatred, and to nurse them into flower," Bishop Jones said.

"America has created a climate of suspicion and of hatred in which no man is permitted to be himself," he told worshippers at the service, held by the Greater New Orleans Federation of Churches and the New Orleans Ministerial Union.

Stating the "American way of life" cannot "stand the test of world scrutiny," Bishop Jones continued, "and now we must admit what can happen in the Congo, or in the Dominican Republic, or in Vietnam * * * can also happen here."

"This is a tragic day. We grieve the loss of a President, and we would honor his memory. We grieve for his family, and we would offer sympathy. We grieve for this Nation, and indeed for the world, and would pray that out of this shocking experience, God will recall us to Himself," the bishop concluded.

Other clergymen who participated in the service were the Reverend Dr. G. Avery Lee, pastor of St. Charles Avenue Baptist Church; the Reverend Dr. Alex W. Hunter, minister of the First Presbyterian Church; the Reverend Herbert L. Polinard, minister of the St. Charles Avenue Christian Church, and the Reverend George Wilson, executive secretary of the Greater New Orleans Federation of Churches.

The Reverend W. K. Sisk, Jr., minister of the Elysian Fields Baptist Church, presided.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 1, 1963]

ASSASSINATION PLUS SOCIETY ALSO SUFFERED TWO GREAT WOUNDS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Everyone who has spoken and written about the misshapen events that have engulfed us—assassination and then murder on top of assassination—have avowed and prayed and predicted that, as a people and as a nation, we would emerge from the shock and shame of these events a better people and a better nation.

I believe this will prove to be true. But neither words of wrath nor words of expiation nor words pious and wishful thinking will make it so. Words will do little and words without deeds will do nothing.

Jesus taught that man must be judged by his fruits, not by his protestations. And Paul, in his letter to the Philippians, after commending us to think on whatsoever things are pure and honest and just and of good report, instantly added the higher command:

"These things, which ye have both learned and received, and heard, and seen in Me, do, and the God of peace shall be with you." (Philippians 4: 9)

If we are to learn some good from these horrible events, we must fix clearly in mind the exact wounds that have been inflicted upon our society and upon our Nation.

The murder of the President is grievous enough. But great wounds were inflicted upon our whole democracy.

1. The assassin's bullet struck from the hands of the 68,836,385 citizens who went to the polls in 1960 their precious right to have a President of their own choosing and an administration by the consent of the administered.

2. The murderer's bullet struck from the hands of the accused assassin the most precious guarantee of a free society, an open trial in open court by a jury of his peers.

These are two grievous wounds to the fiber and fabric of what most Americans cherish as the pillars of our social compact: a knife wound at our process of democracy, a knife wound at the process of justice.

After Jack Ruby shot Lee Harvey Oswald as he was surrounded by Dallas police in the basement of the city jail, you no doubt listened to the many interviews in the street which television recorded. Not a few of them expressed their praise and pleasure at the murder of the accused assassin. In almost the same words, each said, "I believe in an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth; I'm glad he got it."

Are they, when they think it over? Our criminal law is based, in part, on the Old Testament moral law of an eye for an eye, the doctrine that punishment must fit the crime. But who shall determine the guilty? An enemy, an avenger, a crackpot—or a court of law? Ruby acted to sentence Oswald before he was tried—and the American social compact was torn asunder as it has been torn too often in recent years.

I believe that the point of beginning is to be a little less sure that we alone are right and that those who disagree are automatically wrong. I share the view that the words and actions of the extremist right and the extremist left have sown seeds of hatred and violence in the land. But even here I would draw with great care the lessons from the acts of hideousness we have recently experienced.

There is no evidence that the assassination was the act of a racist. There is no evidence that the assassin was influenced to commit his act by the seeds of hatred which extreme racists have sown and which have come to fruition in the murder of Medgar Evers and the Negro schoolchildren in Birmingham.

We don't know what went on in Oswald's twisted mind and, because Ruby took the law in his hands, we never will know.

But we do know that the words of President Johnson need to be taken to heart by all of us: "Let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream."

Why shouldn't we?

---

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Nov. 23, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead, and the Nation mourns him. Yesterday's first shock of horror gives way this morning to a depth of sorrow beyond expression. We can at this moment only look back briefly, and try to look forward briefly, and look into our own hearts as individuals and as a people.

President Kennedy loved the life that has been taken from him. That is what we think of first, remembering him. The pictures that come back are the lively ones: the candidate fighting with a kind of cheerful ferocity for the great office in the performance of whose duties he died; the President laughing, sailing, throwing himself into a speech, joking with his children, reveling in a world full of things to see and hear and think about and above all, do. Life and color and, to use his favorite word, vigor, went with him everywhere. He was greatly endowed by fortune and, unlike many men so endowed, knew it. Complaint and repining were no part of him. Lethargy was no part of him. This quality of vividness, which captivated first the country and then much of the world, makes it seem all the more incredible that he should have been struck down, at the peak of his abilities, gone at an age when most men of his stature are still but on their way toward high achievement.

His death is a tragedy with many facets. The country's first thoughts go to his family, his gentle wife and his young children, only just old enough to understand that their father and companion is gone; his close-knit band of brothers and sisters, his parents, who now lose a third child dead too young. That for all of us is the personal aspect: in loss, all mankind is kin.

There is the tragedy too of great tasks unfinished, of the plow stopped part way down the furrow, the house left standing in framework, the story checked midsentence. No one now can say what Mr. Kennedy's accomplishments would have been had he lived. We do know that he was a strong man in a crisis, and the graver the crisis the stronger the man. Berlin in 1961 and Cuba last year are the memorable examples, written forever in our history: at those breathless moments President Kennedy held the Nation's fate in his hands, and the hands were firm. We do know that in shocking national failure, as with the Bay of Pigs, Mr. Kennedy could take upon himself the full burden of responsibility. We do know that he left his country stronger in the world

than he had found it, and more confident of its destiny. We do know that when internal discord arose to threaten our tranquillity, because of wrongs left too long unrighted, he faced the issue gravely, squarely, and honestly, leading the country in another crisis, a crisis this time of the national conscience. Thus the record so far. What the rest might have been we shall never know.

Regret for a life's work cruelly cut off, and honor at the way Mr. Kennedy died, and grief over personal loss, are not enough. We must resolve as a nation that the story in which Mr. Kennedy was for all too short a time the chief actor shall continue, and grow brighter and more honorable, until the blots of bitterness and hatred no longer stain its pages.

The Government of the United States continues; that Government of which a President is at once master and servant. Any one man's passing is, in the long life of this democracy, but a missed heartbeat. Mr. Kennedy, who had looked death in the face oftener than most, who was a scholar of the Constitution and a pragmatic politician, knew that as well as anyone. To every President the existence of the Vice Presidency is a constant reminder of the continuity of the Republic, though men are mortal. It must have crossed Mr. Kennedy's mind, from that moment more than 3 years ago when he asked Lyndon Johnson to run for office with him, that his old Senate colleague, his political rival and friend, might through an accident of history be his successor.

Upon President Johnson now falls this weight of office. Only one other man in the United States knows how heavy the mantle is when it falls suddenly upon the shoulders. Harry Truman, in 1945, spoke for Lyndon Johnson today when he asked his hearers, if they ever prayed, to pray for him now.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 27, 1963]

KENNEDY'S GREAT WORK—ITS IMPACT ABROAD

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

LONDON.—John F. Kennedy did not have time to achieve everything he hoped to achieve. The biggest single waste in terms of statecraft is that he will not have the chance to use in what might have been his second term the influence and prestige which he had gained during his first.

The immediate damage is minor, since, in effect, a recess had been called in diplomatic affairs. The week of the assassination opened with a restatement of the world balance of power by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara which had the effect of closing the season. The Soviets would hardly be expected to negotiate in the wake of an announcement of decisive Western superiority in both conventional and nuclear weapons.

Even without the McNamara speech the chances of useful or constructive diplomacy during the balance of this year and 1964 were uncertain. Great nations do not often negotiate over major issues when elections are in the offing. Had Mr. Kennedy been spared, he might have been able to do little more until after the November elections next year than others apparently can do now. It appeared probable to be a period of waiting.

But had he won his reelection substantially, he would have possessed such influence and prestige as few staesmen in history ever have achieved. It would have been an advantage to himself and his country of significant value—a credit to be spent for the greater security of his country, of his allies, and of the world.

An English workman who knew me to be an American stopped me on the street and offered me his sympathy on my loss and told me that when he heard the news he wept. I asked him why, and he said, "He was one of us. He was a good man. And I felt safe while he was there."

Many "felt safe while he was there."

That feeling of safety was not an old condition; it was a very recent condition. It can be dated from the Cuban crisis of October a year ago. Until Cuba, the duel between Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy was unresolved and relentless. At some point there had to be the decisive confrontation, the final test of strength.

That moment of the Cuban crisis grows larger in perspective as it recedes into the past. It stands out on the record of the past as the watershed between the period when the possibility of nuclear war ever was present in our lives and the period when the danger seems itself to be a major deterrent.

Mr. Kennedy gave the West, indeed all the world, the priceless gain of release from fear of inevitable nuclear war. He gave us all a chance to look and think and plan ahead in an atmosphere of confidence and relief.

Perhaps not everyone realized the achievement until the man who had gained it was gone. Surely the workman on the street did not realize until the blinding moment of tragedy that he indeed had felt more safe and secure over a whole year for the first time since the last great war ended. When the climactic moment came, he understood it and could articulate it.

In one sense that achievement remains for the greater safety of all. The clock can scarcely be turned back entirely to the dark and dangerous times before the Cuban confrontation. The essential facts of these new times remain unaltered and undamaged. It is reasonable to assume that diplomacy can resume its work once the various political uncertainties of the next year are resolved.

But there already will have been two Presidents in the White House in Washington during a span of 2 years and 10 months and there is now a possibility of three in 3 years. The chance of much achievement until this time of change is over is not large.

The evil work in Dallas has taken from us all the opportunity Mr. Kennedy had earned for himself and the human race to use a longer period. None other can use it for him as he could have used it. It takes the better part of 4 years to make a President.

Mr. Kennedy had only just emerged in his full stature as the leading statesman of the world when hatred struck him down. This is the heaviest loss to the world.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 25, 1963]

GO, STRANGER

(By Joseph Alsop)

Of all the men in public life in his time, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the most ideally formed to lead the United States of America.

Such, at any rate, is this reporter's judgment, perhaps biased, but at any rate based on long experience and close observation, and no longer possible to suspect as self-serving. To be sure, judging Kennedy was never easy, for he was no common man, to be judged by common standards.

Courage, intelligence, and practicality; a passion for excellence and a longing to excel; above all, a deep love of this country, a burning pride in its past, and unremitting confidence in the American future—these were the qualities which acted, so to say, as the mainsprings of Kennedy the President.

Kennedy the man, Kennedy the private face, was half the enemy and half the reinforcement of Kennedy the President. He had an enviable grace of manner and person. He enjoyed pleasure. After Theodore Roosevelt, he was the first American President to care for learning for its own sake. After Abraham Lincoln, he was the first American President with a rich vein of personal humor—which is a very different thing from the capacity to make jokes.

This strange, dry, detached, self-mocking humor no doubt aided him to assess men and events; but in his public role, it was a handicap. Certainly it was not the same sort of handicap as Lincoln's humor, which actually prevented great numbers of otherwise intelligent persons from taking Lincoln seriously.

President Kennedy's humor instead inhibited him from showing the depth of his feelings. Any public exhibition of emotion gave him gooseflesh. So foolish people said he was a cold, unfeeling man, although few men in our time have had stronger feelings about those things that mattered to him.

After his country, what mattered most to him was to live intensely, with purpose and effect. He was in some sense the ultimate personification of the observation of Justice Holmes: "Man is born to act; to act is to affirm the worth of an end; and to affirm the worth of an end is to create an ideal."

The ideal that Mr. Kennedy affirmed in action was singularly simple: for no man was ever more contemptous of the theological complexities of ideology. (It was hard to know, indeed, whether he held a more sovereign contempt for the doctrinaire mushiness of the extreme American left or for the doctrinaire hate-preaching of the extreme American right. He was slow to anger, but these made his gorge rise.)

His ideal could be completely summed up in only a score of so of words—a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal; the proud stronghold of a new birth of freedom; and the standing promise to all men Government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth. The noble, ancient phrases, the pieced-together tags from the finest of all American utterances, are as well worn by now as antique coins, whose legend is illegible. But, he could read the legend still. He still took this definition of our Nation's purpose with perfect literalness and this was the ideal that his actions sought to affirm.

Whereas, Franklin Delano Roosevelt took office when the Nation was clamoring for leadership and crying out to be shown a new course, John Fitzgerald Kennedy took office in a time of violent—yet hardly comprehensible, change.

Too many, then as now, confronted the vast revolutionary processes of our time either with fatty complacency or with shrill, embittered indignation. His task was therefore a hard task, and he was untimely cut off before his task could be half done.

Yet if we look at our country and the world in which we live—if we honestly compare the prospects now opening before us with the prospects as they seemed when Mr. Kennedy's Presidency began—we can see that there has been a new birth of hope.

It is perhaps pardonable, at this moment, to be personal. Speaking for myself, I have not dared to hope as I do now since those first months of the Korean war, when such overly high hopes were born from a strong sense that America was grandly accomplishing a high, historic service. That service had its heavy price.

I still remember watching the wolfhound regiment through a long, hard fight, and how the bodies of the fallen were carried in when the fight was won, and how I suddenly could think only of Simonides' epitaph that was inscribed, for all to read, on the tomb of the dead Spartans at Thermopylae:

"Go stranger, and in Lacedaemon tell
That here obedient to the laws we fell."

But the President who is lost to us, like those men who were lost so many years ago,

was no drilled, unthinking Spartiate. He was the worthy citizen of a nation great and free—a nation, as he liked to think, that is great because it is free and this was the thought that always inspired his too brief leadership of this Republic.

---

[From the Shreveport-Bossier City (La.) Journal, Nov. 25, 1963]

MICKLE ATTACKS HATEMONGERS

"The stage had been set for someone to murder President John F. Kennedy somewhere. It could have happened to Shreveport."

So spoke Dr. Joe J. Mickle, president of Centenary College, this morning, in addressing a memorial service at the college for the assassinated Chief Executive.

"I make these statements," said the educator, "because John F. Kennedy was much hated—hated both by the Communists and the professional haters of Communists.

"Judging by certain editorials, letters to the editor, an avalanche of filthy printed material, certain radio and television programs and political speeches by any number of candidates for offices in our States, John F. Kennedy was the personification of almost all evil.

"Thus it is that our thinking has been warped by an almost endless stream of words of suspicion and hatred. Hatred and violence have ridden unchecked across our land. Eventually this constant stream of destructive criticism, suspicion, hatred, and violence begins to take its toll; and faith in our Government, our churches, our schools, and our international organizations so vital to world peace and security is undermined. Thus, a climate has been created in which almost any person of warped mind or emotionally disturbed may feel that he is rendering a great service by sending a bullet crashing through the brain of a Government official.

"We can honor a great American, John F. Kennedy, only if we individually and as a nation bow our heads in introspection, humility, and repentence before Almighty God," Mickle said.

Elsewhere in Shreveport and Bossier City, residents joined with the fellow Americans in the national day of mourning for the late President.

From 11 a.m. to 1 p.m., the business life of the community came to a virtual standstill. The Shreveport Civic Center, Bossier City Hall, and many stores and business establishments were closed during the period out of respect to the slain Chief Executive.

Banks, Federal and State offices were closed for the day. So were Caddo Parish public and parochial schools. Bossier Parish schools will be closed throughout the week because of a previously announced teachers' meeting and the Thanksgiving holiday.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 27, 1963]

A SCENE UNDUPLICATED

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Pictures and sounds and music told the story better than words.

The Nation, emotionally depleted, went back to everyday life—to routine jobs, to holiday shopping, and to television commercials, but with a new President and ache when it thought of a former one and with a sense of guilt that it could not quite define but could not eliminate.

Above all, the Nation had watched a brave woman, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, representing it among visiting kings, presidents, and dignitaries—a woman who had seen her young husband slain at her side only 3 days before but who somehow managed from an inner spring of strength and self-control to put her sense of duty above her personal grief and to redeem in personal dignity some part of the shame and ignominy the Nation felt.

VERY DETERMINED CROWD

The story of the day can never quite be duplicated in this restless Capital. Scene after scene unfolded, then blurred into one another, and finally ended with the evening starlings flying in as usual from across the Potomac against a fiery sunset.

Sometime during the day the White House announced the President Johnson, as one of his first acts in office, had sent to Nikita S. Khrushchev, Soviet Premier, a message pledging to continue the efforts for peace of his predecessor, John F. Kennedy.

The Johnson message replied to one of condolence and sympathy from Moscow.

Long before this announcement of state, however, the patient crowds had collected and waited and shuffled in the freezing weather all night long for a chance to file past the bier of President Kennedy. It was placed on the Lincoln catafalque in the great echoing rotunda of the hushed Capitol.

Officials were awed at the queue which, by midnight, extended back 30 blocks. At 2 a.m., and 3, at 4, and again at 5, the police warned the shuffling throng that there was little chance of getting in before the great bronze doors shut at 9 a.m. But still they came and came.

At the end, with the grotesqueness that mingles with tragedy, the line was hurried past the casket in a kind of lope.

All during Sunday dignitaries from four quarters of the globe had been gathering in Washington; so many, so varied, and so subdued that often they went to their embassies virtually unrecognized: 22 presidents or prime ministers, 3 reigning kings, and the princes and princesses of 9 countries.

SOVIET EMISSARY

There was stately President de Gaulle of France, rotund Chancellor Ludwig Erhard of West Germany, and wily Anastas Mikoyan, Soviet First Deputy Premier, who came on a special flight from Moscow as Premier Khrushchev's personal emissary.

From Britain there was Prince Philip, Prime Minister Alec Douglas-Home, and opposition leader Harold Wilson. There was beautiful Queen Frederika of Greece, picturesque Emperor Haile Selassie, and Premier Hayato Ikeda from Japan.

Then somewhat before noon, down historic Pennsylvania Avenue came the roll of drums, and the crowds, lined 10 to 20 deep, craned to see the military procession and cortege, moving from the Capitol to the White House, from whence it would go on to St. Matthew's Roman Catholic Cathedral.

The grief was genuine but is was different from that which greeted the bier of Franklin D. Roosevelt on his final ride.

DIFFERING EMOTIONS

For Roosevelt, the crowd made no effort to hide its sobs, as though for a father or protector. For President Kennedy, it was poignant rather than overwhelming. The feeling toward this gay, graceful young man evidently did not go so deep as to the wartime President; it was the tragedy of a broken home and lost opportunity rather than the vivid personal identification to the President of 12 years. Above all, it was crowd eager to see Mrs. Kennedy.

Soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and special service detachments moved precisely, with black-draped drums. The journey was in two parts. The procession came to the White House that seemed to be keeping a kind of silent vigil of its own. And there Mrs. Kennedy and her family and the visiting dignitaries left cars and walked behind the procession to the cathedral.

Crowds were so dense along the streets that those in the rear could not see. Many heard only the clatter of the horses, the cadenced scuff of soldiers' feet, and the Air Force band playing "America, the Beautiful."

At many times at the cathedral and later Mrs. Kennedy stood with her two brothers-in-law, Robert Kennedy and Edward Kennedy.

Caroline and John Jr., wearing blue coats, arrived in a car and joined their mother. Her thoughts were toward her children; she comforted John who cried at one point.

A BOY'S SALUTE

At another time she bent over as the band played, and he stepped forward, holding a pretended salute.

She seemed composed as she emerged after the sonorous Latin service and waited while the coffin was placed back on the caisson for its final ride to Arlington. She held the hands of her two children, Caroline sobbing. Bells pealed softly.

Two former Presidents and old opponents, Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman, chatted on the cathedral steps. They were asked by Senator KENNEDY to speak to Mrs. Kennedy and came forward briefly to say a few quiet words of comfort. Then they entered the same car for the ride to the cemetery.

CENTER OF SCENE

It was around Mrs. Kennedy that the scene turned. It was she that the hushed and almost awe-struck crowd followed with its eyes.

In the solemn serenity of Arlington cemetery the simple headstones of soldiers from all America's battles lie in ordered sequence.

The sky was so clear that vapor trails of airplanes were like sweeping chalkmarks on a blue board.

So on a brilliant November afternoon, in which shadows gradually lengthened, John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, came to rest at last, some of his work done, most undone, in a career cut short in senseless tragedy.

Shortly before midnight, Mrs. Kennedy slipped out of the White House and rode to Arlington National Cemetery to place flowers on her husband's grave. A perpetual flame on the grave was burning through its first night.

The only meaning to all the shock and horror at the end came from the posture of his wife, Jacqueline, a woman long considered beautiful, but who came through the ordeal with ennobling dignity.

---

A PROCLAMATION

(Mayor Victor H. Schiro issued the following proclamation today designating Monday, November 25, 1963, as a day of sorrow in New Orleans in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy.)

Whereas the sudden and untimely death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States of America, has cast the dark pall of sorrow and regret over the city of New Orleans; and

Whereas the assassination of our Chief Executive ranks with the vilest crimes of this generation and as such brings down the resentment of law-abiding people everywhere; and

Whereas citizens of this community abhor and do condemn this truly un-American act which snuffed out the very life of the man chosen by this great Nation to be its duly elected President and Commander in Chief; and

Whereas law-abiding citizens are outraged at this dastardly crime which removes from his place of high esteem the leader of this Nation, a man who not yet attained his true and ultimate mark in life:

Now, therefore, I, Victor H. Schiro, by the powers vested in me as mayor of the city of New Orleans, do hereby proclaim the day of President Kennedy's funeral service, Mon-

day, November 25, 1963, to be a day of sorrow, and urge all citizens to publicly and private mourn the passing of our Chief Executive.

On this sad occasion, and in tribute to our late President, I have ordered that city hall and all municipal offices be closed and I request that all American flags, displayed on public and private buildings, homes, institutions, etc., be flown at half-mast during the period of local and national mourning.

I urge all municipal employees, as well as all citizens, to observe Monday, November 25, as a day of prayer and reverence so that God, in His infinite wisdom and goodness, might: bring peace and eternal rest to the soul of President Kennedy; that the President's wife, Mrs. Kennedy, and his family might be sustained in this hour of bereavement; that our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, might be given strength and guidance in this hour of crisis; that our Nation might be greater united to meet the challenges that face us today and in the days to come.

In addition, I recommend that all places of amusement and business be closed on Monday, November 25. Where it is not possible to close certain business establishments because of undue hardship on employers or employees, I request that at 11 a.m., c.s.t., on the above date that a 5-minute period of silent prayer be observed.

VICTOR H. SCHIRO,
*Mayor.*

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 25, 1963]

BOGGS DESCRIBES SHOCK, SADNESS IN WASHINGTON—SAYS FREEMEN EVERYWHERE LOST FRIEND

(By U.S. Representative HALE BOGGS, House majority whip)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—This is a day I never thought I would see. I shall always remember each sad detail.

I had had a busy week. On Sunday, Speaker (JOHN W.) MCCORMACK's brother had died in Boston, and Congressman (CARL) ALBERT spent the week as Speaker pro tempore, and I was acting majority leader. This meant constant attention to floor details.

Today, however, the House was not in session, and I thought I would take care of several of my many requests from constituents.

I got the news (of the President's death) in a Government agency office downtown. Immediately, the Capitol switchboard was swamped, and the streets of Washington almost instantly were jammed with people.

I hurried to Speaker MCCORMACK's office. He had just returned today from his brother's funeral in Boston. Already, the Secret Service had quietly moved in to protect his person. (He is now next in line of succession to President Johnson.)

FLOOD OF RUMORS

Already, he was complaining about the Secret Service agents. I told him that they would be with him from now on whether he liked it or not.

We were flooded with rumors. One was that the Vice President, now President Johnson, had suffered a severe heart attack. This visibly shook the Speaker and caused grave alarm among all of us. Fortunately, this dreadful rumor was unfounded.

Soon the word came that President Kennedy's body would arrive at Andrews Air Force Base in nearby Maryland at 6:05 p.m. Congressman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, the dean of the House; Speaker MCCORMACK and I went out to the base together. Other cars brought the other congressional leaders.

Soon, out of a clear and crisp autumn night, came the beautiful Air Force red-white-and-blue jet No. 1. Awaiting it were the dignitaries of the world who represent their Governments in Washington; Representative CHARLIE HALLECK and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Republican leaders of the House and the Senate, were standing right next to me.

WEEP FOR WIFE

As the brown casket carrying the body of our young President was moved from the plane, the great and the near great wept openly for the brave Mrs. Kennedy, who followed behind the casket, and for the man who had given his life for America.

The President's body was then taken to the Bethesda (Md.) Naval Hospital.

The congressional leaders then went to the White House for a meeting with a grave and saddened Texan who now becomes the loneliest man on earth. Present from the Senate were Senator (MIKE) MANSFIELD, the majority leader; Senator DIRKSEN, the minority leader; Senator (HUBERT) HUMPHREY, the majority whip; Senator (THOMAS) KUCHEL, the minority whip; and Senator (GEORGE) SMATHERS, the Senate deputy whip.

And from the House, there were Speaker MCCORMACK, Majority Leader CARL ALBERT, Minority Leader HALLECK, and myself.

ALL PLEDGE HELP

The new President asked for our help. He asked for a united country. He said he had been in touch with former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman and they had said they would come to Washington.

We pledged our help, and each of us, on leaving President Johnson, said, "God bless you, Mr. President."

As I left, the White House was dark except for a light in the nursery. The rocking chair in the President's office was now empty, and a lump came into my threat. I remembered on Wednesday, just the day before yesterday, at our usual weekly breakfast, the vibrant health of our President. I remembered his interest, as always, in every detail of the legislative program; his quiet comment on his warm reception the day before in Florida, and his concern for the Speaker and the loss of his brother.

As I drove away, I said to myself, I have lost a friend. The Nation has lost a peerless leader. And freemen eevrywhere have lost him too.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Proverbs 3: 5: *Trust in the Lord with all thine heart and lean not upon thine own understanding.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the many opportunities we daily have of bringing our human life into a more loyal obedience and closer harmony with the enduring principles of truth and righteousness.

May we strive earnestly to make a worthy contribution to the high adventure and lofty aspiration of establishing a social order in our Republic that has in it the spirit of love and good will.

Inspire us with a sincere longing to emulate and manifest those spiritual virtues of faith and courage which were the secret of the greatness and strength of the Founding Fathers.

Make us more sensitive to the guidance of Thy holy spirit as we seek to determine what kind of legislation will be most helpful in lifting our beloved country and all mankind to higher levels of blessedness and the more abundant life.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.



### THE JOURNAL

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

---

### 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 date the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On December 5, 1963:

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

H.R. 3191. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 3, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia; and

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

---

### 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. 6808. An act for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship and Marine Construction Co., Inc.; and

H.R. 6974. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Antonio, and Vittoria Maida.

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

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. 9139. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

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. STENNIS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which